

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 26 March, 1982

Time — 10:00 a.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. JERRY T. STORIE (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac Du Bonnet):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to table a number of documents pertaining to the announced intention of the Federal Government to abolish the statutory rates on grain. The documents are: A report entitled, Impact of Changes in Statutory Grain Rates and Rail Branch Line Configurations on Manitoba's Agricultural Economy, prepared by a research group consisting of Doctor K. Olsen, Doctor A. W. Tyrchniewicz and C.F. Framingham of the University of Manitoba; a letter to Honourable Jean Luc Pepin, the Minister of Transport, outlining the major concerns of the Government of Manitoba; background papers examining the impact of the proposed changes in transportation policy in various sectors of the Manitoba economy; an information package on the Federal proposal.

The documents show that changes in transportation policy, which the Government of Canada have proposed, will cause a substantial decline in farm income in Manitoba and that the anticipated benefits in processing diversification of the rural economy are largely illusory. The decrease in the value of farm production and in farm income will in turn cause a decline in the manufacturing and service sectors of Manitoba's economy and resulting in a loss of jobs and reduction in personal incomes. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will be seeking the support of all members of this House by way of a resolution to be introduced next week to express our disapproval of the federal proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the issue of changing the statutory rate, which will have such serious consequences for the farmers of this province, will be dealt with in a bipartisan or nonpartisan way.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that all of the members of the House have the best interests of the farmers at heart and, therefore, I would hope that all members will express their opposition to changes in federal transportation policy which would cause financial losses to the farmers of this province. The fundamental change in transportation policy which the Government of Canada is proposing can be simply stated. Since 1897 it has been recognized that western farmers needed protection in law against the monopoly power of the railways. The Crow rate provided that protection. What the Government of Canada is proposing to do now is to remove that protection from the farmers and put in law revenue guarantees for the railways. Thus the federal plan replaces a law which protects the farmers with the law that protects the railways.

I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that members of both sides of the House will want to see the principle of statutory protection for farmers retained. It should not be difficult for members of this House to decide who needs protection. In his report on the 1980 costs of transporting grain Snavely writes and I quote, "It is our considered opinion that the selling price of export grain and grain products are not and will not be sufficient to maintain the financial integrity of all of the participants in the total production and distribution process; example, producers, railways, elevator and storage companies, etc."

I'm confident, Mr. Speaker, that members of this House will place the financial integrity of Manitoba farmers above the interests of the railways. If the financial integrity of one of the parties must be put at risk, let it not be that of the farmers of this province. I also know that all members of this House have a deep commitment to promote the vitality and prosperity of our rural communities. The abolition of the statutory rates may well be accompanied by the introduction of variable rates which would result in the wholesale abandonment of country elevators and the branch lines that serve them. Since the survival of many rural communities is at stake, I hope that all members of this House will express support for the principle of equal rates for equal distance, which is part of the statutory rates.

Mr. Speaker, the documents that I am tabling today will assist the Members of this House, and all Manitobans, to have a better understanding of the issues connected with the statutory rates for grain and the changes in transportation policy which are being proposed by the Government of Canada. Arrangements will be made for my department to brief members of the Legislature and the general public on this issue next week. My colleagues and I will be available to attend public informational meetings throughout the province. This information will also be disseminated to interested parties and affected groups. I am confident that, regardless of political affiliation, all Manitobans will urge the Federal Government to retain the statutory rate on grain and to maintain the principal of equal rates for equal distance."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to that there are two

documents yet to arrive and will be distributed in the next few minutes.

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

**MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister, let me first of all say that this side of the House equally support the position of the farm community, that the interests of the farm community have to be our number one concern, and I want that to be very clearly put on the record for the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, if I could recall, one of the first speeches I gave in this Legislative Assembly was that the statutory rate or Crow rate was one of those things, as a young man growing up in rural Manitoba in the farm community, that was one protection that the farm community had. It had to be maintained; the benefit of the Crow rate or the statutory rate had to be maintained for the farm community of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I entered this Chamber with that feeling and I continue to maintain that very feeling.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister has put it on the record that he is prepared to meet with the farm community and clearly give them an understanding of what is taking place. I support that; I think it's very important that there is a clear and a total understanding of what is taking place at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, and certainly appreciate his position that there will not be any political, any advantage or partisan positions taken, that we truly have to protect the interests of the farm community, particularly at a time when they are undergoing such severe costs in production and lower returns for their production.

So, Mr. Speaker, we welcome the opportunity to be a part of the debate on this particular issue.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. AL MACKLING (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce two steps in fulfilling the government's commitment to an active expression of Manitoban's concern about the Garrison Diversion Project. The Washington firm of Welford, Wegman, Krulwich, Gold and Hoff have been engaged to advise on the representation of Manitoba's interest in the Congress and Executive Branch. The members of the firm have a broad range of experience in the Legislative and Executive branches of the United States Government. Mr. Dirk Blevins, a Crown Attorney in the Attorney General's Department of the Province of Manitoba, has been assigned as the Manitoba representative in the Canadian Embassy in Washington. He has experience in environmental law and will take up his new post on April 5th.

We are currently requesting that the Federal-Provincial Ministerial Committee, earlier announced, be convened as soon as possible to plan our joint program on Garrison now that the Manitoba presence in Washington has been established. I hope all members of this House, and all Manitobans, will support these important efforts to avoid permanent damage to the Manitoba environment.

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

**MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside):** I am pleased that this Minister continues to demonstrate that he is capable of following his senior bureaucrats. This announcement of his course was already made yesterday in Brandon so it's not new to any of us here in this Chamber, and we expect that. I'm a little disturbed, Mr. Speaker, that we have now joined the likes of the major breweries, the teamsters union and other major groups. In the American scene, of course, having paid lobbyists is part of the American scene. We believe that we've done reasonably well by working and having some confidence in our system, the Department of External Affairs, the Federal Government, in our Embassy people in Washington, that to date have safeguarded the Manitoba position with respect to the Garrison.

We will, of course, be filing Orders for Returns in due course about the cost of the firm Welford, Wegman, Krulwich, Gold and Hoff. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether they have any particular competence in the field that they're being asked to represent Manitoba interest, and that we, as Manitoba taxpayers, are going to be expending monies on, but it will be interesting to know just how much monies that I believe this government is prepared to pay to, in a halfhearted way, meet a political campaign promise, to meet a political campaign promise. They've had to back down about having a presence in Manitoba so they've hired some gumshoes in Washington and we are going to pay the bill for that; we're going to pay for it. No, but that's the extent that this government is prepared to go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am really interested in, I'm hoping, that with the help of these high-praised people: Welford, Wegman, Krulwich, Gold and Hoff, that maybe the Minister will be able to get up in this House and from time to time keep us informed about what is happening with the Garrison Project?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 27 students of Grade 5 standing of the Robert H. Smith School. The students are under the direction of Mrs. Moolchan and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

We also have 30 students of Grades 11 and 12 standing from the La Broquerie High School under the direction of Mr. Reno Ouellette. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member of La Verendrye.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. Yesterday during the considerations of

the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources in Committee of Supply the Minister made what to many of us was an astonishing revelation, that in passing the \$13 million item covering Construction of Physical Assets Capital Program, that he and that government was in no way bound by carrying out the specific details of that supply program. My question to the Honourable First Minister is: Can he indicate, not just to me but to the many thousands of Manitobans who look with interest in the passing of these Estimates, whether or not they truly represent the spending intentions of this government?

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

**HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, that question, of course, should be directed towards the Minister of Natural Resources. I understand at the present time the Minister's Salary is being debated before the Committee on Estimates, so indeed the honourable member has a great deal of opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to debate this very matter that he's raising.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to drainage estimates and the list of drainage projects, I'm informed indeed by personnel in the Minister's department that it is not an unusual practice that drainage ditches that are indeed proposed to be constructed sometimes are not proceeded with due to right-of-way, due to cost overruns, due to other factors. In fact I understand there might well be some projects that are listed on the Minister's list that have indeed been listed in previous years and were not proceeded with — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Speaker. I say to the honourable member that I think the Minister gave a very fair and very reasonable indication to the Minister that indeed the past practice is one that is followed.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm more than disappointed with the First Minister's response because he himself was present during a good portion of the considerations of the committee last night. He knows that all of the usual understandable reasons for delay were given to the Minister. My question to the First Minister is that there are other Ministers coming before the same committee for construction capital projects. Is that the attitude of this government, that all they want is the authority to spend the money, but not tell this House or the people of Manitoba how?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, let me assure the honourable member that indeed this is a government that will give a clearer picture as to its intentions in connection with spending than indeed the previous government did in the Province of Manitoba. I can remember very well it having been processed through this House a program pertaining to hospital and personal care home construction in the Estimate review of 1977 and I can recall very well prior to Estimates of 1978, massive changes and cuts and freezing in connection with proposed construction projects that were to proceed with regard to hospitals and personal care homes and other areas.

Mr. Speaker, we will do that which is necessary to describe programs and projects that it's intended to proceed with and indeed if we fail in respect to living

up to the general areas of commitment then I would expect that the honourable members, come the next Session, would question us carefully and critically as to any deviations in respect to that. If we do not provide members of the House with sound and good reason then indeed we will be subject at that time to justified complaint.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, a final question to the First Minister; I just would ask him to confirm that there is a reversal taking place here in terms of the capital spending intentions that in a normal way — this government has every right to change the procedure if they want to. I just want to establish that. In the normal way they proceed through Treasury Board for Cabinet approval and then are presented to the House for approval. What the First Minister is telling me is that we are now going to go through the approval of the Legislative Assembly for the monies and then they are going to be subject to Cabinet review. Is that the new position of this government?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, there is indeed a change taking place in respect to this government from the previous government, in that, Mr. Speaker, this government is one that is more open; this is a government that is more forthright and honest; this is a government that is more democratic than the previous administration in the Province of Manitoba.

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister of Agriculture confirm or a question to him. Has the Government of Manitoba, with the taxpayers money, purchased a new car for his use?

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

**HON. BILL URUSKI (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, I would say, yes they have.

**MR. DOWNEY:** To the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the First Minister confirm for the people of Manitoba that his priorities are \$75 a yard carpet for his office, a new car for his Ministers, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, where the employees in Flin Flon are losing their jobs, Metro Drugs are losing their jobs. There isn't any money in the Estimates for the beef producer of this province and they're unfreezing what has been one of the most beneficial programs for the people of Manitoba, and that's Hydro rate freezes.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Honourable Member for Arthur's question. I hope that some member, somewhere in this House, will file an Order for Return as to what changes, what furnishings have taken place in respect to offices in this building in the past two years. It is my understanding that a large number of Ministerial and Deputy Ministerial offices have indeed been changed in the orderly process of refurbishing in this building.

Mr. Speaker, talking about cars, we'll have something to say about cars, we'll have something to say about 16 television sets bought and paid for by the people in the Province of Manitoba that are in this building, bought during the past two years, we'll have something to say about eight Beta-Max machines that were bought and paid for by the people of the Province of Manitoba in this building.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, in view of the need for continued economic development in the province, in view of the pressing need for employment in this province, can the Minister of Energy and Mines advise the House when he expects to conclude an agreement for the establishment of an aluminum smelter in Manitoba?

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

**HON. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote from the Annual Report of Alcan that says that Alcan is conducting a feasibility study that could lead to an investment in a 200,000 tonne a year aluminum smelter and related hydro-electric generating activities. A decision on whether to proceed with the smelter will be influenced by many factors, including Alcan's financial performance, the world outlook for the aluminum industry and satisfactory negotiations with the Manitoba Government.

I point that out to the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of factors influencing those negotiations right now. We are in the midst of a joint review between the Government of Manitoba and Alcan that is proceeding along very well, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that as that proceeds we will be able to firm up a very good proposal that, in fact, meets the objectives of all parties concerned. That is the intention of both parties involved in this joint review. I don't want to set, as I said before, any type of artificial deadlines with respect to these negotiations that, in fact, were set by the previous Conservative Government, and each one of those deadlines, Mr. Speaker, was broken. No agreements were realized by the previous government, Mr. Speaker, of a final binding nature. Everyone of their deadlines was broken. I think that that's misleading the public.

I want to tell the public very openly and honestly that we are going to proceed expeditiously with these negotiations and we indeed hope that we conclude them successfully, Mr. Speaker. We do want to have economic development. We are proceeding with that, Mr. Speaker, and that's our intention, despite any efforts on the part of the other side of the House to undermine those negotiations. We are negotiating in good faith. I don't know whether the Conservative Party really wants us to negotiate in good faith; whether, in fact, they want to see those negotiations concluded successfully. I think sometimes they feel that it's in their interest to undermine those negotiations. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not what we are trying to do. We're not trying to score political points, we're trying to negotiate in good faith.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Energy and Mines confirm to the Legislature the information that was given to the committee last night by the Minister of Environment to the effect that the Balmoral site, which was selected by Alcan as the preferred site, is in fact no longer considered a preferred site by the province?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm astounded. Alcan has said that this is their preferred site; but we had agreed on January 29th, and this was an agreement between myself, on behalf of the government, and by Mr. Morton, the President of Alcan, on behalf of Alcan, that we would conduct a joint review of all aspects of the aluminum smelting business and the possibility of an aluminum smelter in Manitoba without any preconditions, Mr. Speaker. We know what their preferred location is but we are going to review all of this without any preconditions, which means that we expect them to talk about their preferred site, but, Mr. Speaker, we will ask them questions and raise the possibility of other sites which, frankly, the previous government never, ever did. They never, ever put forward and from the public prospective whether, in fact, there were other locations in Manitoba that could indeed be considered for aluminum smelting.

We have a Provincial Land Use Guidelines Policy where the government states that they think that this type of economic activity should take place in this area, and that type should take place in that area. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for government to do that. What will have happened, Mr. Speaker, if in fact Alcan had picked the east yards for the place that could have been vacated, the CPR yards, as a possible site, would the government have just sat there? We know, Mr. Speaker, that the government, or at least some member of the government, possibly weren't that ecstatic about the Balmoral site but they never, ever raised any of these concerns with Alcan. They assumed that Alcan could come in and just pick their own site without the government putting forward any alternatives. We don't think that's the way in which a responsible government should act, Mr. Speaker, so we are raising alternatives with Alcan without preconditions. Who knows, through this review process, it may turn out that Balmoral ends up as the preferred site for everyone, but Mr. Speaker, there should be a rational process of review, not one where the government just sits back and only reacts. So we're conducting this review in a responsible way, Mr. Speaker, which wasn't the way it was done before.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise the House whether or not the Letter of Intent with Alcan, signed between Alcan and the Government of Manitoba, is still in effect?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, there is an agreement that exists that was signed between the previous government and Alcan; it runs until July. That agreement hasn't been formally terminated, but we have established a review process that was announced on January 29 which says that we will conduct a joint review without preconditions. It may turn out that if that review is completed before July that there might be some amendments to that agreement. We haven't

cancelled it formally but frankly, informally, the joint review that has been agreed to between Alcan and Manitoba is proceeding with, Mr. Speaker, and those negotiations are proceeding with very well. Alcan's not been complaining about the negotiations; the Government of Manitoba is not complaining about the negotiations, Mr. Speaker; we're negotiating in good faith. The only people who are complaining about the negotiations and trying to undermine them are the 23 members of the Conservative Party who were kicked out of office, Mr. Speaker, because they didn't negotiate responsibly with people.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond more fully to the Member for Arthur on the question of automobile purchasing policy. I would like to remind the Member for Arthur that there are 400 new cars bought every year by the Public Service, five of which, in the current Estimates, that's the Estimates that they approved a year ago, are for ministerial vehicles; and Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with that, that is a normal process. As the cars wear out they are replaced, Mr. Speaker, and it takes four years . . .

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that a question was placed to the Minister of Government Services, and if he wishes to make a Ministerial Statement, Sir, I believe he should make Ministerial Statements during the time allotted for that at which time we have an opportunity to respond.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur on the same point of order.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I asked a specific question of the Minister of Agriculture. I got a specific answer and I was satisfied.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the Member for Arthur doesn't want the answer. The answer is that there has been an ongoing policy for years, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I believe I raised a point of order with you, Sir. A question had been asked, as the Member for Arthur pointed out, the question had been asked of the Minister of Agriculture; an answer had been given, and no question has been placed to the Minister of Government Services. He is making a statement which is more appropriate to Ministerial Statements, Sir, and I ask you to rule whether or not there is a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have the feeling that the Honourable Minister wished to expand on the previous answer given to give a fuller picture of what was happening. In view of the situation, perhaps the Honour-

able Minister could finish his sentence and finish the reply.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's not a statement. It's in response to the question put to the wrong Minister, Mr. Speaker. The Minister in charge of automobiles is the Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker, and the policy of renewing 400 cars per year results in a renewal of all cars every four years. As they wear out they are replaced, and it is their Estimates, Mr. Speaker; they foresaw the need for five or six ministerial vehicles, they put the money into the Estimates and those are the dollars that are being spend at the present time.

**MR. ENNS:** Before you know it, we'll be putting the bar in the Premier's office too.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines. Last night the Minister of Environment told us that the Letter of Intent with Alcan was indeed still in effect. I gather that the Minister of Energy and Mines is confirming that this morning. The Minister of Environment acknowledged last night he had never read the Letter of Intent. Is the Minister of Energy and Mines aware that the Letter of Intent contained the provision for Alcan to own an undivided minority interest in a power station in Manitoba?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of that Letter of Intent. That's why, when we decided to set up this joint review on January 29, which we made public, we made that public when we met with Alcan. We didn't have a lot of secret discussions and then have statements emanating after that, Mr. Speaker. We've been quite candid with the people of Manitoba saying that we are conducting a joint review without preconditions, Mr. Speaker. That means that agreement, although not formally cancelled, is on the back burner while we are conducting this internal joint review which has been agreed to by Alcan and by Manitoba, and I can't understand what the Conservative Opposition is trying to get at. Alcan's proceeding with the review; we're proceeding with the review; everyone seems to be proceeding well, negotiating in good faith, trying to reach an agreement except for the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, and I don't understand what their motivation is.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, it then is evident that the Letter of Intent in fact is not in place, that the development of this project, this investment of hundreds of millions of dollars that would create hundreds of long-term jobs is in fact not proceeding as it was before. It has been set back, perhaps indefinitely, Mr. Speaker, and my question to the Minister of Finance is, in view of the fact that the Letter of Intent is not in effect now — it has been nullified by the Minister of Energy and Mines — is the Minister of Finance not concerned that in his . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines state his point of order.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I have not said that the

Government of Manitoba has formally cancelled the Letter of Intent, but that the negotiations that are ongoing and which are normal part of a process of negotiation are proceeding without precondition. We haven't formally cancelled it, that runs until July, Mr. Speaker. We are indeed conducting a full inquiry with Alcan without preconditions, and the Member for Turtle Mountain is trying to say that there is no Letter of Intent and that there isn't any negotiations under way with Alcan and that is completely and totally false.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. A difference of opinion as to the facts between two members does not constitute a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain may proceed.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question was to the Minister of Finance. Is he not concerned, based on the fact that the Letter of Intent with Alcan has been nullified by the actions of the Minister of Energy and Mines because the Letter of Intent provides for an undivided minority interest of a power station, since the Minister of Energy and Mines has nullified that agreement by not agreeing to that provision, is the Minister of Finance not concerned that he has filed a prospectus helping to convince investors that they should invest \$200 million in Manitoba and he has told them in his prospectus that under a Letter of Intent between the Aluminum Company of Canada Limited, Alcan, and the province, Alcan has commenced a feasibility study for the construction of a \$500-million primary aluminum production and processing plant in the province. Alcan has announced the selection of a site approximately 25 miles northwest of Winnipeg and is conducting environmental and socioeconomic studies.

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Finance not concerned about the credit rating of this province and about his integrity when he places this type of document before the investors of the United States and indeed of the world and asks for their support when that information is clearly not true?

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

**HON. VIC SCHROEDER (Rossmere):** Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat surprised that the former Minister of Finance who was in office when that prospectus was being prepared would stand up this morning and make those kinds of idiotic statements.

Mr. Speaker, the man stands up here and doesn't read the total package of what is said. The prospectus puts on the record the fact that in November of 1981 there was a change in government and that the New Democratic Party had formed the government in this province. The prospectus put on the record, I quote, "The newly elected provincial government is reviewing negotiations relating to five major construction projects including the Alcan project." The suggestion by that member, Mr. Speaker, that somehow we are misleading the investors by stating what is a fact, is absolutely incredible. It is an incredible misuse of his privilege of the right to stand up here and ask questions, to try to distort what had happened. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it's absolutely shameful.

The fact of the matter is as the Minister of Energy and Mines has stated so very clearly, that document is still legally in effect. The Member for Turtle Mountain does not seem to understand the difference between modification and nullification. Neither the Government of Manitoba nor Alcan made a request to abandon the Letter of Intent that had been signed before that group left office, and therefore that agreement, subject to the modifications made voluntarily between two parties in the midst of negotiations is in effect with those modifications.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that when prospectuses such as the member is quoting from are being prepared they are looked at very, very carefully, first of all by the very same senior Civil Service who were there when he was the Minister and secondly, by the underwriting group and it is a strong underwriting group and the legal people involved with those underwriting groups. They make sure they don't walk around putting statements into prospectuses that don't conform with the facts, and this statement conforms perfectly with the facts. The only problem was that member forgot to inform the House of half of the facts thinking that I would not have this document with me this morning.

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

**MR. STERLING LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, referring to the same document, which document by the way, the prospectus dated December the 23rd, 1981 produced by the present government, and then the preliminary to it, the date of it is March 8, 1982 which we can also presume was prepared by the same government and contains information as follows at the back of it. "The information set forth herein except for the information appearing under Underwriting and Delayed Delivery Arrangements was supplied by the Minister of Finance of the Province of Manitoba in his official capacity as such Minister duly authorized thereto by Order-in-Council."

My question, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the attempt by the Minister of Finance to state that he had told the truth in this prospectus whereas in fact he hasn't, would the Minister of Finance care now to confirm that this statement that is also in the prospective, page 11, quote, "In May, 1979, the Minister of Finance of the province announced fixed power rates for a period of five years ending on March 31, 1984, for all Manitoba consumers other than bulk purchasers and those on other separate contracts." In light of the statements made by his colleague that this matter is under review and that there is likely to be the freeze removed, would my honourable friend care to tell us why he didn't advise the investors that they were reviewing that fact as well, and tell the full truth which they have not done?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is reverting to his sleazy types of questioning that possibly one —(Interjection)— I'm standing up to answer only because I recognize that there are people outside of this House who might be interested in the answer. Certainly the former First Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, knows full well that freeze is

now in effect, that there is a review and that there has been no change with respect to that freeze. To suggest that on December 23rd, 1981, when this document was filed there was something wrong with the statement, is incredible, nor was there anything wrong with it when the loan was obtained.

It is just absolutely incredible that this Opposition has nothing better to do than ask ridiculous questions about a prospectus that was prepared by the senior civil servants in the Department of Finance, the very same people who were there when they were in office. Those were the people who prepared it. It was gone over by the list of underwriters, including the First Boston Corporation, Salomon Brothers Incorporated, Merrill Lynch, Whiteweld Capital Markets Group, Wood Gundy Incorporated, Richardson Securities Incorporated. It was examined by the New York lawyers for the group and it was approved and as a result thereof, we got a loan at a reasonable rate for Manitobans. I suggest that what the Leader of Opposition is doing is not in any way helpful to this province.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the information that has been given to the House by the First Minister and by the Minister of Energy and Mines to the effect that the Hydro rate freeze is now under review, and that the Committee of Public Utilities will be hearing a response presumably from the technicians at Hydro about whom the Minister of Energy spoke the other day. Would the Minister of Finance having regard to the integrity of this province and to the integrity of its dealing with its creditors, not feel it suitable that an addendum or an amendment should be made to this prospectus with respect to the section on Section 11 that I just read, pointing out properly that this Hydro rate freeze is under review? Would the Minister not think that that would be more in accord with the truth and in accordance with the practice followed heretofore by this province of trying to tell the truth in the prospectus that it gives to the people?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, just to look at a few other areas of the prospectus to show that we were concerned to tell investors the truth. We showed, for instance, that real growth provincial product grew in 1979 by minus 1.1 percent in this province; that it grew in 1980 by minus 1.6 percent in this province and that in fact at the end of 1980 our gross provincial product was less than it had been in 1977. We showed those kinds of things.

We talked in this prospectus about the difficulties with Hydro and the rate freeze, the fact that there was a projected requirement of payments to the province to Hydro as a result of the — I don't recall whether it said specifically as result of the freeze — but certainly an indication that there were funds being paid to Hydro because it wasn't running at a current level position.

So to suggest that we aren't telling what in fact is happening with Hydro, and other parts of the economy is rather ludicrous. We can go through the prospectus. There are many areas where the province had

performed well. There are other areas dealing with housing and other specifics where we had not performed so well. No I'm sorry. At the time this document was prepared we didn't put anything in about the Crow rate. Possibly we will consider that for the next time that we do prepare a debenture. But as the Leader of the Opposition I'm sure knows, that it would be somewhat ludicrous to be preparing supplementaries to a prospectus which has already been completely subscribed to.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, may I direct the attention of the Minister of Finance and his colleagues to the statement that was made by the First Minister of the province in this House — not a statement made by the Opposition — a statement made by the First Minister of the province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable the Attorney-General on a point of order.

#### POINT OF ORDER

**HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge):** It is often said, Mr. Speaker, that fools reveal themselves quicker than any other species known to mankind.

I rose on a point of order and as a mere amateur in this House it's my understanding that when a member rises on a point of order, and the Speaker has recognized that point of order, that the House will pay attention to what is being said. May I continue as a mere amateur?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister should proceed.

**MR. PENNER:** The point of order is that the Leader of the Opposition during Oral Question period rose, not to ask a question, but asked to draw the attention of the members opposite to some document. That is not an oral question, it is not proper, and it is out of order in Oral Question period.

**MR. SPEAKER:** If that was the full case I would have to agree with The Honourable Attorney-General. I assumed that what the Leader of the Opposition was saying was a one-sentence preamble which has the blessing of Beauschene for use.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS (cont'd)

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, your assumption as usual, Sir, is quite correct.

Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the First Minister of this province and the Minister of Energy and Mines have announced that the Hydro rate freeze, which has been a great boon to all consumers in Manitoba for the past three years, is under review and may well be lifted. How can the Minister of Finance publish in a prospectus which is given to investors in Manitoba this statement:

"In May, 1979, the Minister of Finance of the province announced fixed power rates for a period of five years ending March 31st, 1984 for all Manitoba consumers other than bulk purchasers and those on

other separate accounts." I merely ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, would it not be more in accordance with the truth to tell in this prospectus, that this Hydro rate freeze is now under review by this funny government?

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister has said that the First Minister and the Minister of Energy and Mines announced a review within Manitoba Hydro. Frankly I was responding to a question by the Member for Turtle Mountain regarding whether, in fact, there was any type of review within Hydro. I answered candidly, Mr. Speaker.

Every year Hydro does a financial projection, every year they do a review. Every year they do a review of what their financial position might be, Mr. Speaker. The government of the day may choose to ignore that technical review. They might ignore it, that's what the Conservative Government did with respect to past financial projections done by technical staff within Manitoba Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, we have said that when that technical review is finished we will take a look at it. We think that's the way a responsible government should operate. It's not the way in which they acted.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance thought it was important to put this paragraph which I will read, into the prospectus relating to a review, why would he not put into the prospectus that there was a review under way on the Hydro rate freeze? I read the statement that he did not read into the record from page 10 of the prospectus:

"The newly elected provincial government is reviewing negotiations relating to five major construction projects including a Western Power Grid involving transmission of hydro-electric energy to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, a 1300 megawatt hydro-electric generating station on the Nelson River expected to cost approximately \$2 billion, a \$500 million primary aluminum processing plant which would require additional electrical generating capacity, a \$640 million potash mine and refinery and expansion/conversion of the Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited plant at The Pas (see the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board - Construction Program and Economic Structure - Minerals - Manufacturing)."

If the Minister saw fit to enumerate that review, why would he not say that the Hydro rate freeze was being reviewed and where in that statement, Mr. Speaker, does he say anything about suspending the Letter of Intent with Alcan and about suspending the site selection for Alcan.

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I think we've just seen a perfect example of why it is that the Leader of the Opposition should be the Leader of the Opposition rather than the Premier, because what we did in that prospectus, we told investors of the areas where we are reviewing where things might go against the investor.

Mr. Speaker, if there was an elimination of that

particular freeze of the Hydro rates, then those people in New York who had lent us money would be happy. They wouldn't be unhappy that we are getting a break-even level of revenues from a public utility. They wouldn't be unhappy about that at all; they would feel that's the way that a utility should be run. So, for him to suggest that somehow by not stating this, we have improved our case to the investors is patently incorrect. The very reverse would be true. The investors would be happier with that statement.

We didn't put it in because in fact, as I understand it, we didn't have any specific knowledge of the review nor was it a formal kind of a review other than a yearly look-in — I picked up that word look-in from a former member on the other side. It was something that was done every year by Hydro, but it wasn't something that could in any way be conceived of as being against the interests of the investors to whom that prospectus speaks.

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, would you call the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 14.

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

#### BILL 14

#### THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1982

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the adjourned resolution for the Minister of Finance, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, Bill 14.

**MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to participate in this debate on Interim Supply because of my very serious anxiety and concern for the conditions in the Province of Manitoba at the present time under this new government and my concern for the fate of the welfare and the future of the province under the administration currently in office.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that all members on this side of the House and a great many Manitobans in general who have an opportunity to watch the performance, monitor the performance of this government and this House by whatever means, through the media and other reporting lines of information, are becoming increasingly concerned and alarmed about the fate and the future of this province. The conduct of this government in respect to its responsibilities as trustees of the resources and the interests of the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is extremely disturbing. Many of the hopes and the opportunities of Manitobans I feel are being seriously endangered. The partisan dabbling and trifling of this administration is seriously and critically undermining the future of this province.

There's a catalogue of jeopardy building up right



now, Sir, and unfortunately a new page is added to it every day. We see evidence of it in the performance of the government in the regular business of the House whether it be dealing with the current issues of the day that arise in question period or whether it be in dealing with legislative procedures and proposal that are in front of the House such as the consideration of Interim Supply. We see evidence of it in particular in the study and evaluation of various departmental Estimates being presented before committees both inside and outside this Chamber. We see evidence of it in the performance of the First Minister and his Ministers and his caucus members in general outside the House and I think that we have reached a point, Mr. Speaker, where Manitobans are relying more and more each day on the Opposition in this Chamber, Sir, to preserve not only the present but preserve the future of this province and to ensure that the damage that's been done and apparently is going to be done by this government is kept to an absolute minimum before all our hopes and all our chances are lost and shattered.

The litany of the disappointments and failures and let-downs offered the people of Manitoba by this government in the brief four-and-a-half months it's been in office, Sir, is absolutely staggering. There's the anticipated deficit and the enormous borrowings into which the administration has entered already and the Throne Speech message which emphasized flights of particular partisan fancy in the old NDP style of spend, spend, spend and which totally ignores the fiscal reality of the moment. The government has no hesitation in reminding Manitobans at every opportunity of the deficit that they "inherited" from the previous administration, no hesitation in reminding the public of that fact, Mr. Speaker, whenever it suits their political purpose, but when it comes to addressing the challenges of the province and the people there is no recognition of that deficit, of that difficult fiscal reality whatsoever. We have a Throne Speech message which proposes massive new initiatives in spending; many of them, such as the proposal for the Crown corporation in the oil activity field — ManOil — totally unrealistic, unnecessary and imprudent in our view.

We have an approach in terms of spending programs that can lead nowhere but to a higher imposition of taxes on the people of Manitoba or an increasing magnitude of debt and deficit which will burden this province in terms of international monetary markets to the point where our integrity, Sir, will be undermined and potentially destroyed. And yet the government in its approach continues to pursue those ethereal kinds of objectives that contain and imply that there is an unlimited supply of revenue and money and contain and imply suggestions for additional spending and never face up to the reality that the bills are coming in, that Manitobans are going to have to handle and shoulder those bills and that the best opportunity for meeting those obligations, the economic opportunities of this province are being eroded and injured day by day through the positions the government itself is taking with respect to those projects. That's one aspect of the approach of this government that has seriously concerned the Opposition and now I can assure the members of the government, Mr. Speaker, is seriously concerning

Manitobans in general.

Another aspect of it, of course, has already been the subject of considerable reference and discussion in this House and that is the promises, in the posturing of the New Democratic Party in the last several years, and particularly in their election promises and their election campaign material. Those promises for the most part, Mr. Speaker, now are proving cynical, misleading and hollow. We've had the promises to the elderly, which contained implicit criticism of the previous government and suggested that there was going to be a great new period of protection and care for the elderly in this province which, to say the least, was a highly cynical position to take anyway, Mr. Speaker, because under the four years of our administration consistently through the Department of Health and the Department of Community Services major initiatives and programs on behalf of the elderly including such initiatives as the establishment of the Manitoba Council on Aging were undertaken and put in place. And if anything in the record of the previous administration stood out as being particularly significant in terms of its social impact and its value for the social welfare and well being of Manitobans it was the programs, capital and operating, that were undertaken on behalf of the elderly.

But the New Democratic Party in its period in Opposition and certainly during its election campaign last fall attempted to make the case for the elderly that they hadn't received the kind of attention and consideration that they required and there were many subtle messages, and some not so subtle delivered by the NDP throughout that four-year period and throughout that election campaign, which held out promises of better treatment, better programs, more spending, more consideration for the elderly, by an NDP Government than had been the case under a Progressive Conservative Government.

Well, that, Sir, has turned out as it was in its inception and at the time of its use, that, Sir, has turned out to be another cynical political promise, another cynical election posture, that rings more hollow with each passing day. A classic example of that was the position that the government took with respect to personal care home fees and the continual criticism that they heaped on the previous government for necessary increases in the personal care per diem, required an order to maintain the existing financial viability of the program itself without disturbing the ratio of resident government participation. But we never heard the end of it, Mr. Speaker, when such personal care per diems were increased. Along came the new government, recognized the basic integrity of the method for raising personal care per diems that we had introduced and at first blush permitted the automatic January 1st increase to go through, recognizing, as I say, at least the fiscal common sense in having to meet the increased costs of the program on a fair and continuing basis.

Well, I guess that didn't go over very well, Mr. Speaker, with some of the colleagues of the Minister of Health. Certainly, it was noticed by the members of the media — (Interjection) — that's right. My colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, Sir, reminds me that that was the way they handled the capital items too. The decision was made in some cloistered office and

then went to the Cabinet room afterward. But the other party that was alerted to the increase, of course, Mr. Speaker, was the media. Once there was some media attention focused on the fact that here was the NDP doing precisely what they criticized us so vocally for doing, there were great feelings of anguish and concern among the members of the government caucus and certainly along the Treasury Bench and the the Minister of Health was called on the carpet and called to account for the fact that he had introduced a per diem increase in this field and had invoked some public criticism and some media criticism. This was a terrible thing for a government that was posing and posturing as the friend of all the people, the nice guy government. It was more than their political character and their respect for principal was going to be able to accommodate and so they did, Sir, an immediate reversal, an immediate flip-flop and ordered the Minister of Health to go out into the hall and tell the media he was rescinding his original position and he was reneging on his original statement, his statement of justification, and he was going to produce a counter-argument that was going to justify the fact that there would be no increase at all. So, immediately there were suspicions that had been perhaps smouldering in the minds of some Manitobans that began to expand into a more nagging flame, Sir, that here was a government that really had no commitment to principle of direction, or integrity of position; that here was a government that was going to respond entirely to the political opportunities of the day, and react to the kinds of pressures and the kinds of feedback that reflected on their popularity as a bunch of nice guys, as a nice-guy government.

Their ambition since November 17th, Mr. Speaker, is to cover up their lack of talent, to cover up their lack of integrity, and to cover up their lack of cohesion with a nice-guy image. They think that they can get through the rigours and the challenges of administering the affairs of a very important society of one million people simply by appearing to be all things to all men and women; simply by appearing to be nice, popular, friendly, easy-going people. That is going to cover up all the multitude of other sins.

There was always this nagging suspicion on the part of many of us, Mr. Speaker. We had an opportunity to see evidence of it at first hand perhaps more closely than some members of the general public did, but the general public began to see it very clearly, Sir, on reversals and on flip-flops such as those that I have just described, such as the one having to do with the increase in the personal-care per diem, and such as the one which my colleague from Turtle Mountain reminded me on the capital program. Then, at last, came that glimmer of recognition and realization on the part of the public that perhaps here is a government that we have elected that really doesn't have a set of principles; that really doesn't have a sense of cohesion and unity; that really doesn't know the meaning of the word integrity; that really doesn't know the meaning of the word sacrifice, and challenge, and sweat, and work, and struggle; that really is just a collection of people who achieved their basic objective which was to defeat the government of the day, the Sterling Lyon Progressive Conservative government, and to win office and that now are going

to do what they have to do to project an image of popularity that will cover up their shortcomings and maintain them in office for as long as possible.

Well, Sir, that strategy is beginning to backfire in some of the revelations that have occurred since the Session of the Legislature got under way in February, and as I suggested a few moments ago, a new page is being added to that catalogue every day. There were the promises, Mr. Speaker, to the unemployed and those entering the job market. The fact that here was a party and here was a government that was felt concern for Manitobans with respect to job opportunities and existing jobs. It was going to ensure that small businesses didn't suffer from high interest rates and weren't forced out of activity and forced out of existence by economic conditions.

We've got the ruins of that promise all around us today, Mr. Speaker. We've got situations such as the Metro Drug situation which, had it occurred when our government was in office would have provided the fuel and the material for a hysterical attack by that party, Sir, when it was in Opposition which would have put the howl of the banshees to shame. One would have thought that the world was collapsing and that the Progressive Conservative government of the day was igniting the fuse, had there been a situation like the Metro Drug situation when we were in office and they were in Opposition.

Now, Sir, all they can say is that they never suggested that they were going to be able to protect enterprises either from managerial mistakes or from management difficulties that resulted from conditions beyond the control of an administration in this province, that resulted from conditions extraterritorial. That wasn't the message we heard when they were in Opposition, Mr. Speaker. When we were in government, the word we continually heard from them and their election material pledged, that they would take action and not sit idly by and see Manitobans lose their jobs. Even if those conditions and even if those factors were extraterritorial in the main, there still was no excuse for a government to stand by and let people lose their jobs or suffer economically. Therefore, this party was going to take action and make sure that people were protected against that kind of thing.

What do we have now, Mr. Speaker? When the question is put in the House to the First Minister, he ducks it. The first two or three times it's put to him and the first two or three times any question is put to him, he ducks them. That's been abundantly clear to Manitobans since this Session got under way particularly those who watch any of the television coverage or listen to any of the radio coverage of the proceedings of this Chamber. Then, if he is finally pinned down and cornered and backed into a position where he has to provide an answer, his answer is that administrations in provinces like Manitoba are powerless to have any influence or effect on outside conditions, fiscal, economic and otherwise that have forced these severe business emergencies and business crises on the community.

My colleague from Turtle Mountain reminds me of the infamous election campaign brochure from the New Democratic Party once again, Mr. Speaker, and the references that it makes on a page in the middle of that brochure to the kind of help that an NDP govern-

ment would provide people threatened by just those circumstances such as those that I've referred to. This pledge, and as I say, Mr. Speaker, I'm quoting from the celebrated gospel according to the NDP which was distributed far and wide throughout the province during the recent election campaign: "A Clear Choice for Manitobans; Policies with the Manitoba New Democratic Party; Great People, Great Future, Manitoba and the NDP." A pamphlet, Sir, which with each passing day of examination and evaluation is revealed more and more to represent one of the lowest most cynical examples of pamphleteering in the worst sense of that word, in the history of Canadian politics. Page after page of this brochure has been revealed by my colleagues in the Opposition, by the media and by the public to be a sham, Mr. Speaker, and here is a classic example.

This is one of the things they went to the people with: "Working people: a Safe and Healthy Job," and this a direct quote from the page carrying that heading in that brochure. The Manitoba NDP believes working people deserve job security in a workplace that poses no threat to their health or safety. "Manitoba New Democrats would provide security from layoffs." Hah! "Up to twelve months' notice or compensation to employees would be required in the event of shutdowns or layoffs involving more than fifty people. Priority would be given to wages and pension benefits if a company closes with provision for seizure of assets in the event of noncompliance." Rubbish, Mr. Speaker.

If that's an example of the kind of message with which those people, Sir, went to the people of Manitoba and solicited their votes and their support, well, those brave promises, and they were promises guaranteed by the First Minister, are being revealed now hour by hour, day by day, week by week for what they truly are — cynical political manoeuvres designed to win an election and nothing else. Don't let us be told, neither you nor anyone else in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, by the First Minister that there was nothing either sincere or intentional or of a totally committed nature where these promises were concerned. The First Minister made those promises in a brochure in which he described them as guarantees. He described them as promises that we can guarantee and then signed his name to them.

So that's where we stand, Mr. Speaker, on the position that this government of the day, this new government takes with respect to the whole matter of integrity, and the whole matter of principle, and the whole matter of commitment to and faith with the people of Manitoba. We hear from the First Minister that it's the intention of this government to keep faith with the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, Manitobans must be laughing, if they're not crying. They must be either laughing or crying today when they review those kinds of election promises, that kind of statement repeated again in the House by the First Minister a few days ago about keeping faith and then review the record of this government and the condition of this province since November 17th.

Mr. Speaker, what about all the other promises? The immediate start on Limestone — well, if that represents their sense of the word "immediate," we

would hate to see what they would do and where the people of Manitoba would be if this government ever had to respond to some kind of an emergency. If that's "immediate" then God help us. And we're not advocating an immediate start on Limestone. We never did. We explained why it couldn't be done, but that government when in Opposition went on the campaign trail and those are the key words, Mr. Speaker — "went on the election campaign trail" — did advocate it because it was a case of win at any cost. It doesn't matter what the province needs. It doesn't matter whether we understand what we're talking about. It doesn't matter whether we even agree. What we have to do is win. Get in there, get the Progressive Conservative Government out. Get in at any cost and then once in, we'll cover up all our weaknesses, all our foibles just by posing as the nice guys and the nice girls and the populist administration for this province. Well, Sir, that was a great strategy. It got them elected but it's not going to help Manitoba or Manitobans one iota. It's going to damage this province irreparably unless the Opposition keeps this government to a minimum of damage, keeps it as close to the straight and narrow in terms of the requirements for this province as is absolutely necessary and we see that, Mr. Speaker, as our sacred challenge, if I may say so, for the next two or three years until we can get rid of that government and assure Manitoba of a sensible and prudent approach to its affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the most recent shock for all Manitobans must be the revelations that have come on Alcan and the Alcan negotiations. We're now into a situation where the environmental impact assessment is jeopardized, where the socioeconomic studies are jeopardized, where in fact the whole project and all its promise and potential for Manitobans is seriously endangered, and that's only come about in terms of awareness and knowledge insofar as the people of Manitoba are concerned as a result of intensive and scrupulous questioning and searching in this House and in committees of this House during the examination of the Estimates and during question period. If it weren't for the unrelenting efforts of members of the Opposition to pry that kind of information out of a reluctant front bench, the people of Manitoba would have no awareness as to what degree these projects, such as the aluminum smelter and the Alcan project and the other major economic projects have been jeopardized and endangered, but that information is now coming out as a consequence of the activities of the Opposition in this Session; and if we can keep them honest enough, Mr. Speaker, and if we can keep them to the issues that concern the people of this province in this Session, we can indeed reveal for Manitobans the extent of the difficulties facing us because of the lack of principle, approach and cohesion of this government and create, hopefully, a sufficient climate of public opinion that will force the government to recognize the realities of the day and start meeting some of them and start living up to some of the opportunities that Manitobans have and that indeed Manitobans do not want to see squandered.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the situation with respect to mining layoffs in the north, the social and economic conditions resulting from that inactivity in communities such as Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids. What do we

hear from this government that was so convinced when in Opposition and on the campaign trail that the Progressive Conservative government could have been doing something miraculous to save the situation and save the jobs for the miners in the north? What do we hear from them, Sir? They can't do anything about it because no administration in a particular region such as Manitoba can exert any influence on world mineral markets, copper and otherwise, nickel and copper markets and prices. We can't do anything about it because those are international market conditions and monetary conditions and you can't expect a province like Manitoba to be able to fly in the face of that.

Well, there is a certain realism in that approach, Mr. Speaker, but it's interesting to note that realism has only been acquired by the First Minister and his colleagues since they faced the harsh light of reality of responsibility as a government. It didn't exist when they went out to the people of Manitoba and tried to weasel their way into the affections of the people and tried to misrepresent the Progressive Conservative government of the day and tried by every scheme available to them to work their way into office as the government of the province. Oh no, there was no such realism at that time.

Mr. Speaker, as we look down this litany of danger we look at the certainty of higher taxes that Manitobans are facing in order to meet, not only the that deficit which is very real and very legitimate and results from economic conditions of the past several years, but to meet the expansive flights of spending fancy on which this government has committed itself, both inside and outside the Legislature, both through the Throne Speech message and in other pledges in the province at large, so that we know that here is an additional burden that Manitobans face certainly as a result of appointing to this collection of politicians to administer their affairs for the next three or three-and-a-half years.

The propaganda for those increases in taxes is already being laid. The ground work is already being put down, Mr. Speaker. We see the threat to the Hydro rate freeze, which, if it is realized will be an extremely damaging thing for Manitoba's economic future. The impact that it will have on business activity here and some small business activity here, investment opportunity and initiative will be immeasurable, Mr. Speaker, not to mention the impact that it will have on homeowners and residential uses who will be carrying the kinds of increases in the Hydro rates that we suffered under for many years in the 1970s under the earlier NDP administration. But as serious as that impact for homeowners, residential ratepayers is the threat to the economy contained in a removal of that Hydro-rate freeze, Mr. Speaker.

What is absolutely necessary is sufficient business and economic activity in this province to generate revenues and create jobs and career opportunities and to hold our people here and hold our young people here. That is the kind of dynamo, that's the kind of catalyst that can fund the programs that we need for people. That collection opposite in the guise of government today, the new NDP administration, Mr. Speaker, seems for some reason beyond our comprehension, unable to understand that basic point.

The social programs, the educational programs, the health programs, the general welfare programs that we have, and need, and want to reinforce, and want to reassure, in order to provide the quality of life for Manitobans that we all desire, have got to be funded and fueled by the economic generator that produces the necessary revenues, and over and above that, Sir, in order to keep our people here and in order to attract and interest our young people, there have got to be interesting, worthwhile, profitable and if possible, exciting career opportunities here. None of that can be achieved by these continual and insidious impositions on the free enterprise sector, on the business sector, on the small business sector in particular, Mr. Speaker.

And hence, I suggest to you, Sir, and to members of the government opposite that a removal of that Hydro rate freeze at this juncture would be a body blow to the future and to the opportunities at hand for the people of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to cite also in the very few minutes remaining to me on the clock, the disenchantment now being experienced by many Manitobans and certainly by those of us on this side of this Chamber, in the attitude that this government has taken to the principle of freedom of information. They were the great preachers and purveyors of the concept in the principle of freedom of information, Mr. Speaker, while in Opposition. Today, now that they're in government, we see once again the integrity of that party, that government, the integrity of that kind of approach and that kind of argument. They don't give a darn about freedom of information now that they're in government. We don't get any answers from the government, we don't get any information in the Estimates process. The people of Manitoba aren't told about changes in policy or attitudes that are being developed or noninflated. The people of Manitoba get the opposite of what they were promised in the election material junk that went out under the NDP logo in the autumn of 1981. So where is that great holier than though commitment to the sacred principal of freedom of information? Mr. Speaker, it was just another election maneuver, just another cynical, political ploy.

But the biggest concern of all, Sir, as I say is what's happening to the potential opportunities for this province. That is now becoming a subject of major, worry, anxiety and concern to Manitobans all across the length and breadth of our province. Manitobans everywhere have seen through the coverage the lack of integrity and commitment of this government to those opportunities.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member's time having expired, the Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER (Emerson):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make a few comments or put a few comments on the record in the Interim Debate taking place at the present time and I want to express some concerns.

During the Throne Speech Debate there was a lot of reference made from time to time about members going on the high road and I think we're at that stage where we finally have to call a spade a spade and

assess the situation or the performance of this government to date.

It's been a month that we've been in Session now. It's been four months since the present administration took over and I think it gives us enough time to see the direction that they're going and there's definitely a direction taking place at the present time.

Representing a rural area, I'd like to concentrate a little more on the agricultural and rural aspect of the activity that is taking place or not taking place and from time to time, Mr. Speaker, I will be making reference to an article in a local newspaper, the Carillon News as of January 13th, 1982 where there is a picture of our present Premier looking very aggressive and at the bottom it says: "Howard Pawley promises Manitobans an open government."

This is the area I'd like to concentrate most of my remarks on, Mr. Speaker, because we've had examples in the House here during questioning where that open government is certainly a very hidden government. We've had examples also taking place during our Estimates to date, the Minister of Natural Resources has showed exactly how open he is with his attitude towards open government by the fact that when he wrote the people along the Red River Valley, the municipal people that they would — without consulting or anything about 30 days time — that there would be a 10 percent cost to them for their dyking. The Minister at that time did not know what was happening. When questioned on the aspect of it he says: "There is \$900,000 in the Budget. If they will not accept their 10 percent, the money will be expended somewhere else."

When the hue and cry came from the municipal people he finally says well I will meet and negotiate with them so subsequently he did exactly that. The people came in very aroused. He indicated that he would be reviewing the situation with them. They went back with some kind of a feeling, I think that the Minister was honourable and was going to review the situation. But we found out last night in Committee that actually the whole thing has been an effort in futility and I want to see what the Minister will say when he meets with the municipal people next time and finds out that what he did last night, when he made the statement that we were going to approve the Estimates and principal, then he'll go back to Cabinet and establish priorities.

Unheard of, that's why the big rhubarb took place night and I think rightfully so. I think the people of Manitoba should know exactly how this Minister reacted. That makes reference to the open government that they're referring to all the time.

There has been an expectation raised in the rural areas during the last election. Economic times were tough. People were looking for ways to maybe come out of this thing a little easier — hard times, high interest. So we have the NDP Party running around indicating that they're going to give interest relief; they're going to do big projects to save small communities; the Main Street Program, a variety of these programs and expectations were raised by the present administration. Now we're finding out that was actually a political ploy, it was to get elected, because when I look at the Estimates there's a change taking place. They are not concerned about the rural area,

about the agriculture area.

I noticed before the Minister of Transportation got up and made a statement on Crow. Yes, I think it's commendable that they are concerned. That's the first concern they've shown to any degree about the agricultural people. Expectations were raised by the Premier sitting across the room here when in that interview with the press he indicated, "Agricultural priorities are the establishment of a Beef Price Stabilization Program, closing the loopholes in Farmlands Protection Act and rationalizing Federal and Provincial Farm Credit Programs." What has happened? Well, let's do a little review, Mr. Speaker.

The Beef Program still is in limbo, hanging up in the air. I think between the Cabinet and the backbench over there, their caucus, they cannot agree so they say well we're going to be out consulting with the producers. When I asked who they were consulting with, they said many producers. My anticipation would be or my belief would be that they'd probably consult with the Manitoba Farmers' Union with whom they've always been associated with very closely and I expect it won't be very long before the Minister of Agriculture will be again having grants available to the National Farmers' Union of \$20,000 the way they had before. The National Farmers' Union seems to be the chief adviser in the agricultural field to the NDP.

Talking of open government, I just want to make a little reference. We've had a bit of activity going on during question period about the Hydro freeze investigation and the questions have been raised, the doubt has been raised from the government of the day that they're reviewing it. The fact that they're reviewing it, I think they're floating it out to see what the reaction of the people will be. But I would like to take and just quote from the First Minister in his interview with the Carillon News some time ago: "Pawley promises his government will honour the Hydro rate freeze for the remaining two years of the agreement."

I think, Mr. Speaker, possibly some missed it, I'll read it again. "Pawley promises his government will honour the Hydro rate freeze for the remaining two years of the agreement." Mr. Speaker, if that is the case and if the First Minister is honourable then we shouldn't even have a debate in this House about the Hydro rate freeze review, because I think they're floating up a little balloon and seeing what the reaction is going to be. But this is in documentation and we will keep it. We will make the First Minister honour this agreement or this statement here, or else we'll tell the people of Manitoba exactly how he and his government operate.

There seems to have been a shift taking place. I don't think the concern is there at all for the rural people. We saw in the Estimates of the Minister of Natural Resources actually not a normal increase, if you take the inflation value into there, there is a decline in there. It is these kinds of programs, Natural Resources, Agriculture programs that basically built up this country that they're now trying to tax the dickens out of.

Drainage projects, agricultural programs, they have no concern about them. They're more concerned about their social programs. In terms of the debate from time to time the First Minister's got up and grandstanded before when answering questions to

the cameras, indicated the economic roles are national and he blames the previous administration, he blames the Liberal Government. He's already on his two envelopes right now because what he's finally realizing, I think, is that all the promises that they made, they will not be able to come up with the goodies. The people of Manitoba are out there waiting for many of these programs.

I want to quote a few more little quotes here from the First Minister's statements to the press at that time. "Besides the economy," Pawley cites, "appealing on the part of Manitobans in general that the Conservatives let them down. There have been expectations since 1977. Those expectations have been betrayed by four years of Conservative administration." Well, it hasn't taken them four years to betray anybody at all; it's taken four months and we already know that they are being betrayed.

I think basically we're going the same old road that we did prior to 1977. He further indicates, "When the economy is in bad shape, the government cannot absent itself from intervention. In times like that it is necessary for the government to develop short- and long-term policies." We're looking at involvement in ManOil; we're looking at involvement in other things which was this hotel or something that they bought out at Falcon Lake there. You see the same trend taking place that was there some years ago, but in the meantime economic conditions are bad. The money is not there, so what can we anticipate? When we question about are there going to be increases in taxes, and rightfully so, they say wait for budget time, but already they're sending out their little messages. The First Minister in his statements says things are so tough; we'll have to raise some of the taxes somewhere along the line. It will be very interesting to see exactly what taxes they will be raising — (Interjection) — That is what they're doing; they're trying to psyche the people of Manitoba up that if they want these services, they'll have to accept increased taxes.

We've already seen that. The Minister of Education already, through her program, we find out that the cost of taxes to the rurals, the farmers, is going to be — how much was that, Member for Morris? — 15-percent increase on the farm population. The beef program is not in place. It's a matter of just squeezing and squeezing them. What bothers me a little bit, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that I wonder what they're actually trying to accomplish. Are they trying to get the farm community down on their knees and then they'll step in and take over the farms? They had a good program going on that previously.

Actually I think I might take the opportunity if somebody would so request after a while to table this portion of that paper, because I don't want to read the whole thing into the record, but there's some very, very interesting comments. It further indicates here that, "The Premier hopes to gain confidence of residents of the area south of the Trans-Canada Highway" even though that area, the most productive farm area of the province, voted solidly Conservative. Then he goes on further again making reference to that open government. He says, "Government is open." He promises, "Rural residents will find this government is one that is open. This is a government that is interested in rural areas and we are not interested

in confrontation."

I wish you would have told the Minister of Resources that when he started dealing with the municipalities along the Red River Valley, when he told them without any consultation it was going to cost them more money and he still hasn't done anything about it. He has not come to an agreement with them. Their budgets have to be completed; they still don't know where they stand, and yesterday he told us that maybe there won't be any program, period. I drew it to your attention.

Interesting stuff here. "Pawley recognizes the fact that a segment of society in the southeast fears the NDP party is a party of the far left. He tells those people that they are a social democratic party and not a communist party." The fact that he has made reference to it in that respect and when we see some of the members of his side of the party that have affiliated themselves with the Communist party, how other can people think except that, and I don't mean that as a shot. I think we have to draw it to the attention of the people. It was the local press that had it in front line headlines there.

An open government; promises, all kinds of promises, and we have yet to see actually one that is going to be completed. They have a commitment to the people of the province, to all of the province. What they're doing in my opinion, I think they're discriminating against the rural areas and against the farmers at the present time. They're more concerned about their social programs in the cities and, Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that by the time their four years are up if they haven't bankrupted this province by that time that we will again take over the government.

Why has there been so much discussion about these megaprojects? I think everybody in Manitoba knows realistically that we have a limited tax base. One of the projects that our government undertook was to bring in private money, private investment, and build up the tax base in this province. What they have successfully done in four months is scuttled every one of those projects and then try and defend it by reviewing everything. I don't know whether we've ever had a government that has so many reviews going on in so little time, but I suppose that will be reflected in the contracts for people that they have working for them.

I'd just like to make certain reference to the Crow rate which was made reference to before, the Federal Government has appointed Mr. Gilson to make a report. Accusations have been made by your Minister that the Federal Government has already made up their mind that we're going through a charade. Why, if the Federal Government has already made up their mind and if this is the case, why would the Minister of Agriculture turn around and hire somebody to do exactly the duplicate work of Mr. Gilson? That is what has happened.

The members opposite are so concerned about getting everybody a job. Payola is what we have. We saw that yesterday when the Minister of Natural Resources indicated under his programs that they don't even bother tendering for public projects anymore. They make their decisions and tell us that's how it is going to be and that is open government, but the people of Manitoba will be judging you; they are judging you

right now and if you continue at this rate, I don't think you'll last four years.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, D. James Walding:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa):** I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I would like you to call the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs, Mr. Kostyra, on No. 9, An Act to amend The Insurance Act, standing in the name of Mr. Graham.

### **BILL NO. 9 — THE INSURANCE ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The bill is Bill No. 9, An Act to amend the Insurance Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Virden had taken the adjournment on my behalf, so if I may I would like to proceed with comments on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs' comments on amendments proposed for The Insurance Act, I concur with his assertion that these amendments do not contain any significant new policy directions, with one major exception. With the one exception I find the amendments to be useful, but not significant as changes in policy. For instance, the extension of the time period during which an action may be claimed against an insurer, the permission for monies to be paid to a minor to be paid to the public trustee, and the increase in minimum liability limits under The Highway Traffic Act would all be considered to be house-keeping and normal changes. But I do not agree with the Minister's statement that the amendments that are contained within the section known as Clause 10 are merely, and I'll quote, "a provision to control the establishment of agencies that are set up for the sole purpose of placing insurance requirements for a single client or a group of clients," as he suggested. I think indeed, Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment does more than that.

Firstly, it specifically precludes the Superintendent of Insurance from issuing a license to a corporation whose head office is outside Canada, and although there are nationalistic overtones which may be supportable by many, we would want to know, Sir, what other jurisdictions are doing with respect to this particular initiative. It may well be that the provision is merely going to require that agencies and brokers who are currently doing business in Manitoba, establish a wholly-owned Canadian subsidiary with a head office in Canada in order to carry on doing what they're doing. But I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, just pre-

cisely why this is an important amendment and one that is necessary to be made to The Insurance Act at the present time.

Further I would think that many members, particularly those on our side of the House, would want to know the rationale behind the change from a positive statement in the existing Section 371(1), which said that the Superintendent shall, if satisfied that an applicant is a suitable person and intends to publicly carry on business in good faith as an insurance agent, shall issue the license to that sort of individual or company. That has been changed from a positive statement that would have allowed the discretion of the Superintendent of Insurance, to a negative statement in which, under the present proposed amendment the Superintendent rather than merely having the right to refuse a license to somebody who was not going to be publicly carrying out the business of an insurance agency or brokerage, now must refuse a license to an agent or a broker who's sole purpose is to act as a self-insurer for one act on behalf of a self-insuring interest for a group, person, corporation, or state of family, etc., as indicated in the proposed amendment.

We have some considerable concerns, Mr. Speaker, as to the rationale behind this change, particularly when, as I said earlier, the existing Section 371(1) expresses in positive terms the Superintendent's right to refuse such a license. And now we've changed it into negative terms whereby the superintendent must refuse such an applicant a license.

At the moment without any further description or additional commentary by the Minister, we are unable to judge or understand why it is necessary to compulsorily refuse a license for such a purpose. There may be a great deal of speculation as to why it might be in the government's interest to do this, but it's not obvious from the comments that were made by the Minister at the present time. It may well be that if there were some interest on the government's part to get into a broader involvement in the issuance of general insurance across the province, that this would enable the government to preclude individuals, or corporations, or companies, or groups from setting up a brokerage or and agency for the purpose of, in essence self-insuring, to avoid dealing with a broadly-based government insurance scheme. I'm not so sure that this is the reason, but it may well be, and it will require a great deal of further explanation before we are prepared to accept the necessity for this.

The Minister in introduction went further and said that as far as possible and practical it is desirable to maintain a high level of uniformity of insurance law in all jurisdictions in Canada. Some other jurisdictions have already incorporated these amendments into their statutes and after careful consideration these changes have been recommended for Manitoba. A cursory review of The Insurance Acts of our immediate neighboring provinces, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta does not show that he has adopted this type of provision. In fact, their statutes contain essentially the same type of wording as in our existing Section 371(1), and if it is indeed desirable to maintain our Insurance Act on a parallel basis with other provinces then I would ask the Minister to bring a further explanation and justification before Committee

because I would believe that not only would we be concerned about it, but others who are in the insurance industry and who have an involvement with the carriage of insurance in this province, I think would require further explanation on that.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I'd say that we're prepared to have these amendments to The Insurance Act proceed to committee stage with the hope that the Minister can indeed bring justification and further information that might convince members on this side and other people involved with the insurance industry in Manitoba as to the necessity of bringing forth the amendments, particularly those contained within Clause 10 of Bill 9.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is there any other member present wishing to speak on Bill 9?

In the absence of the honourable member and the Minister, the bill will stand adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

The Honourable Government House leader.

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, unless it's not in order to do so, we're prepared to have you put the question on Second Reading.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have asked for advice on this matter and I am somewhat loathe to let a matter come to a vote where a member has adjourned the debate indicating he wishes to speak on it and then to have the matter go to a vote in his absence. What is the wish of the members?

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. ANDY ANSTETT (Springfield):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that the House has established the precedent in the past that when a member advises the House that another member had adjourned the debate on his behalf that the House has allowed the matter or the motion to go to a vote on Second Reading despite the fact the member is not here, that only when such advice is not provided by the House has the Speaker reserved that member's right to speak at a later date.

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

**MR. ENNS:** I want to advise you and help you with that decision. It is my understanding that the Member for Virden did adjourn it as a matter of courtesy to allow the Member for Tuxedo to speak on the bill. We are satisfied on the Opposition that we have had our opportunity to speak to the bill.

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

**MR. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I just wish to confirm that that was indeed the purpose of the Member for Virden's adjournment, was to take the adjournment in my name in order to turn it over to me.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

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

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, 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.

I should state, Sir, in moving this motion that it's the intention that the Committee meet as a whole in the House and I would like to obtain leave from members opposite if necessary to go a little bit past 12:30. I understand there will be nothing debated on Private Members this afternoon.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I presume this is for the purposes of the arrangement that I understand the Opposition House Leader and the Government House Leader have made with respect to moving along the Capital Bill to Second Reading stage, that's all we're doing in Supply? There's been some arrangement made on both sides and that's satisfactory to us. If that's what my honourable friend is referring to, we certainly will carry through with any undertaking that the House Leader for the Opposition has made with him.

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

**MR. PENNER:** Yes, I understand there has been an arrangement made with respect to moving along to Capital Supply but I understand that there's a vote to come from the consideration of the Estimates of the Minister of Natural Resources —(Interjection)— Not today? Isn't it required as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, that that vote be held?

**MR. SPEAKER:** It is moved by the Honourable Attorney-General and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance that the 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 and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Flin Flon in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

### NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon):** This Committee will come to order.

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. HARRY HARAPIAK (The Pas):** Mr. Chairman, last night in the section of Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 to consider Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources an Amendment was moved by the Member for Lakeside to reduce the Minister's Salary by \$1.00. When the Committee was ready for the question I deferred the vote in accordance with Rules 65.9(a)(1) and 65.10.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The motion before the Committee



is that last night in the section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 to consider the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources, an Amendment was moved to reduce the Minister's Salary by \$1.00. When the Committee was ready for the question the vote was deferred in accordance with Rules 65.10, 65.9 and 65.9(a)(1). Are you ready for the question?

Call in the members.

**A COUNTED VOTE** was taken the results being as follows:

Yeas, 19; Nays, 23.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The motion is defeated.

### CAPITAL SUPPLY

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** On the understanding that we're dealing with Capital Supply there is a motion before us that,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$37,800,000 for Capital Supply.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS (Niakwa):** On a point of order, are we entitled to pass that item at this point? I think that we were voting on Minister's Salary and on the resolution. We have agreed to it?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Springfield on a point of order.

**MR. ANSTETT:** It's withdrawn.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To continue, this is referring to Schedule A, the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, \$26 million; the Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited, Trout Lake joint venture, \$2.8 million; Emergency Interest Rate Relief Programs, \$9 million for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committeerise. Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

### COMMITTEE REPORTS

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, A. J. Anstett (Springfield):** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I move seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a

Committee to consider of Ways and Means for the raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

### COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon):** Committee come to order.

The resolution before us is Capital Supply.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT towards making good certain sums of money for the Capital purposes, the sum of \$37,800,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund—pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committeerise. Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

### COMMITTEE REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has adopted a certain resolution.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**MR. SCHROEDER** introduced Bill No. 8, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes, Loan Act (1982).

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

### SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

#### BILL NO. 8 - AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF MONEY FOR CAPITAL PURPOSES, LOAN ACT (1982)

**MR. SCHROEDER** presented Bill No. 8, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes, (Loan Act (1982) for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I would ask that it be called 12:30.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have my notes here. I did have some notes prepared which I didn't bring this morning. The Bill, just in global terms, is self-explanatory. I would prefer to stick to the notes if that is agreeable.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

**MR. RANSOM:** In view of the fact that the Minister doesn't have his notes present, we'd be prepared to call it 12:30 and leave it standing in the Minister's name.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it the agreement of the members to call it 12:30? (Agreed)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. PENNER:** It being called 12:30, I would move that this House do now adjourn, seconded by the Minister of Finance.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday afternoon