



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 33A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 24 MARCH, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**Thirty-Second Legislature****Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellise	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Cncordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virден	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 24 March, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I have a statement, Mr. Speaker. I would like them distributed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Universities Grants Commission will be disbursing \$146.3 million in operating grants to the three universities and St. Boniface College. This represents a 10.3 percent increase in grants, inclusive of funds to offset the levy for health and post-secondary education.

The grants to the universities are conditional on tuition fee increases not exceeding 9.5 percent. This is in line with the decision we have taken regarding tuition fee increases for the community colleges.

In considering an appropriate level of increase in our grants to the universities, we considered three things:

- the present difficult economic conditions which have put pressure on provincial revenues;
- the 15.7 percent increase in funding we provided to the universities last year, an amount that was well above the inflation rate;
- the significant cutbacks by the Federal Government in established program funding this year.

Under the conditions I have just mentioned, our level of support to the universities is fair and responsible.

As far as tuition fees are concerned, with this year's increase of 9.5 percent, averaged with last year's freeze, students in Manitoba will continue to find themselves paying the lowest fees of all provinces, with the exception of Quebec. They will still also find that the increase over the two years is still well below the inflation rate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We thank the Honourable Minister of Education for the statement that she's made today. In responding to it, Mr. Speaker, I think it's valid to point out that the increase of 10.3 percent in grants, inclusive of the amount to offset the employment tax - the 1.5 percent payroll tax that was put on last year - means an actual increase of something closer to 9 percent, I would think.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I know that this has to be contrasted against the universities' requests for this year; for something in the neighbourhood of 18 percent increase, in order to carry through their plans and programs, as they had them outlined in entering this year.

That, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, is evidence of the fact that this government has a serious budgetary problem to face, a deficit of something in the range of close to \$600 million at the present time being projected and as well, this government has to, in its repriorization, try and cut the suit to fit the cloth.

I remind the Minister, of course, that when we were in government and were wrestling with the same kind of budgetary constraints and were endeavouring to be fair with the universities in making the grants reasonable in terms of the provincial resources, that her colleagues in opposition screamed loud and long and orchestrated demonstrations on the steps of the Legislature, led by, among others, the now Member for Thompson, who said that they, if put into office, would take off all constraints and give the universities massive increases in fundings. My, what a difference a year-and-a-half makes!

Mr. Speaker, I remind the Minister, as well, and hope that she would have taken into account in arriving at this decision that the university is one of the few growth industries in Manitoba today, with a 12 percent increase in enrolment this year, I believe. From information I received from the President of the University of Manitoba, in conversation on the weekend, they're looking at a 20 percent increase in applications for this coming fall.

So I would hope that the funding that's made available, and I suppose that's reflective of the fact there are some 20,000 Manitobans unemployed under the age of 25 these days, and obviously greater pressure being put on post-secondary institutions to accommodate them.

So I would hope that given the difficult times that everyone faces, this funding will not result in too great strains and harms on the quality of education at the universities.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file in the House the second report of the Spring Run-off Outlook for Manitoba. It's a fairly lengthy report, Mr. Speaker. Generally, it is a favourable report, but of course these reports are subject to the present conditions and can vary depending on precipitation between now and the full break-up. Copies of the report should be available for all members.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 33 students of Grade 9 standing from the Sanford Collegiate School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Hew, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

There are also 20 students of Grade 7 standing from the Churchill High School under the direction of Mr. Fenton. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Protest demonstration, U.S. Consulate re Nicaragua

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister or, in his apparent absence, the Acting Premier of Manitoba. Can the Acting Premier confirm that two members of the Executive Council of the Government of Manitoba; namely, the Minister of Economic Development and the Minister of Natural Resources, at least those two members; and the Member for River East, Mr. Eyles; the Member for The Pas, Mr. Harapiak; the Member for Rupertsland, Mr. Harper; and the Member for Springfield, Mr. Anstett, all participated last evening in Winnipeg in a demonstration in front of the United States Consulate, at which demonstration the flag of the United States was burned?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that all the members named have been there; I know that there is a fair number. I wish to say that they were there representing themselves as individuals. The Consul General of the United States has been so informed.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member for Inkster said he wished to associate himself with a group who was present?

MR. D. SCOTT: That I do, that I do.

HON. S. LYON: The Member for Inkster was also present at the demonstration at which the American flag was burned.

Can the Acting Premier tell the House and the people of Manitoba if he considers that kind of conduct on behalf of Cabinet Ministers of the Government of Manitoba to be appropriate and to be decent, given the relationship between the United States and Canada, or what are he and his left wing colleagues up to in this province?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the information that I have is that the burning of the flag, none of the members of this caucus had anything to do with it, that's unfortunate that was done.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes they were there. That doesn't mean that people are responsible because they

are there. The situation is that in this party we do not decide what every single member intends to do in his own time, on his own. This is something that every single one of, as members, are free to do and there is no intention of changing that at all.

This is not done as an act of this government. It is individuals who chose to be there and this is their responsibility and choice.

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

MR. G. LECUYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just heard the Leader of the Opposition imply that we were there to condone the burning of the U.S. flag.

I was there, never saw that there was the burning of the U.S. flag, in fact, I would vouch that this did not happen, and if it did, it did not happen while we were there or while I was there, nor that I ever condoned such a measure being taken.

So I would like this put on the record, Mr. Speaker, that this did not happen. It was implied and therefore I would like this put on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for Radisson for his explanation, I don't think it was a point of order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the Acting First Minister that these various members of the government caucus, including at least two members of the Cabinet of Manitoba, were acting on their own, can the Acting First Minister tell us whether the NDP Party is acting as a government or just a rabble?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that the responsibility of any individual's action is his own.

There's a lot of things that happen in this House - the conduct of the Leader of the Official Opposition, we don't necessarily blame all the members of his party for that.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to engage in the kind of sandlot hooliganism that is customary for the Member for St. Boniface when he gets caught in a corner, and he's caught in a corner right now.

I'll ask this question of the Acting First Minister, and we'll seek its confirmation from the real First Minister, if the real First Minister will stand up some day. The question will be this: Is the Premier of Manitoba prepared to offer a formal public apology to the Consul General, Mrs. Lillian Mullin, on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, for the unseemly behaviour of a number of its backbenchers and at least two of its Cabinet members in participating in that kind of hooliganism in front of the U.S. Consulate last evening?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, certainly not, certainly not, Mr. Speaker. I repeat, the action of individuals is not the action of the Government of Manitoba. Besides that, in a free society, and a free

society has to be free in every respect, certainly people should have a chance to voice their disapproval or approval of policies of others that concern all the free world.

Garrison Diversion

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources, whom I understand will be going, either in his capacity as an individual and I would think as a Minister of the Crown, shortly to Washington to try and win friends and influence American legislators, to share our concern about the Garrison Project, can the Honourable Minister, whose face filled the television screens, grinning, while the American flag was being burned - and by the way, a picture of which is right now on its way to those same American legislators that we will be trying to influence and win friends with - tell us how he expects to accomplish that kind of friendly persuasion in lobbying in Ottawa on a matter so important to Manitoba as the Garrison issue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I am an individual; I am entitled as a free individual in this society . . .

HON. S. LYON: We're beginning to find out what kind of an individual, too.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . to make my views known as an individual citizen . . .

A MEMBER: A Member of the Cabinet.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . as to what I believe to be a form of international aggression, sanctioned by a government that believes in democracy, but through its actions is acting to destroy democracy in another part of the world. Now, Mr. Speaker . . .

HON. S. LYON: Tell us all about it.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . I have every respect — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite want to harass me in my answering the question.

MR. L. HYDE: We'll continue to harass you, too.

HON. A. MACKLING: That indicates the type of view they hold, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't add anything to their stature. I say this, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of this House have great affection for our neighbors south of us. They are wonderful people, Mr. Speaker. They happen to be represented at the present time with people in government that I don't support, whose views seem to be destructive of world peace and as individuals we are entitled - as individuals - to stand and criticize that, freely as free men.

Mr. Speaker, in respect to this flag-burning incident, I was one of those, yes, marching in front of the Embassy as Al Mackling, individual citizen — (Interjection) — shame they say. Well, they can shame all they want. I did see the remnants of something burning. I inquired as to what had been burned and it was indicated to me that a flag had been burned. I certainly, nor did any of my colleagues have anything to do with that act of destruction.

So, let the record be clear, Mr. Speaker. We were there as free people expressing our views. We weren't expressing the views of government. — (Interjection) — Well, what are we there for? Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member doesn't know yet, there's no point in my trying to tell him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I trust you'll be generous with the Rules from the sometimes Acting House Leader who frequently lectures us about the brevity of replies or questions.

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister - in view of the fact that the organizer of that particular protest, a Mr. Casper Shade, conceded in an interview, "There's 'absolutely no proof' at the moment of any U.S. involvement in the Nicaraguan situation. 'I don't know. It's a protest against the invasion of Nicaragua,' - he goes on to say - Shade said, admitting 'we probably could have protested in front of Eaton's.'" - my question is that it's not that much fun burning an American flag in front of Eaton's as it is burning it in front of the U.S. Consul, burning it in the face of our American friends, the people that we are trying to influence and help us with some co-operation; my question is to him, and I'll ask the question again because it is of vital interest to Manitobans, how is this going to further the cause of settling our differences on the Garrison issue? How is this going to help solve our problem on that issue? I am asking a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm rising on a point of order. We have clearly, the members that attended clearly did disassociate themselves from the burning of the flag and that has to be accepted.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They do not deny that they were there to show their displeasure at some of the action of the United States Government, but they disassociate themselves completely from the burning of the flag and that has to be accepted.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I will accept to some extent the Acting Premier's constant repetition that they were acting as individuals. Will then the Minister of Natural Resources consider, in the interest of Manitobans, to

remove himself from any further negotiations, because after all our American legislators are just individuals too, they're just human beings? Will he remove himself? Will he voluntarily resign from that portfolio or at least not handle the Garrison negotiations in Washington?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, many people in the United States including United States congressmen and United States senators are appalled at some of the actions of their government. Mr. Speaker, I've indicated in this House, and the honourable members continue to babble otherwise, that I had nothing to do with an active destruction of the American flag and I have no reason to believe that I will not be welcome in the House of Congress, in the House of Senate when we go there to talk to those friends in respect to Garrison.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, when the Acting First Minister says that members of the Cabinet and members of the NDP caucus, but in particular, members of the Cabinet have stated that they have no responsibility for that action and that they do not condone it and took part in it as individuals, does the Acting First Minister mean that the Minister of Natural of Resources and the Minister of Economic Development will now resign from the Executive Council of this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that my honourable friend knows the answer to this, that in the United States, I think it is clear, that not every single American believes in every decision that is made by the government . . .

MR. L. HYDE: We know that. We've got one right in the House here. . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . just a minute. I know you know and I know you can talk. I see you talking there. You've made the message.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, the then Premier of this province attended a Republican meeting. He was the Premier of this province. He did that as an individual supporting that group. He could have been insulting all the Democrats. It's the same way. He was there representing himself. There was no criticism of that. He came back with a flag, excuse me, a tie, and Mr. Speaker, there is no way that we're going to try to muzzle individuals.

We even had the Ambassador of the United States who lectured our government right here in our country, an ambassador. That is his freedom. I think you show friendship to a country if you are not afraid to tell them of the things that you agree and those that you don't agree.

— (Interjection) —

The Leader of the Opposition said, stand up and tell it. That's exactly what they did.

HON. S. LYON: You're not a Red, why do you defend him?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm not defending him, I . . .

HON. S. LYON: Yes, you are.

Borrowing of Money from United States

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. How much money does the Minister of Finance expect to be borrowing in the United States in this coming fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Finance know how much money he borrowed in the United States last year on behalf of the people of Manitoba?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I can get the specifics of that to the member in due course. If he wants to ask me those kinds of specifics, I would appreciate it if he gave me advance notice and then I could give him the answers without having to go back and get the checking done.

MR. B. RANSOM: Does the Minister of Finance know whether or not the kind of political climate that exists within a governmental jurisdiction borrowing money on the markets in the United States has anything to do with whether or not the borrowers want to lend their money?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The interest is the main thing. The interest, how much they can make on it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Member for Turtle Mountain is aware, the matter of ability to borrow has something to do with such things as credit ratings. It certainly has something to do with whether money has been repaid in the past and, if he is suggesting that we should muzzle Manitobans and say to them that they cannot partake of a perfectly legal activity, an activity, whether it was — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, you hear the opposition referring to burning flags. Our members have said very clearly that they disassociate themselves from that action and I believe that everybody on this side would clearly disassociate themselves from that activity, whether they were right or wrong.

As I understand it, they believed, rightly or wrongly, that the United States of America was involved in a

military activity against the nation of Nicaragua. On the basis of that belief, they went and said, we don't want that happening. That is basically what happened at that demonstration with respect to our members, as I understand it. I don't know of anyone in the United States who would say — (Interjection) — members opposite say that may not be true.

If it wasn't true, then there is no problem at all. If it was true, then I believe that many, many Americans including those who lend money to us would agree with the position taken by those demonstrators. But, regardless of that, I would not want this government to be in a position where we would tell people in this province not to partake . . .

HON. S. LYON: Never mind the province, look after your own . . . that's where most of the Reds are.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . of a perfectly legal and moral activity in order that we can borrow some money. I think that would be something akin to selling our souls.

Four-laning Highway 75

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. In view of the fact that the Minister has continued four-laning of Highway No. 75 and completion of that project to the U.S. border is part of the "Wish List" by the Minister of Finance, could the Minister indicate what particular advantage to the promotion of commerce and the encouragement of tourism with our United States friends, participation by Cabinet Ministers and backbenchers of the government at a demonstration in which the American flag was burned, how do those actions by government members prove conducive to continuation of trade with the United States and encouragement of tourism by citizens of the United States to this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to get into an ideological debate with my friend, the Member for Pembina. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the public interest for both sides of the border to try to co-operate, whether it's with respect to transportation or other matters. It is not my position here to either condone or to condemn the actions of individuals, be they individuals, part of the Government of Manitoba, the backbench. That is for their own conscience, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wants to pursue with me whether that is, in any way, going to hamper tourism, I suppose that's a hypothetical question.

Canada Day Celebrations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Acting First Minister. First of all, I would like

him to tell me if he feels that should he and other of his Cabinet colleagues were to take part in the celebration of 1st of July, and someone happened perhaps to burn the Canadian flag, whether he would . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. LECUYER: . . . consider himself morally bound by that decision?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Although I haven't heard all of the question, it appears to be hypothetical and it also is asking for an opinion of someone. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

MR. G. LECUYER: I'll rephrase that question then. I want to ask the Acting Minister whether he will attend the celebration on the 1st of July next summer, even though this possibility may take place?

Secondly, would he be prepared to participate in a demonstration in opposing the Garrison proposals of the United States, even if this possibility were to arise that the burning of the United States' flag were to take place there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, any reception or celebration that I feel that I would like to attend, I will. I will not ask permission of anybody, I'll go on my own; I'll accept full responsibility for my actions. I would hope that if some incident happened I will not be blamed, not more than I wish to blame the people across here for their responsibility of Watergate because they support the Republican Party in the . . .

Afghanistan Demonstration - USSR Embassy

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Acting First Minister. Would he mind giving - and I'm sure he'll have to take this as notice - us a list of all of the members of his caucus who paraded in front of the Embassy of the USSR at the time that Afghanistan was invaded by USSR and burned the USSR flag? Would he mind giving us all of the names of all the New Democrat's caucus in Manitoba who did that and who performed that act of protest? — (Interjection) — The left is always right with you guys.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not intend to take that as notice. This is not a thing that interests me or should interest the members of the House, not more than I'm seeking to know where every single member of the government caucus were last night or the night before or tomorrow.

HON. S. LYON: We don't burn flags in front of embassies.

A MEMBER: We don't burn American flags . . .

HON. S. LYON: Reds do.

Sale of electrical power to U.S.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: My question is to the Acting Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Acting Minister whether or not the Minister of Energy will be travelling to the United States within the next few weeks in an attempt to sell electrical power?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Who did he ask?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I was just going to tell the Member for Turtle Mountain that the Minister of Energy and Mines just walked in.

A MEMBER: Good answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, like quite a few other things, that's quite evident to the members on this side, just as it's evident to us that the United States normally celebrates their national holiday on the 4th of July rather than on the 1st of July. The members opposite don't seem to be very aware of those sorts of things.

My question for the Minister of Energy and Mines was, does he plan to be travelling to the United States within the next while in an attempt to conclude some sort of power sale with the states or power companies in the United States?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, within the next month, I will in fact be travelling to the State of Wisconsin to have discussions with officials there on the matter of possible sales of electricity to utilities in the State of Wisconsin.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Energy and Mines is does he think that the negotiating climate with the United States, with power companies in the United States, will be enhanced by the fact that members of his colleagues in Cabinet were participating in the demonstration last night at the U.S. Consulate at which a flag was burned?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that matters that are extraneous to the discussions will have any impact. There are members of political parties who are involved in certain activities. There indeed have been supporters of the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker,

who from time to time have been associated with western separatism. I don't think that's hurt them, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that's hurt them in any discussions, Mr. Speaker, that they've had on governmental matters.

There are matters of dispute regarding acid rain, for example; there's matters of dispute regarding fisheries between the United States and Canada. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that those disputes are carried on within a spirit that we do have freedom of speech and we do have freedom to criticize each other on issues that we feel concerned about.

Americans, Mr. Speaker, have criticized Canadians about a number of issues. They have done that, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't hold that against the particular state when I go down to speak to them, and I assume that they in fact will not hold that against Manitoba when I go down to speak to them about electricity.

Cabinet solidarity and unity

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Acting First Minister a question. In view of the fact that Manitobans will now be very concerned as to where this current government stands in respect to parliamentary traditions and practices, which we've inherited, can the First Minister advise this House whether members of the Treasury Bench, members of the Executive Council, in this New Democratic Party Government regard themselves as individuals or regard themselves as representatives of the people who have taken an oath of office to operate in terms of Cabinet solidarity and unity?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, yes, very much so, when we deal with the affairs of Manitoba, the responsibility that we have as a Cabinet. As far as individual responsibility, I don't think that you're offending anybody if you disagree with them. It would be a sad world and it would be a sad day for democracy if you've got to agree with everybody else to please them before you can deal with them.

An honest disagreement is certainly — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I resent very much and on a point of order, I would wish that you admonish the members on the other side and make them realize that the burning of the flag had nothing to do - if this was done at that time, it's certainly not the responsibility of the members that were there.

Burning of USSR Flag on Legislative grounds

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

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs. — (Interjection) — Can he indicate to the House . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. If there are members present who wish to carry on a private debate, perhaps they would step outside and do so. I would like to hear the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs. Can he indicate to the House if he was present when the USSR flag was burned on the Legislative grounds last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I can confirm that I was representing the Premier at a rally sponsored by the Canadian Polish Congress, the Canadian Labour Congress, and other groups on the front of the Legislative grounds last year at which time the flag of the USSR was burned. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was also in attendance there.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On the point of order raised by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, I was present at a freedom rally for the people of Poland. I was present and somebody burned the flag of Russia at that gathering, and unlike my honourable friends, I don't disassociate myself from that. I think that was the proper thing to do. I'll tell the truth about it.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, were the statements by the Leader of the Opposition part of new parliamentary tradition that he's trying to establish whereby question period will be subverted into some type of session for opposition members to make statements rather than ask questions?

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

MR. B. RANSOM: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, raised by the Minister of Energy and Mines. We have one more example of how the members opposite don't wish to see an even, balanced approach to questioning and answering in the House. — (Interjection) — Earlier - perhaps the Minister of Natural Resources could contain himself long enough to listen to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier in the question period today the Member for Radisson interrupted while a question was being asked to explain his role in the leftist demonstration last night in front of the U.S. Consulate at which the U.S. flag was burned and no one rose, either on this side or the other side, to try and rule him out of order, Sir.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

There was no point of order on the floor and I will remind the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain the remarks of the Honourable Member for Radisson were ruled out of order from the Chair.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the diversion drawn into the debate, or dispute, by the Honourable Member for St. Johns and the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, could I ask the Acting First Minister whether he would not, in fairness, in this House, to the press gallery, and to the people of Manitoba, concede that he, if none of the others understand this, that he, with 22 years experience in this House at least recognizes there is a difference between the responsibility that is imposed upon a Cabinet Minister, a member of the government, and the responsibility that is imposed upon a member of the opposition, even if that person be Leader of the Opposition. There is an oath of office involved in the one instance and not in the other.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly concede that there's a difference with the Minister acting in his capacity as a Minister but that has to stop somewhere.

When I go to bed with my wife at night I'm not a Cabinet Minister.

HON. S. LYON: I imagine the performance is about the same in both places . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. SHERMAN: Do you treat her the way you treat the people of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: She doesn't seem to be complaining. Do you beat your wife?

HON. S. LYON: When you're not used to much, why complain?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This has to go on the record. I want Shorty, excuse me, the Leader of the Official Opposition, to tell me what he means by when you're used to too little, you don't know the difference. Maybe he can explain it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that his performance as a Cabinet Minister and as a husband are probably both the same and they're neither up to much.

MR. SPEAKER: Do the members wish to continue with Oral Questions?

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of casting reflections on the Minister of Health's marital performance, I would truly like to ask him a question of some concern.

The Minister of Cultural Affairs indicated that he participated at a rally on behalf of the Premier in which the flag of the USSR was burned and he said that was acceptable by his estimation. Are we to assume then that since . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs on a point of order.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did not state in my answer to the question from the Member for St. Johns that I found that that practice of a burning of a flag was acceptable.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister for that explanation.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of Cultural Affairs objects to the burning of the USSR flag as we object to the burning of the United States flag. There's possibly a difference in thought patterns there.

MR. SPEAKER: Question?

HON. D. ORCHARD: But, Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Minister of Health, that since at a rally in which the Minister of Consumer Affairs was there officially on behalf of the Premier, that the credibility was lent to the burning of the soviet flag, would not the credibility be added to the burning of the United States flag last night by the attendance of the Minister of Natural Resources, the attendance of the Minister of Economic Development, who addressed the rally that the American flag was burned at?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that any officials, anybody representing a government should start being involved in burning of flags, any flags, Lower Slobovia, China, it doesn't matter. I don't think that this is the thing and we are, the members, I can't speak for them, have disassociated themselves from the burning of the flag.

They do admit that they were there as a form of protest; that it was an orderly protest; and this is a decision they made. I decided not to go, I knew that the — (Interjection) — for my reasons. This is something that every single member of this House will have to search his conscience and decide what he should do. This is not something that Cabinet will impose on anyone.

Burning of flags

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting First Minister.

Can the Acting First Minister tell me whether it was the Manitoba taxpayer who paid for that American flag that was burned last night?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that and I don't know who paid for the matches either.

MR. A. BROWN: I wonder if the First Minister would find out whether it was the Manitoba taxpayer who paid for that American flag that was burned last night?

HON. L. EVANS: That's not even in order.

How can you sit there and let those questions be asked?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'd like to ask a question. How in the heck did I get in this?

I'll try to accomodate my honourable friend and find out all this information. As soon as I find out if we have a secret police here in Manitoba, I'll put him on the job immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, to the same Acting First Minister, can the Acting First Minister give the taxpayers of Manitoba the assurance that all these flags that have been burned around here recently have not been paid by the Manitoba taxpayer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if somebody makes a complaint, I think that they would go to the Winnipeg Police and say, hey, the members or somebody burned my flag, I want to bring him to court. We haven't heard any complaints on that at all.

Motor Coach Industries - layoffs

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Could she tell the House what action she has taken during the past eight months, Mr. Speaker, while she has withheld the information from the House, that more than 532 employees of Motor Coach Industries are about to be laid off?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I simply have not withheld any information from this House. Motor Coach

Industries has in a very courteous manner told us that they have been having some difficulties with gaining orders and that they were considering possible layoffs later in 1983. The formal announcement of this came through and crossed my desk in an orderly fashion just recently, and the announcements have now been made public. This happens in any layoff situation.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the government promised there would be no more layoffs in Manitoba as soon as they were elected - and she received notice of this eight weeks ago - also, in view of the fact that it's indicated in news reports that the plant here is competing with a plant in New Mexico, has she investigated the economic circumstances existing in New Mexico as compared to here, and particularly our payroll tax and other economic disadvantages in Manitoba, and is she prepared to report on those matters to the House?

HON. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to correct the record. The letter that I received was February 15th, I don't think that was eight weeks ago in my calculation. The response was sent in early March to that recognizing that notice. The information that the honourable member has brought forward with regard to New Mexico is not something that I would be investigating as Minister of Labour. I do know that my colleague is investigating and, on top of all of these situations where we have a breakdown for orders for a company, my understanding is that Greyhound, which I believe is the parent company for Motor Coach, simply isn't ordering any new buses this year. Now, whether that in fact is the case is something that I'm sure that my colleague will be determining.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave from the House to make a personal statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to make a personal statement? I'm sorry, leave is not granted. Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Citation 322, I would like leave to make a personal statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has not been granted. I heard several members say "no."

MR. A. ANSTETT: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you could poll the opinion of the House again.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed) It appears now the honourable member has leave.

STATEMENT BY LEAVE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, Citation 322 allows members to make statements regarding their own personal knowledge and their own personal behaviour and, since reference has been made to activities in which I engaged last night, I would like to make a statement regarding my participation in those activities.

I attended at the U.S. Consulate yesterday, as was reported by the Leader of the Opposition, to show support for the people of Nicaragua and to demonstrate my personal opposition to foreign military intervention in any form from any source. I did not know that a flag was to be burned, nor did I know the origin of the flag that was burned. In fact, I didn't know a flag was burned until it was raised in the House and the Minister of Natural Resources confirmed that fact. I did not know until shortly after 2:00 p.m. today.

I consider that an unacceptable practice. I consider it irresponsible and reprehensible and I wish to disassociate myself from that action, and I would do so regardless of the country of origin of the flag, regardless of where in the world it came from. However, I will always feel free as a citizen of this country and of this province to speak out on any issue and to act peacefully in a non-obstructive manner on any issue that matters to me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

A MEMBER: Scott, you're not in the Cabinet.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like, if possible, if I could have agreement of the House, to make a similar statement as the Member for Springfield . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Leave has not been granted to the honourable member.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, first of all, an announcement. I'm advised by the Minister of Transportation that, as a result of informal consultation with the Member for Arthur, there's an agreement that there will be a formal meeting of the Standing Committee on Agriculture at 4:30 this afternoon simply to set times for hearings on the Crow question.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 29 - THE INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Adjourned Debate on Bill No. 29, Page 3, of the Order Paper, standing adjourned in the name of the Member for Lakeside.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, the second reading of Bill No. 29 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, as indicated by our House Leader, we, on this side, certainly have no desire to hold up the necessary funds that are contained in this bill encompassing some 30 percent of the overall expenditures required by this government to carry on the purposes of the government of the Province of Manitoba. I might say, and it's always worthwhile saying this to honourable members opposite, that's a courtesy that was not always extended to us by the NDP Party when in opposition when we were in government. They did force us through that difficulty and that embarrassment, if you like, on the part of government where the government could not meet its payroll and that's of course what we're talking about. That was done and engineered by no less a person and a former Minister of Finance of the New Democratic Government, the former Member for St. Johns, among others. So, Mr. Speaker, I simply assure the Government House Leader that this bill before us, the Interim Supply Bill, will pass in good order in a responsible way after members on this side have had an occasion to comment on it.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help and I know my colleague, the Member for Roblin-Russell, from time to time comments about the very size, the growth of government, reflecting on the fact that - I can recall in 1969 the total expenditures of government were some \$300 million. Now, the Interim Supply measure that we are now passing, which represents some 30 percent, virtually encompasses the total cost of government just a relatively short decade-plus ago.

However, Mr. Speaker, perhaps more important is the concern, and I want to raise it and I raised it at the time that I spoke on the Budget, is the fact that Interim Supply, as all of us understand it in the House and even if not all Manitobans understand it but those that do pay some attention to the goings on of the financial bills as they pass through the House should understand is that we passed this measure so that the government can get on with the business of funding schools, hospitals, universities and all the other functions of government, in advance, if you like to use the word, in the "interim", while the Estimates are more formally pursued and passed and then finally the Supply Bills in total are passed. This gives the government the authorization to carry on those expenditures of funds required.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my bringing that to your attention is that most Manitobans and, in fact we have to remind ourselves, most of us believe that's what these funds are going for. That's where this \$300 million is going for. One has to be reminded that in this year, very close to the total amount, \$282 million is not building a single classroom; is not building a single mile of road; is not helping improve the facilities or hire nurses in the Flin Flon Hospital; \$282 million of it is going to pay for the carrying charges of our

public debt. You know, that too is astonishing because that just about is the same figure that the total cost of government was back in '69.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that all members opposite, although I would certainly like to think the Minister of Finance has growing concern about the size of deficits, but I asked the question during the Budget Debate, you know, at what point, at what percentage figure of our total revenues does the size of a deficit become acceptable or unacceptable? We've made a very quantum jump from the kind of average 4, 3.8, 5 percent of total revenues to cover the carrying charges of our debt to 9 percent in this year. That's a very quantum leap. What will it be next year? Will it be 14 percent, 13 percent, or will it be 18 percent, or will it go down? But my question still remains, what is acceptable? Because to relate that to more understandable terms - that's always the problem when you're dealing with multimillions of dollars.

We have to understand that a lot of hardship that so many individual businesses were faced with, individual families faced with in their household mortgages, farmers were faced with on the farms, was a farm or small business or indeed just the working couple, could carry the costs of their mortgages on their homes, could carry the costs of borrowed money to operate their farms or their businesses at acceptable or certain levels of interest, at 8 percent, 9 percent, maybe even 11 and 12 percent they were carrying. But they couldn't, they all of a sudden faced themselves with a crisis when those interest charges jumped to 18 and 19 to 20 and 22 percent. When all of a sudden, overnight, as household mortgages were being renegotiated, had to be renegotiated, in a family that found itself capable of living within their means and capable of providing shelter at \$200 or \$300, \$400 monthly payments, all of a sudden, overnight, faced \$500 or \$600 monthly costs for shelter.

That's of course one of the reasons that prompted this government in introducing some measure of relief, not the kind of measure that they promised on November 17th in '81, but some measure of relief in terms of their Interest Relief Program to farmers, to household owners, to small businesses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see little in the actions of this government that assures me, holds out the promise, that that percentage point of carrying charges which now represents 9 percent is going down in the near future. In fact, I would have to say that virtually everything this government has been doing, certainly during this Session indicates the very opposite to me.

Mr. Speaker, this government is isolating itself economically and I must say I can't ignore the debates of question period. They even seem bent on isolating themselves politically.

It's simply beyond me that there aren't at least some thinking heads opposite that don't understand the utter foolishness, even if there is no particular warmth and feeling for our American friends and cousins opposite, even if ideologically or for other reasons, they don't like the Americans - we know that obviously exists - but, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about a government that's charged with the responsibility of carrying on the economic affairs on and for the people of Manitoba and we do a lot of business with them. We have all kinds of very serious issues that are directly dependent on how well we get along with our fellow Americans.

We will not resolve the major flooding problems of the Red River Valley, or the Souris River Valley, without the kind of co-operation that can only come about if there is a sincere and genuine co-operation, partnership, and friendship developed with those who are equally and mutually bound up in these problems. The kind of actions, the kind of statements that this government indulges in, individually, privately, as members, as Cabinet Ministers, you know, that's a peripheral debate.

We have obviously a somewhat different point of view in terms of Cabinet responsibilities. We obviously have a somewhat different point of view in terms of the oath of office that you take when you become an executive councillor. It's quite different, Mr. Speaker, than being another member of the government backbench or a member of the opposition, quite different. I have legal responsibilities. I have very specific responsibilities depending to the department that I've been sworn in to accept.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I say that this government surprisingly is isolating themselves, firstly economically, they have said, no, even to the belated coming to some sense of the seriousness of the question in Ottawa. And when Ottawa belatedly says - we need to worry about the size of deficits and gosh they should be worrying about it, we are now approaching \$30 billion of a deficit in Ottawa which I think and, you know, translated to our neighbors, the Americans, is about 20 times as bad as ours. Is that an exaggeration Mr. House Leader? — (Interjection) — Eighteen times maybe eh, 18 times.

We are making, but we are isolating ourselves more importantly, and it came out at the last First Ministers conference, that brief little period of time that they had to deal with economic issues, more importantly when the Minister of Finance last was there, from the rest of the provinces. When certainly in reading reports from those meetings, from reading reports from the statements that the other nine Premiers are making in this country, that the Prime Minister is making in this country, they are saying yes, let's try and pull the lid down a little tighter. Their suggested guidelines of six and five were immediately rejected by this government. Not just in word, but more important, in action, by the kind of contracts they're signing with their own Civil Service, and by the kind of Budget that was brought down in this Chamber that talks of a 17 percent increase in spending, and we haven't seen the last of that figure. I think the Minister of Finance will not stand or fall, or have his reputation stand or fall on the validity of that figure. That figure could well be 20 percent before the final figures come in.

Mr. Speaker, I can't understand the actions of this government in pursuing that course because what it means - and this is perhaps the most important thing - is that we are simply guaranteeing ourselves here in the Province of Manitoba that we will isolate ourselves from the recovery that may, God willing, come to Canada. If we are imposing on our small business, medium-size businesses, additional onerous burdens of taxations such as the payroll tax, such as increases in corporate and personal taxes, such as the increase in the sales taxes, as this Minister will have to do while restraint is being practised in our neighbouring provinces, we are simply making sure that it will be that much more difficult for Manitoba businesses to

partake in the recovery, as I say, should it come, making it less attractive to bring into the Province of Manitoba some of the needed investment dollars in the private sector that fuels the economy and that creates the real wealth, creates the real jobs in this economy.

Mr. Speaker, on other occasions, I would be prompted to of course acknowledge that there always is a different alternative and I acknowledge it. There is an alternative open to the government and one that is perhaps attractive to some members of the government. But it's not my purpose today, Sir, to get into those fields but simply to express, once again and put on the record, a very serious concern that 12 months hence when we meet under similar circumstances, when we talk about the 1983-84 Budget and the 1983-84 figures, nothing this government has been doing, in terms of how they are conducting their affairs economically, leads me to believe that we will be in any better position than what the Minister was forced to put into his Budget this year when he said, Mr. Speaker, and I quote from Page 20 of his Budget, as " . . . I indicated, the public debt costs had increased rapidly. For 1983-84, they are estimated at \$282 million . . . "

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, just not that many years ago, \$282 million paid for the entire costs of running government, " . . . up \$155 million or 120 percent increase from the \$127 million total projected originally for the 1982-83 fiscal year . . . "

"This year, public debt charges will account for nearly 9 percent of our total expenditures, . . . " Mr. Speaker, I would feel much more comfortable in passing and supporting the bill before us, Interim Supply, and I will support it, Mr. Speaker, because the business of the province has to be proceeded with and we'll do it in good order. But, Mr. Speaker, I do so with a heavy concern that the request for a similar bill will be up by another 60 percent, 80 percent, 100 percent next year. It went up 120 percent this year.

What do we see out there? How many factories are opening up their doors? How many factories are putting in new machinery? How many new jobs are being created out there? We just heard today that we are losing another 500 jobs in a major industry in the Province of Manitoba. So, you know, Mr. Speaker, this is what bothers me. Too many members opposite talk rather glibly about when the recovery comes. When the recovery comes, all will be well. They cling to it like a true believer at a camp meeting, particularly a good evangelistic meeting, — (Interjection) — moonies, maybe.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see in the actions of this government any signs that they are preparing Manitoba, that they are laying the climate, the business, the economic climate to make sure that Manitobans will benefit from their fair share of that recovery.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the 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.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this motion in moving to Supply is to consider the presentation by the Minister of Finance of resolutions with respect to the Loan Bill No. 1.

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 River East in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE CAPITAL SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Order please. We are considering the motion of the Minister of Finance, Capital Supply. Do you wish the motion read?

RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$30 million for Capital Supply: For the Jobs Fund, \$20 million; Manitoba Beef Stabilization Fund, \$10 million; for a total of \$30 million for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. R. DOERN: Keep it brief, Brian.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I hear the Member for Elmwood say, "Keep it brief." Mr. Chairman, we have been doing that up to this point. Today, perhaps, that will not be the case.

Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader, on the 22nd of March, 1983, Page 965 of Hansard, said that he had no need for lessons from me as to how to run the House. Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Honourable Government House Leader doesn't think that he needs lessons on how to run the House, but we're here this afternoon dealing with this bill in this committee and we needn't have been here. This is one more example of bungling and of inept management of the business of the House by the Government House Leader and by the Minister of Finance.

For the honourable members opposite, who are perhaps not aware of what is happening here, this bill should have been dealt with when the Interim Supply Bill was brought before this committee. The two of those bills could have been dealt with at the same time. You may recall that we passed the Interim Supply Bill through this stage without debate; we passed it through the next stage without debate; we gave the Government House Leader leave to get to the position of having the bill brought to second reading. We would have done the same with this bill except that, once again, we are given a demonstration of the totally inept handling of the business of this House that we're getting from this government and this House Leader, and I intend to spend a little time on that subject.

Last year, it was very evident in this House that the Government House Leader and the members of the Treasury Bench had very little idea of how the House

should operate and how the business should be done. I fault the First Minister for having appointed a front bencher, a Treasury Bencher to the position of Government House Leader, when that person has had no experience in the House. To appoint any person to be Government House Leader, when that person has had no experience in the House, is unfair to that person and it is unfair to the House because it inevitably results in wasted time and that was the case last year.

Any of the members opposite who were here during the previous four years will understand that there were many occasions when the New Democratic Party in opposition debated at length various issues and used the rules to prevent the business of the House from proceeding as the government might have hoped. There wasn't anything necessarily wrong with that, Mr. Chairman, but a Government House Leader who had been here during that period of time would have been able to avoid some of the shoals that this Government House Leader has floundered on, because they would have known how they handled things when they were in opposition and the business of the House could have gone more smoothly.

It was evident, I think, to everybody who was watching the business of this House conducted during the last two or three weeks of the Session last year that the business of the House was actually being ordered by the members on this side of the House and that, without the co-operation of members on this side of the House, they would have been sitting here for some time longer. But that was the first year, and perhaps we might be prepared to accept that the Government House Leader, in his first year of operation, being unfamiliar with the business of the House, could make some errors in tactics and strategy.

I believe that the First Minister indicated that, indeed, during this Session things would be different, and that he was going to call the House in December to begin the business of the House and, especially, to introduce some major legislation in order that the opposition could have an opportunity to study that legislation. That was a good idea, Mr. Chairman, that they should do that. It should have allowed the government to get back here in good time, following the Christmas break.

What have we seen as a consequence of that, Mr. Chairman, aside from the fact that the House was not called back into Session until the 24th of February, we had the two major bills that were introduced during the Session in December. We had The Law Enforcement Review Act and we had The Farmlands Ownership Act and what have we seen since, Mr. Chairman? I don't believe that The Law Enforcement Review Act has been called. — (Interjection) — It was called and stood and the reason is, Mr. Chairman, we are told that there are amendments to these bills.

Now how is the opposition supposed to debate, in principle, two of their major pieces of legislation when we are told that there are amendments coming? But we don't have the amendments, but we have reason to believe that some of the amendments are out there in the public, that the public has knowledge of the amendments. What kind of ordering of the business of the House is that, Mr. Chairman? What good was it to introduce these bills in December and then here we are, almost through March, and we're not able to debate the bills because we don't know what the bills

are, because the government is already talking about amendments.

One of these bills, Mr. Chairman, and of course was a follow-up to the bill which the Minister of Agriculture had to withdraw from this House last June, because it was such a horrendous piece of legislation. He had to go away with his tail between his legs and instead of coming back with a bill that would have been acceptable and we asked for, and insisted, and received the opportunity to have at least brief debate on that bill last spring, to indicate to the Minister of Agriculture what the problems were with it, instead of coming back with a bill that took care of all the concerns that the public had, which were basically those that we were expressing, he comes back with a bill which again has to be amended before it has even gone to committee, Mr. Chairman.

This Session, the Leader of the Opposition seems to have decided that he needs a backup House Leader to the House Leader that he has.

A MEMBER: The Leader of the Opposition?

MR. B. RANSOM: The First Minister - has decided that he needs a backup House Leader. So we have the Minister of Natural Resources now who has . . .

A MEMBER: You have a backup House Leader now.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, it was hardly evident that we had a House Leader on the government side last year, let alone a backup one. This year we have a backup in the form of the Minister of the Minister of Natural Resources and he has done little more than obstruct the business of the House. He insists on rising during question period and trying to tell the opposition that we're taking too long in placing our questions.

I want to put a little bit of information on the record and the Member for Radisson can check this out himself, but last year I rather expected that the way business was being conducted was somewhat different than it had been in the previous four years. I had had the impression that as a Minister of the Crown that I and my colleagues used to answer questions in as straightforward a fashion as we could and generally in as short a period of time as we could. And I had the impression that the members of the opposition used to take a rather inordinate length of time in asking those questions.

So, I asked someone if they would go through, on a random basis, some of the previous copies of Hansard and make an assessment simply by counting the number of lines taken up by the NDP in asking their questions when they were in opposition, the number of lines taken up by the Conservatives when they were in government in answering those questions and then choose at random some pages in Hansard when the NDP were in government and do the same thing.

Well, Mr. Chairman, what did we find? We found that taking pages from 1979 and '80 and '81 and I don't put this forward as a scientific study, I would ask the honourable members opposite to do their own comparison because I wouldn't want them to have to accept mine. But I'll tell you what this indication is, that for 1979, '80 and '81 on the pages selected, the

opposition took 3,757 lines to ask a given number of questions; the government answers took 3,508 lines to answer the questions. So, Mr. Chairman, the government Ministers were taking slightly less time to answer the question than the NDP in opposition were taking to ask it.

Now, we looked then at what happened when the NDP were in government — (Interjection) — and we found then that would make quite a difference. The Minister of Finance says what would happen if we added in Jay's question and he's referring to the old master of bombast from Churchill who used to go on ad infinitum, ad nauseum asking questions and speaking. I admit, that would have made quite a difference. But, let's look at 1982 when the NDP were in government and out of the questions that were asked, we used 1,825 lines to ask a series of questions. Well, Mr. Chairman, the government answers took 2,711 lines. So, the government was taking half as much time again to answer the questions as we were taking to ask them. And, so be it.

But what do we have this year? We have the would-be Government House Leader who likes to go and march in front of the U.S. Consulate, we have him trying to raise continually on points of order to tell the Speaker that the opposition is out of order in asking the questions that they are. Mr. Chairman, I find that rather had to accept on the basis of the record, and the Minister of Natural Resources of course wasn't here during the last four years either. So, here we have both the Government House Leader and the backup House Leader who weren't here during the previous four years to know what was going on. I think it would have helped had the First Minister demonstrated a little more judgment and put a member like the Member for Lac du Bonnet as Government House Leader. Then, we would have had someone who understood how the House operated and he doesn't seem to be listened to very much by his colleagues in Cabinet so he would be able to have more time to sit in the House, and I'm sure that the business of the House would have been ordered much more efficiently had that been the case.

Now, let me deal for a moment, Mr. Chairman, with Interim Supply.

A MEMBER: We wouldn't want to take you away from the Main Street Program.

MR. B. RANSOM: Let me deal with the question of Interim Supply, Mr. Chairman. Again on Page 965 of Hansard on Tuesday of this week, the Government House Leader rose and he said, "Mr. Speaker, I must, on a point of order, place on the record the fact that I have communicated with the Opposition House Leader the fact that there is an urgency about this matter. This is Interim Supply, the end of the month falls on Good Friday. The pay cheques of employees must be mailed by the 28th of March. We will go on calling this bill; we will not allow this kind of dilatory treating of a serious matter to go unnoticed by the people of Manitoba."

That, Mr. Chairman, simply because members on this side stood the bill. We stood the bill. No indication, Mr. Chairman, that bill would not pass and contrary to what the Government House Leader indicates further on, he had my assurance that we would pass the bill

when it had to be. What we were doing by standing the bill, Mr. Chairman, was facilitating the business of the House because every day that we stood that bill brought us a day closer to the day that it was going to be passed. The Minister of Finance would have been happy to see it not debated at all until a quarter to 10:00 on the 28th of March and he would have known that we, true to our word would have passed the bill and he would have had Interim Supply. But, no. The Government House Leader rises in his place because he doesn't understand how the House works and gives us what-for because we've chosen to facilitate the business of the House. Now, I don't mind getting it when I do something and when we do something which is an abuse of the rules or which obstructs the business of the House. But I must say I don't appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, when we get criticized for facilitating the business of the House.

Just so there should be no misunderstanding about the fact that we were facilitating the business of the House, I want to go back to the Interim Supply of 1981 - and the Minister of Finance is smiling and you may come to appreciate the reason why he is smiling. Three years prior to 1981 the NDP in opposition had said, the government isn't bringing in Interim Supply in time for them to be able to debate the bill. Fine. When I was Minister of Finance, I looked at the dates it had been brought in and I said, yes, I think they have a point. They really weren't given all that much time to debate the bill, so I'm going to bring it in earlier and I'll give them time to have proper debate.

So, Mr. Chairman, on March 11th, we took the Interim Supply Bill to the very stage that we're on now. That's an important consideration for you, Mr. Chairman, because you may think that I'm straying from the subject matter at hand. This was the stage that Interim Supply was at on March 11th and that's when the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Pawley, spoke on the bill. He carried it through until adjournment that day. One has to recognize that at this stage the debate cannot be adjourned. Once called, it is either debated until the time expires or until we move out of the committee. He took it to the point where the time expired.

On March 13th, we called it again and on that day we had my colleague, the Member for Pembina, spoke; then we had Mr. Doern speak on the opposition. We had Mr. Green speak on the opposition side and another of my colleagues was speaking as well, again, brought the debate to the expiry of the time. March 18th, we're back in committee again, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Schroeder spoke that day. Mr. Hanuschuk and Mr. Walding all spoke that day and took the time through to the adjournment again. March 20th, Mr. Uskiw spoke, and Mr. Uruski spoke, and again took the time right through to the adjournment. Then on March 25th, Mr. Green spoke; Mr. Corrin spoke; Mr. Blake, Mr. Uruski.

We used to hear quite a bit from Mr. Corrin, Mr. Chairman. He was the runner-up to the master of bombast for Churchill, but he doesn't speak very much any more.

Then we called it again on March 27th, Mr. Chairman, as time was wearing on. Mr. Uskiw spoke again; Mr. Downey spoke; Mr. Green spoke again; Mr. Adam spoke; Mr. Mercier, Mr. Cherniack, Mr. Cowan spoke - still didn't pass it, Mr. Chairman. Time expired again, so on the 30th of March we came back into committee.

Mr. Mercier spoke; he was attempting to impress upon the opposition that time was running out, that the bills had to be passed or the government wasn't going to be able to get the pay cheques out. Ah, never mind, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cowan spoke again; Mr. Pawley spoke again; Mr. Boyce spoke again; Mr. Filmon spoke, again trying to move things along. No. Back again, Mr. Green spoke; Mr. Cowan spoke again; Mr. Evans. Mr. Orchard tries to move things along; Mr. Cherniack speaks again; Mr. Filmon puts in another plea. Mr. Green speaks again; Mr. Cowan speaks again; Mr. Boyce speaks again and, at last, on March 31st, we moved out of this committee, Mr. Chairman, after seven days of debate in this committee on a resolution that we passed last week in five minutes. Five minutes. — (Interjection) — No, last week we passed that out of committee in five minutes and they took seven days.

I know that we have already heard charges from the government that we have obstructed the business of government. The Government House Leader rises in his place and condemns us for standing a bill and bringing it that much closer to passage. And we still weren't done because then, Mr. Chairman, you'll recall that it has to go to the bill stage.

On March 31st, the bill is called for second reading and then we have Mr. Doern speaking again. Mr. Enns spoke; then we have Mr. Desjardins; Mr. Uruski spoke again, Mr. Chairman. Mr. McKenzie spoke; Mr. Corrin. Mr. Schroeder is back in speaking and that's on March 31st, Mr. Chairman, and that was the occasion when, if the bill didn't pass, then the civil servants were not going to get paid.

My colleague, the then Member for Brandon West, who was the Acting Government House Leader, came over here and spoke to the Member for Concordia who was sitting in the seat where the Member for La Verendrye sits now and says we need to get this bill passed. Can you give us the assurance that it's going to pass? No, I can't give you the assurance that it is going to pass. So we asked, will you give us permission, unanimous consent, to sit past 10 o'clock so that we can pass this bill? No, we won't give unanimous consent to sit past 10 o'clock so that we can pass this bill.

So what happened? The pay cheques couldn't go out the next day - right? And I sent a letter to every civil servant saying that the NDP wouldn't pass the bill. After eight days of debate, they didn't pass the bill, Mr. Chairman. — (Interjection) — I can refer them to my colleague Warner Jorgenson's speech that was made when they came in here on a grievance the next day because that is, without doubt, the finest speech that I have ever heard in this House, the finest piece of debating skills that I have every seen displayed in this House - and I see the columnist from the Free Press is smiling because she remembers. That was indeed a masterpiece and, for those of you who weren't here at the time, it left a rather shellshocked-looking bunch on this side of the House. The Leader of the Opposition turned in vain to see if somebody couldn't get up to defend them further and there wasn't a soul on this side that felt they wanted to try and match the kind of debating skills that the Member for Morris showed.

So we came back, Mr. Chairman, on the second of April, and do you think that the members would have passed the bill then without debate? No, Mr. Schroeder

spoke on the bill again on the second of April. Then we go into Committee of the Whole - it's quite a series that this bill has to go through - do you think it passed then? No, Mr. Walding had to speak on the bill.

MR. R. DOERN: That was a good speech, too.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Government House Leader stood two days ago and gave us "what for" because we weren't wasting the time of the government by debating Interim Supply. Now tell me, Mr. Chairman, where is the judgment of the Government House Leader and of the First Minister to make that kind of an accusation when the recent history shows what had happened in this House two years ago? Last year, Mr. Chairman, you will recall there was some debate on this item, but it still went through rather quickly. There was no debate at this stage at all last year; there was no debate at the Ways and Means stage. There was some debate at second reading, and it went through and it passed in time for the government to be able to pay its bills.

So, Mr. Chairman, we could have been through this stage of the bill. This could all have been done if the Minister of Finance had simply done his job - and I think the Government House Leader, next year, will probably go to the Minister of Finance and say, are you sure you haven't got another bill that you want to introduce in here before we get caught up in the same embarrassing kind of situation that we got caught in last year? But this is the Minister of Finance that is continually accusing me of being confused, Mr. Chairman. You may have noticed that along the way, you may have noticed that.

We run into situations where the Government House Leader says he doesn't need to be lectured, and listen to this, Mr. Chairman, because this is the height of intellectual achievement on the part of the Government House Leader because he says, "I need no lessons how to run the business of the House from the 'Turtle from Ransom Mountain.'" That's a real high level that lends itself, Mr. Chairman, to putting the name on the Government House Leader as the "Rouge from Fort Penner," and that might stick for a while . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Hair from Fort Red.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . because I think there may be a little more reason to apply the tag of "rouge" to the Member for Fort Rouge than there was for him to apply the tag of "turtle" to me.

A MEMBER: See how things backfire.

MR. B. RANSOM: I rather expect that the Government House Leader has not heard the last of that. That may come back from time to time. Mr. Chairman, that doesn't bother me that the Government House Leader should do that because all it indicates to me is that the Government House Leader was trapped in a situation at the time and he didn't know what to do. He is never able to take the route of simply not saying anything, he always has to respond and so he stood to see if he couldn't insult me to try and make a point. At the same time - and this is a bit of sleaze that I didn't

expect to get from the Government House Leader - he said, "It was open to the Opposition House Leader at any time. I discussed it with him to give me the assurance that he is now being compelled to give in this House. Now that he has done what he ought to have done, if he knew his business, I would not have had to raise the matter at all."

Mr. Chairman, that is not true. The Government House Leader knew because I told him, when he told me that the bill had to pass by the 28th of March, that the bill would pass, because I've been through it. I know what the Minister of Finance is faced with. I know that if he doesn't get his bill passed on time that he's going to have a problem because the government isn't going to be able to pay its bills. For the Government House Leader to make that kind of an accusation simply doesn't sit very well, Mr. Chairman, and it's not likely to facilitate the business of the House in the future.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have another piece of business that I would like to deal with and that has to do with the scheduling of the committees. The Government House Leader has recently given to me a copy, a proposed schedule of committee meetings, Law Amendments proposed for April 7th; Economic Development for April 19th; Economic Development, again, for April 21st; Public Utilities for April 26th and 28th, May 3rd and May 5th; Law Amendments, May 10th; Economic Development May 12th; and Public Accounts, May 17th.

Mr. Chairman, my concern with this is that the Government House Leader and the government - I don't blame him entirely for this, but he's the one who's in charge, he's the one that's in the kitchen so he's got to stand the heat. The problem is, Mr. Chairman, that these committees should, to a large extent, already have been dealt with. They should have been out of the way by now and what is going to happen and I've told the Government House Leader this in writing, it will be conveyed to him today, that the problem is business is going to pile up at the end of the Session because these should have been out of the road.

In 1981, which was the last year we were in government and that was the year, by the way, you may recall, the last time I spoke or advised the House about the kind of debate we had on the simple motion to extend the time for filing of reports that we received such a vicious oily tongue-lashing from the Member for St. Johns at the time and the present member for Churchill, the Minister of Northern Affairs, about the inept bungling by the Government of the Day. This is the scheduling of the committees in 1981. Public Accounts was February 26th and 27th; Manitoba Telephone System, March 17th and March 20th; MPIC, March 19th and March 24th; Hydro, April 2nd, 3rd, 7th, and 9th; CEDF, February 17th; MDC, February 19th, Channel Area and Moose Lake Loggers, February 24th; Manfor, March 26th; Manitoba Mineral, May 5th; and McKenzie Seeds, May 7th.

Mr. Chairman, what we have this year is that proposal from the Government House Leader to begin the Standing Committee at a time - well, thank you for that, I'll simply be able to continue on later if I run out of time because we're in committee - when the Government House Leader is proposing to start this year, we were almost completed in 1981. What he is proposing on this list is to deal with Public Accounts

on May 17th. Public Accounts were available last December. There is absolutely no reason why Public Accounts could not have met in December when the House was here. There's no reason why it couldn't have met in January or February or any time that we've been here. We will be examining Public Accounts over 14 months after the end of the fiscal year. That's never been done before.

In 1979, I recall we held Public Accounts in November and December to deal with it as soon as we could. I expect, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister of Finance wants is to deal with Public Accounts as far removed from fiscal year 1981-82 as he can get and as close to the end of the Session as he can get, because that's where his Estimates were last year. I expect that's where they're very likely to be this year. I would encourage him to move them up. I expect he wants to deal with this when there is some pressure on the House to conclude its business, Mr. Chairman.

I'm afraid that simply demonstrates a difficulty, and there's one other thing I should put on the record, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister, the Government House Leader, has allowed eight sessions, he has scheduled eight sessions to deal with those committees. In 1981, they, in opposition, took 16 sessions to deal with it. In 1979, they took 12 sessions to deal with it and I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that eight sessions will not be sufficient time to deal with this and they're going to be into legislation in Law Amendments and the other committees of the House.

So what we're seeing is a great waste of time. If the Government House Leader had only taken time to either consult the record, or to consult with his own people, or to consult with me, we could have told him weeks ago that the business of the House should have been ordered differently in order to save time. So, Mr. Chairman, I note that you'd like to end this presentation and that has been sufficient time for me to deal with that subject on this bill, but I'm sure that some of my colleagues have some comments to make as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: It seems to me that people who live in glass houses shouldn't throw the rule book. I'd just like to put one or two things on the record and indeed to the extent that I have to defend myself. My defence will be brief because the record in fact speaks for itself.

Just one comment about the last Session, which, true, was the first Session in which I occupied this important position of Government House Leader. We introduced some 65, 66 bills, I forget the exact number. Of those bills only two, in fact, were not proceeded with. Through the course of what was my first Session, every bill which was introduced but two, and those two were withdrawn for very good reason, were proceeded with. The Estimates were proceeded with in good time and in good shape, and indeed some of the time which was taken in Estimates exceeded the time normally taken in preceding Sessions, whether by this side or the other side. We have the records that show that, but that's what Estimates are for, they'll take as much time as the opposition wants to take and there's no problem with that. But, nevertheless, the Estimates were

proceeded with, the bills were proceeded with, the two that were withdrawn; one, Bill 30 having to do with the Legislative Assembly because we were anxious to get as much consensus as possible on a bill of this kind. Efforts are still being made to find that consensus. That was a very laudatory reason for withdrawing that bill. The Session had some fits and starts. What Session doesn't? But for it to suggest in any way that it was disorderly, or a shambles, I think is not what the record will bare out.

I make no apologies for my stewardship in that sense as a novice, I'll admit it, a House Leader; one has to contend with a whole number of variables, one of which, of course, is the Opposition House Leader. I want to just deal very briefly with that because, as was pointed out to me by the Member for Turtle Mountain - and let me apologize for that slip the other day when I played around with his name, that was unseemly and I do apologize for it, I ought not to have done that - but the Member for Turtle Mountain last Session said to me, and I thank him for that, that there must be co-operation if the affairs of the House are to be run and I've endeavoured to do that. But let me just take two recent examples.

I, having been asked by the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Opposition House Leader, about committee meetings, said I will be bringing in a proposed schedule this week but because there must be co-operation I accept that. I didn't simply stand up here, I don't think it would have been even seemly or within the tradition of the House, and say - here are the dates for the committee meetings. I prepared a draft list and it's listed as, "Proposed schedule of committee meetings." I gave it last Friday, I believe it was, to the Opposition House Leader and I said, let me know what you think if this, and he said to me, well, okay, I think I only have one. He did say that he thought they were a bit late and I said, well, I've looked at the record of last year and that's the only record I have to go by - and they're more or less consonant with last year's record - then he said, well, I think I'll have one problem and I will let you have a note.

I asked him again yesterday, because I wanted to make the announcement to the House for two reasons, with respect to the first meeting of Law Amendments the public should have a couple of weeks notice. There are many members of the public who want to make representations. I wanted to be able to make the announcement, but I did not want to make it unilaterally.

Today again I called upon him and he said, I will let you have a note. He was not intending to let me have a note. It's clear now that what he was intending to do was to utilize this occasion to play politics with the Business of the House. Now that ought not to have been done. If there is to be co-operation it has to be a two-way street. — (Interjection) —

Now the Member for Turtle Mountain says, that with respect to the time in which The Interim Supply Loan Act is to be dealt with, that he is perfectly aware of the need, he's had all of the experience - and I'm sure that he has - and the experience I hope will stand him in good stead and that he will be true to his word; that's the difficulty. I mean, I hope that the Member for Turtle Mountain doesn't take this in bad stead but he tends to be a little bit monosyllabic. You know, and one only asks that one gets the word so you know what it is.

I must say this, that when I raised the question, true, over the phone, not always the best means of communication, with respect to the need that had been transmitted to me by the Deputy Minister of Finance raising with me the question of the peculiarities of this month and Good Friday, and the rest of it, the need to try and get things through by the 28th of March, and when I raised that over the phone with the Member for Turtle Mountain it is my recollection - and that's all I'll say, I'm not going to swear on a stack of bibles, or affirm - but it's my distinct recollection that I got a grunt, or something akin to a grunt, rather than, don't worry, the matter will be dealt with by the 28th of March. Had I had that, there would have been no necessity to raise the issue in the House in the way in which it was raised.

One final comment because I don't want to take up the time of this committee with raking over old matters and dealing with old hurts and old sores. It's true that the Member for Turtle Mountain is feeling a little bit hard done by in the sense that I stood in this place the other day and criticized him. Well, he has the right to defend himself but we do have other business to transact.

I'd like to say this about the two bills to which reference has been made, The Law Enforcement Review Act and The Farm Lands, and some reference about amendments being out there well, I don't know about the Farm Lands Bill, I don't think there are amendments out there anywhere. There certainly are no amendments with respect to The Law Enforcement Review Act. It was one of our stated purposes, Mr. Chairman, in calling the Session and in tabling the bills, that they should be available first of all, properly to the opposition so that they might consider the heart of the matter, the substance of the bills, so that when we met again in February as it turned out, we would be able to debate the substance of these bills in due course.

It was also our purpose to make the bills available to affected constituencies, in the case of The Law Enforcement Review Act, with a whole number of police associations, the City of Winnipeg, the Winnipeg Police Commission, so that we could have the benefit of their advice recognizing the justice of a criticism that was made last year by some groups, that it was late in the day for them to get notice in a sense, and first instance of the contents of a bill after second reading, and then to be faced with a meeting of Law Amendments in a relatively short period of time. It didn't give them the opportunity to think, to meet, to consult, to do whatever they wanted to do in order to give the best possible presentation at the committee level in order to improve the shape, form and substance of a bill. So that indeed with respect to The Law Enforcement Review Act the bill, after it was introduced, circulated and distributed in the House, was made available to these affected constituencies who have been writing and meeting with me and indeed the consultative process has been working very well.

As a result of a lot of this input I came to the conclusion that some changes should be made but I didn't want to bring these on the opposition critic of the Attorney-General sort of at the last minute. I thought he should have the benefit of those, and I had made him aware of the fact that there would be likely amendments introduced at the committee stage a

yesterday, when I called the bill because we were simply calling all the bills, Sir, to him, he raised the point that he would like to know at least the substance of any possible changes so that he would not be tilting at windmills when he debated. In fact, it was only yesterday that I completed the process, or Monday, that I completed the process of consultation sufficiently to want to put out a form of proposed amendments and I believe they are now in his hands. So that what has been happening here is not that we've been delaying debate on the bills - Farm Lands has already been called - but that it would have been unfair to the opposition critics of the particular pieces of legislation not to let them have the substance of possible changes to the bills so that they're contribution at second reading debate could be indeed all the better.

So I've thought it important to make these points in answer to the criticisms and defence offered by the Member for Turtle Mountain this afternoon, he had the right to do that. I think he has the right at any point to raise his criticisms, but I am beginning to get the uncomfortable feeling that there's an element of vindictiveness that is entering into the criticisms of the Government House Leader. The Government House Leader is flayed for this; the Government House Leader is flayed for that.

Quite often, to the knowledge of the member opposite, there are a number of variables that the Government House Leader must deal with. The Government House Leader is not a dictator, and he cannot say to members of Treasury Bench, you must have this ready by this date, there are affairs of the government to run and one does the best that one can.

I would appeal to him, and I'll conclude my remarks with this appeal, to himself take to heart what he has said to me about co-operation. I thought it's beginning to work fairly well this year. There are things to be ironed out, but if, on every possible occasion, the Government House Leader is going to be the target of this kind of criticism, it's going to be very, very difficult. I'm not saying that in any way of withdrawing co-operation - I will not do that - I think co-operation is necessary, but it is a two-way street.

So let's get on with the business of the House. I mean if they have to take all of the time that they're taking, instead of researching the problems of the people of Manitoba, to research how many lines in Hansard were used back in 1979 or 1980, then it demonstrates a certain level of bankruptcy of ideas and of substance with respect to the business of government. I think it's a fruitless exercise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, what we just hear from the Government House Leader is, "Let's get on with the business of the House." That's exactly what we're talking about, is that we need not have been here this afternoon, in this committee, if the Minister of Finance and the Government House Leader had done their job.

HON. S. LYON: And knew what they were doing.

MR. B. RANSOM: Because had they brought this bill in earlier in the week, or last Friday, I think it was, when

they brought the Interim Supply Bill in, it would have passed without debate, just as the Interim Supply Bill did. It would have gone through Supply, it would have gone through Ways and Means, we would have given leave for it to be introduced for the first time, and indeed, to be introduced for second reading and it would have been adjourned, it would have been debated once or twice. — (Interjection) — Well, the Government House Leader thinks that we're supposed to bail him out of his problems all the time. When he comes forward with thoroughly incompetent management of this House and tries to blame us for stalling the business of the House - that is absolutely patent nonsense, Mr. Chairman. It is absolute patent nonsense, Mr. Chairman. He talks about bankruptcy of ideas. Talk about bankruptcy - it's not only going to be the government of the province that's bankrupt - we can see where the Government House Leader is going.

He talks about vindictiveness. He thinks there's vindictiveness involved. Do you think for a minute, Mr. Chairman, that if we had wanted to be vindictive, that we would have passed Interim Supply through this stage last year without debate, and through this stage again this year without debate, after those member opposite took seven days in debate in 1981? Does that sound to you like vindictiveness, Mr. Chairman? That we did that, that we allowed the business of the House to proceed after the kind of obstruction that we got from the members opposite and the Minister of Finance was one of them.

He knows full well what happened. He could have least have advised the Government House Leader of what kind of behaviour we saw from their own members two years ago and what he should have told the Government House Leader was these guys aren't being vindictive because their facilitating the business of the House, and we didn't hold it up. This needn't have been held up, but now that it's here, due to your incompetence - to the Government House Leader's incompetence - it's going to be debated, Mr. Chairman. It's going to be debated.

The Government House Leader is trying now to say, after having given me a list a few days ago of the proposed scheduling of the committees, that I'm now holding it up. He didn't put forward any suggestion of when the committees were going to be held, until I rose in the House and asked the Government House Leader, when are you going to begin calling your Standing Committees?

HON. S. LYON: A month after the House started.

MR. B. RANSOM: Because he should have realized that he had the document, like Public Accounts - months ago - it was available last December.

The Government House Leader says he only has last year to compare to, Mr. Chairman. That shows you that the Government House Leader doesn't understand the operation of the House, because right over there, Mr. Chairman, I can point it out to him, is kind of those tan covered books over there, are called the Journals of the House and if the Government House Leader will refer to some of those, he will find that they actually tell you what business was conducted in the House and you can go back and find out how many days were

spent debating these things, and when it's traditional to have them introduced.

A MEMBER: You wouldn't expect a law professor to know that would you?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, he had the audacity to stand in this House, a few moments ago, and try and say that we took more time on some of the Estimates than they took. Mr. Chairman, I'll give him a few facts about the time that the opposition spent on the Estimates.

In 1979, the New Democratic Party, in opposition, took 337 hours and 35 minutes to go through the Estimates of Spending. In 1980 they took 358 hours and 5 minutes, and in 1981 they managed to cut it back to 292 hours and 55 minutes. Last year, Mr. Chairman, this vindictive group on this side took 270 hours. That's a full 80 hours, 90 hours less than the government took in 1980.

Well, I can assure the Government House Leader it wasn't because of his good management. The only reason that it passed in that period of time was because we recognized that the business of the House has to get on. We don't insist on beating an issue to death, time and time again, and making 40-minute speeches every occasion that arises, and I recall the Member for Ellice, at that time, and the Member for Churchill used to rise practically every occasion, and if they didn't go on for 40 minutes, they sure went on for 30 minutes. We hear it time and time again and when the Member for Ellice used to stand and go on, practically everyone of his own people bailed out and left him here talking by himself. And they're talking about us holding up the business of government, about us being vindictive, in not moving the business of government along.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the Government House Leader to talk to some of his colleagues. Talk to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, talk to the Member for Ste. Rose. Ask them. Ask them about how the business of the House was facilitated when they were in opposition. And the Government House Leader says, he can't get any more than monosyllabic answers.

Sir, all that's required is yes or no, and I have great difficulty in making more than one syllable out of either of those answers. I don't know what it is about the Government House Leader that he isn't prepared to accept a yes the first time. What does it say about a person who doesn't accept the first answer? Why does he have to go back and say, "Do you really mean that?"

Mr. Chairman, when we give our word on this side of the House that something is going to happen, it's going to happen.

HON. R. PENNER: Why didn't you do it?

MR. B. RANSOM: And I did.

HON. R. PENNER: No, you didn't.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well you see, this is the problem with the Government House Leader. If he wants everything in writing, I'll give it to him in writing, Mr. Chairman. When we give our commitment that something is going to be done, it will be done. But the

Government House Leader has the attitude that just because he calls a bill in this House, or a resolution, that it's up to us to debate it, when he calls it. That's not so, Mr. Chairman, that's not so at all. The opposition has the perfect right to stand the bill or a resolution, and I recall last year, during the debate on the Crow Resolution, when it was such a great urgency to carry that debate through, that on the Friday morning before the election in Saskatchewan the next Monday morning, the Government House Leader got up, blustered in his place and tried to force us to come to a vote on the resolution. We have the numbers. That's the attitude of the Government House Leader. We won the election; we've got the numbers and, damn it, we're going to force things through.

HON. S. LYON: We are the masters now.

MR. B. RANSOM: That isn't the way the system works, Mr. Chairman, and you may recall, that come Monday and the defeat of the Government in Saskatchewan, all of a sudden the interest in the Crow debate evaporated and it never did come to a vote.

Mr. Chairman, they do have the numbers and they have the responsibility to govern but they also have some responsibility to this Legislature and to the opposition members of this Legislature. We have been co-operating to facilitate the business of government to a greater extent than those members did when they were in opposition. I can tell the Government House Leader that we will continue to co-operate so long as there is some co-operation coming both ways.

As long as we continue to have the little backup second-rate Government House Leader, the Minister of Natural Resources, continuing to rise in his seat and try and cut our members off every time that we're placing a question, then there may be some difficulties. He should realize, as I think the Government House Leader does, that the question period is basically the time for the opposition and for the backbenchers to ask questions of the Ministers. If the opposition chooses to take a little longer in asking their questions, it's our time that is being taken. Instead, we have the Minister of Natural Resources continually trying to obstruct the Business of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I expect, as I said, that some of my other colleagues will have considerable to say on this resolution before it passes through the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wish to speak to this matter, Mr. Chairman, because once again today, Manitobans and Manitoba workers have learned of another considerable and significant setback. News reports today indicate that as many as 532 employees at Motor Coach Industries could be laid off by June 10th.

Mr. Chairman, when I had an opportunity to ask the Minister of Labour questions, particularly with respect to what action she had taken since she had received notice of this, as I said in my question, eight weeks ago, she corrected me by saying that she received notice February 15th, which is some five-and-a-half weeks ago. Whether it is five-and-a-half weeks ago or

eight weeks ago, she has taken no action at all, Mr. Chairman. She said, that's not her jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, do we have to remind the Minister of Labour that there are over 54,000 unemployed people in Manitoba and then when a significant industrial concern like Motor Coach Industries files a notice with her that as many as 532 employees are going to be laid off within a matter of a few months, that it's something she should look into.

Mr. Chairman, the news reports indicate that the plant here has to compete with a similar plant in New Mexico. In my question today I asked her whether she has done any investigation to compare the economic circumstances under which that plant operates in New Mexico and the economic circumstances under which the plant operates here in Manitoba. She indicated she had taken no such action.

Mr. Chairman, I want to use this opportunity to recommend to her very highly that she do investigate, and maybe if she investigates that and finds out the reasons why the industry here has difficulty competing with the plant in New Mexico, she is going to find that they have, for example, no payroll tax in New Mexico, a 1.5 tax on employment. Mr. Chairman, we're talking about a highly intensive labour industry. I suggest to her that if she would do that, as I requested her to and report to this House, perhaps report to her colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, she's going to find as a result of the actions of this government in imposing this kind of tax, in increasing the sales tax, in increasing all the other taxes that this government has done in the 15 or so months that they have been in operation, they have put this industry in a very difficult competitive situation with industries outside of Manitoba. These taxes are, I suggest, a cause, at least partially, of the difficulty which Motor Coach Industries find themselves in at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, we're talking about an industry that employs a large number of people in Manitoba. We're talking about an industry that, I suggest, has a great future. The bus industry, Mr. Chairman, is one that we can be relatively satisfied with that it's going to continue for a long period of time and the Minister of Labour should, when she receives this kind of a notice, undertake some kind of investigation so that she can make some kind of a report to her Premier and to her government, on the steps that could be taken to help Motor Coach remain competitive in this industry and maintain jobs for these 532 employees.

How long, Mr. Chairman, is it going to take for this government to realize that the tax measures that they have introduced are making it very difficult for manufacturing industries in Manitoba to compete? How long is it going to take, Mr. Chairman? How many more layoffs do workers in Manitoba have to go through before this government realizes that it is acting to the disadvantage of workers in Manitoba?

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity, once again, we will be going into the Labour Department Estimates, I expect, sometime next week when we will be asking questions of the Labour Minister along this line and we expect her to take a much more active role in the unemployment question than she's taking so far.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday she introduced what she called an important new initiative in the Manitoba Jobs Fund, called Careerstart. Mr. Chairman, the Estimates

in 1982-83 contained a provision for a Youth Employment Program of \$2.931 million and Youth and Student Employment of another \$2.9 million. The Estimates this year in the Department of Labour contain only, under Employment Services, approximately \$2.9 million for employment programs. What the government has done, Mr. Chairman, has moved - and they acknowledge it on Page 134 of the Estimates - they've moved some \$2.7 million from the 1982-83 Estimates under Labour and Employment Services to the Jobs Fund, and the Minister of Labour stands up and calls this an important new initiative. This is nothing, Mr. Chairman, other than a continuing program, one that we had initiated while we were in government, one that was very successful in those years in providing some 5,000 jobs for a similar amount of money. With the restrictions that the government introduced last year and this year, a much smaller number of jobs are going to be created and there is no expansion of the limited program that they had last year compared to the program that we had, which supplied many more jobs.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is not an important new initiative. This is nothing but a continuing program, no expansion, and I do say to whoever now is the House Leader or the Acting House Leader, Mr. Chairman, that when we were in government, when a member of the opposition spoke at this stage of this matter, the appropriate Minister was asked to be in the House, to listen to the opposition critic. Mr. Chairman, we see no evidence of that whatsoever from the government side, and I take this opportunity to remind the Acting House Leader, whoever that is, that in the future as members rise on this side, as we intend to rise, to debate this particular matter, that they arrange to have the appropriate Minister in the House to listen to the comments that are made with respect to their jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, the only thing new about this program is it has a new name, it's called Careerstart, compared to what it was called before, but it is no new initiative, Mr. Chairman. I remind members opposite that when we introduced our program that hired 5,000 students in the summer, the unemployment rate among students was much much lower than it is now. It's 17.5 percent right now. There are 20,000 people between the ages of 15 and 24 unemployed and that rate is going to increase as we approach the summer months.

Mr. Chairman, there are no jobs available for the graduates of high schools, of community colleges, of universities. Those graduates are going to impinge upon the part-time jobs that used to be taken by students continuing their education. So for those students, Mr. Chairman, who are looking for part-time summer employment, they're going to have a very very difficult time.

I'm not just calling, Mr. Chairman, upon the government to introduce and create make-work projects for students throughout the summer. They have to address the whole question of private sector employment. The criticism that they've received this week, directly to the First Minister by the President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, should be taken very very seriously by them, Mr. Chairman, because everything we see in Manitoba is a restriction of jobs in the private sector resulting from a lack of a proper economic climate, from the lack of any incentives in this province under this government.

Mr. Chairman, the program announced by the Minister of Labour is no new important initiative, it is a continuing program. It is unsatisfactory in terms of dealing with the severe problem of unemployment among young people which we have at the present time and which is going to increase during the summer months. Mr. Chairman, it's time that the Minister of Labour dealt with the problems that are being created by this government in the private sector and investigated them. It's time that she deals with the situation evidenced by another layoff, like Motor Coach, that she look into the reasons why a Manitoba industry cannot compete with outside industries. I hope, for the sake of the unemployed people in this province, that the Minister will start attending to those duties in the way that she should in order to do whatever she can and everything that can be done for the unemployed in Manitoba, because they are being left adrift. The Minister of Labour's reaction was short of getting contracts for more buses. There isn't much we can do. Well, she's overlooking, Mr. Chairman, the fundamental reasons why Motor Coach Industries is not getting contracts for more business, why they are having difficulties competing and why they are being put at an economic disadvantage by the taxing policies of this government.

In her absence, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Acting Government House Leader, whoever it is, will bring to her attention the remarks I made about these two particular instances in order that this matter can be dealt with in some serious way in the hopes that these layoffs will be put to a stop in Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know the Attorney-General in his position as Government House Leader has wiggled and twisted like a fish on the end of a line . . .

MR. H. ENNS: That he has.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . over our concerns about the way he has ruined the operation in this House. — (Interjection) — The Member for Inkster is back in his seat making his usual contribution to this House and, Mr. Chairman, this whole House rues the day that an honourable member of this Legislature was defeated and replaced by that excuse for an MLA as what happened in Inkster last election. When we had the former Member for Inkster in this House we could count on him for a rational, logical debate, a little levity and a whole lot of knowledge and it's unfortunate that we've got that kind of an MLA here now who can't contribute anything but flag-burning demonstrations against the United States, marches against El Salvador, and whatever else, and attending Marxist Conferences at the University of Manitoba, and other matters that are at the forefront of consideration to Manitobans. Those are the kind of issues that Manitobans are really concerned about. The 54,000 unemployed Manitobans are very glad that the MLA for Inkster sees fit to attend Marxist Conferences at the University of Manitoba; to march and demonstrate in front of the U.S. Embassy last year in a march, I believe, against El Salvador that

time; to march in front of the U.S. Embassy last night and burn a United States flag in front of the U.S. Consulate last night in demonstration of Nicaragua.

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler: Order please.
The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like the member to withdraw that remark. He just accused me of burning a flag. Of any nation, I have never done such. I have no intentions of ever doing such and I would suggest that the Member for Pembina withdraw that slur in this House which is only too common coming from his mouth.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I must apologize, on behalf of my leader, for not including him first off in the esteemed group of demonstrators from the Government of Manitoba that were present at the demonstration at which a United States flag was burned. But he saw fit to stand up in his place and say, yes, he was there. He wanted to be recognized with that group of people who chose to burn a United States flag in the Province of Manitoba in front of the United States Consulate. That's his problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.
The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I did not go there to burn any American flag. I went there to stand up for human dignity and civil rights within a country of Nicaragua which is being invaded. That is why I was there. That is why my fellow members of the Legislature were there with me. We were there supporting human rights, Mr. Chairman, something the other . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please. I am having difficulty understanding the remarks of the members who are speaking from their feet. Might I also remind members that we are discussing the Capital Supply Motion and they should try to keep their remarks to the resolution under discussion.
The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indeed we are debating the Capital Supply bill, part of which is going to be borrowed in the United States of America and after a demonstration was staged in front of the United States Consulate at which such notable talents of the government as the MLA for Inkster was present in that demonstration, marching arm-in-arm with demonstrators who burned an American flag, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the debate on this bill is going to be very, very, very important.
Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.
The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, on two occasions, the Member for Pembina indicated that members who were at the Embassy Consulate last night were members of the government. He is trying to impute that they were

there as representatives of the government. This is false, Mr. Chairman. That is not the case. They went there as individuals, as free people in this society which they have a right to do and I don't think that the member should impute those motives on members of this side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I feel dearly sorry for the Member for Ste. Rose who, in his constituency, has to justify why eight members of his New Democratic caucus, the current Government of Manitoba, were present at a demonstration in front of the United States Embassy in the City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba where an American flag was burned by the demonstrators there. Now if he's got a problem with the fact that those eight so-called individuals were New Democratic Party MLAs and part of the present Government of Manitoba, then I suggest he discuss that matter in caucus and in Cabinet and censure those members for such an indiscretion against the United States and against the dignity and the honour of the people of Manitoba whom they are supposed to be representing in this Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.
The hour is 4:30, the time for Private Members' Hour. I am leaving the Chair and I will return at 8:00 o'clock tonight. Call in the Speaker.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a committee change.
On the standing committee for Agriculture, a substitution of the Member for Springfield for the Member for The Pas.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, is the Government House Leader now going to conduct government business during the Private Members' Hour?

MR. SPEAKER: Is there an objection from the opposition side to that change of personnel?
The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, once again, we are prepared to bend the rules to accommodate the government.

SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS BILL NO. 32 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

The first item on the agenda for Private Members' Hour on Thursday is Second Reading of Public Bills, Bill No. 32, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first would like to apologize for not being here when the bill was last called. Mr. Speaker, I was at a meeting. In fact, I was delayed at a meeting dealing with the assessment problems that we are trying to address at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 32 attempts to single out what is assumed to be an inequity in the assessment of real property. The Member for St. Norbert proposes to, by this bill, expand and add to the list of property presently exempted from assessment.

The whole issue of exemptions, Mr. Speaker, from taxation is one which the Weir Committee recognized as being very complex and sensitive and it is generally conceded that exemptions from assessment is a major contributor of inequities in the assessment system at the present time. The current problems in assessment have been evolving over the past several decades and, Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford the patchwork and haphazard solutions. It is certainly our intention to thoroughly review each proposed change to the system, so that once a decision is made, Mr. Speaker, we can be reasonably confident that it will properly redress assessment inequities, not only the short-term, but for some considerable period into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a bit surprised that the Member for St. Norbert has brought this bill forward at this particular time. — (Interjection) — The Member for St. Norbert. I'm a bit surprised that it passed the caucus, because, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of very conscientious members on the Municipal Affairs Standing Committee who are consciously attempting to co-operate with myself and the government to try and redress some of the problems that have developed over the many many years. I want to congratulate them for that. I have asked for their co-operation and I am surprised that this bill comes at this particular time because, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this problem - it's a motherhood issue. You come in and say, well, we're going to remove the inequity from one particular assumed inequity that's out there.

MR. H. ENNS: What's wrong with supporting mothers, Peter?

HON. A. ADAM: But, Mr. Speaker, that is what we have been doing over the years, and the fact is that the member who introduced this bill now was the Minister who commissioned the Weir Committee to go out and study and review the inequities that are out there. Complaints were coming forward to the Minister and the question I ask, Mr. Speaker, is why, if the Member for St. Norbert is so concerned now, did he not address that inequity that was there and has been there for a number of years not address it at that time?

Mr. Speaker, he chose not to do that. He says there are too many inequities out there and the member well knows, and I'm sure other members across the way

are aware, that there are a whole host of other inequities out there. The reason why the Member for St. Norbert didn't undertake to address that inequity at that time is because there was a whole host of other inequities there that had to be reviewed. So rather than deal with that particular issue or any other inequity that was there, he established the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee to go out and look at the whole issue, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel at this particular time it is ill-advised. We have a whole host, Mr. Speaker, I can really give you some of the inequities that are here. There are several of them that have come to our attention that people feel that they are overassessed or shouldn't be assessed.

MR. D. BLAKE: Why are you sitting on the Weir Report?

HON. A. ADAM: Well, the Member for Minnedosa, who is a member of the committees, indicates that we're sitting on the Weir Report. We are not sitting on the Weir Report; we are dealing with it. In fact, I have just said in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I apologize for not being here when this bill was called at the last Private Members' Hour because I was sitting at a meeting dealing with assessment problems. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of opinions out there. We have the Weir Report and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, while I have the Weir Report in front of me, if we look at Page 127 and if members have their copies there, I would suggest that perhaps they should take a look at it. It says - well I think I have it here on my research notes . . .

A MEMBER: You can't find it in the book.

HON. A. ADAM: Yes, I had the page. On Page 127 it states the following basic principle: "That the exemption of real property for municipal or school taxes should be kept to a minimum. Such exemptions should be standardized throughout the province, as they affect not only the local taxpayer but taxpayers within a school division and over the whole province."

In addition, on Page 126 the committee states: "The assessment of all land for municipal purposes is of considerable merit and may well be worth implementing in the near future. It is the committee's opinion that this matter should be closely studied with a view to introduction of such at an early date."

So, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned a while ago that there are a host of people out there in different groups who have come forward and requested exemption. We have one case, it was the Winnipeg Bible College, when they took over the facility at Otterburne, I think it is, that their assessment was less than \$700, in round figures. The assessment today is \$155,000, Mr. Speaker. We had the YWCA come forward; we have co-op groups coming forward. We have cultural associations coming forward for exemptions and, Mr. Speaker, we can't deal with changing or reforming the assessment system on an emotional basis. It has to be done in a businesslike manner and that is what we are doing. I see an agreement and a nod from the Member for Gladstone, and I appreciate her support in what I have just said;

I take that as being supportive of what I have just said. We have to take a hard-nose business approach to dealing with this kind of a situation.

A MEMBER: How many years is it going to take?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, they said how many years is it going to take? Well, I want to say that the Province of Ontario have been studying the same . . . — (Interjection) — Well, just a minute, just a minute, hold your horses. Every report that has been undertaken has come to almost the same conclusions as the Weir Committee. Now the Province of Ontario have been attempting to deal with assessment problems in the Province of Ontario since back in the '60s, over 15 years. They have not resolved it yet. They're still juggling with it and having difficulty with it, Mr. Speaker, because we had the Minister of Municipal Services in Ontario - I don't know what he is referred to as - but he indicated they we're going to go to the market system, to the full value for assessment. Then we had Premier Davis, the following day, rapping him on the knuckles and saying, "No, we're not going to ahead with that." So they are still having problems to address and I think, Mr. Speaker, we can take, I guess, some consolation in what we have done since the report was brought back by the Weir Committee to me.

We have had our hearings, we have had briefs coming in, we've had a lot of information coming to us. We have the experience that has taken place in the Province of British Columbia. We have also the experience that I have just indicated of what's happening in the Province of Ontario. So, we have all those informations that we have to glean and pull together.

We are still getting briefs at the present time, and one of the major briefs that we have just received recently was from the City of Winnipeg, in which they indicate that they want us to do more studies within the City of Winnipeg.

A MEMBER: That's because they want to keep the freeze on forever.

HON. A. ADAM: No, no, they are anxious to remove the freeze, but they want to have more data. They want more data, and they have requested that we do more data, more studies in the City of Winnipeg because we've unable to do that. I am responding to the mayor, His Worship Mayor Norrie, that we are going to try and do more studies.

Now, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, we want to do this in a judicial and comprehensive way. We want to put in place a system that we can be proud of, that would at least endure for a few years, and I think because of that, if we are now because there's a freeze in effect, how can we on one hand say to one, you know, self interest group, say to them, we will exempt you so that we can shift that burden that we removed to you onto other groups or other individuals? How can we do that when we deprive all the citizens of the City of Winnipeg from appealing their assessment?

I think the Leader of the Opposition is nodding in agreement to what I have just said. I don't know whether he was nodding to his colleague and I think he was saying that he was in agreement with that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

HON. S. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, let the record show that because the Member for Ste. Rose is so concerned about how my head nods, that very seldom in his life has he said anything I would agree with, or is he likely to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if he is agreeing at this time. That is what I wonder. Regardless, if he did agree with me at this time, it would be one time that he was right rather than being wrong most of the time.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, without trying to take too much time of this Assembly, I want to say that we are addressing the problems. We will be calling the Municipal Affairs Standing Committee of the Legislature in due course. We will be making, we're tying up all the information that we can now. I'm asking my staff to glean all the information that's coming in and try and put it in a comprehensive way so that we can look at it. We will be calling the Standing Committee of the Legislature on Municipal Affairs to make recommendations to this Assembly, at this Session, so that we can get on with the job of trying to redress some of the inequities that are there.

But I would recommend that we not proceed with this bill at this time. In fact, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, rather than muddy the waters and have a whole host of other people coming in and saying, well, if you can give them an assessment, I want to have an exemption. If you can give them an exemption I want it too. Rather than getting to that kind of a hassle out there, I would strongly recommend that the honourable member withdraw that bill until we can address the total package.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if the Minister would submit to a question, Mr. Speaker. (Agreed)

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister received the Weir Commission Report, which is a fairly large and thick document substantiated with charts and various other information and material, I think the Minister said at that time that it was a very comprehensive and detailed report, and it was some two years in the compiling by very competent people in their field and their research staff. They consulted with all of the municipal people, infinitely with the people of the City of Winnipeg. How much more consultation and how much more study does the Minister think should be done before some action is taken on the assessment problem?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I have just in my remarks that I've just completed I indicated that the City of Winnipeg had just recently asked us. The Member for Minnedosa says, ". . . including the City of Winnipeg

have made presentations to the Weir Committee." They have come back to us and said now, do more studies, take a close look at this. They are now having second thoughts. They say be sure what your doing, that you're not going to rue the day some day later on.

So, Mr. Speaker, we want to address this problem, but we want to be careful that we're doing the right thing, and that we're not going to come back two years down the road and say, "What the hell did we do."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

RES. NO. 6 - HYDROGEN RESEARCH IN MANITOBA

MR. SPEAKER: Assuming that Resolution No. 1 will continue to stand, Resolution No. 6, the Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley the following resolution.

WHEREAS, the Commons Committee on Alternative Energy concluded in 1981 that "Canada has a unique opportunity to become the world leader in hydrogen technologies if we follow an ambitious route to the early establishment of a hydrogen-based system", and

WHEREAS, the most promising method of producing hydrogen is by electricity, and

WHEREAS, Manitoba has both the cheapest electricity in Canada and large undeveloped potential, and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government is funding hydrogen research in Quebec, but not Manitoba,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that this Legislative Assembly urge the Federal Government to fund hydrogen research in Manitoba where the economies of production are the most favourable in North America.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to deal today with a topic which, I think, holds a lot of potential for Manitoba and that is the production of hydrogen for substitute energy uses in this province, in this country and perhaps within the whole continent.

Hydrogen is, of course, one of the best sources of energy that we could find. It's a non-polluting source. I am sure all members would know that hydrogen when you burn it becomes water and certainly water is not a pollutant. H₂O is nothing but hydrogen and oxygen combined together. The energy content of hydrogen is high, relative to other sources, perhaps not as high as natural gas. Hydrogen has 333 BTU's per 100 cubic feet as opposed to 1,000 BTU's per 100 cubic feet of natural gas, but you can easily substitute quantity for

quality when it comes to the use of hydrogen, so it can readily be used as a natural gas extender or as a substitute further on as the natural gas supplies decline in this country.

It has been suggested that we could substitute already 20 percent hydrogen in the natural gas distribution systems of this country and, bearing in mind the fact that it has one-third the energy content, that would result in a 7 percent reduction in the consumption of natural gas.

One of the easiest methods, if not the prevalent method, to produce hydrogen is by electrolysis. That's something, I'm sure, that all of us did in our high school chemistry courses where we took an electric current, DC current, and ran it through a jar of water with a solution of potassium hydroxide and this is a system which is produced commercially by Electrolyzer Corporation in Toronto and marketed on a world scale.

There is, however, another second generation, more efficient method of producing hydrogen through electrolysis being developed by General Electric in the United States and it uses a solid polymer electrolyte, SPE for short, which promises in the long run to be more economical and more efficient. However, it hasn't been put into any practical applications as of yet.

The main barrier to producing hydrogen at the moment by electricity is its cost and, primarily, its the cost of electricity and the relative efficiency of conversion of electricity to hydrogen. The Electrolyzer Corporation in Toronto which makes electrolyzer units which are sold even in Winnipeg has an efficiency of - well, it uses 12.8 kilowatt hours to produce each 100 cubic feet of hydrogen. In Europe, the efficiency has been dropped to the point where it takes only 10.2 kilowatt hours to produce 100 cubic feet of hydrogen.

To put this in perspective, if we took the electricity which is currently exported from Manitoba at 1.5 cents a kilowatt hour, which represents the average price of wholesale and interruptible export sales, if we applied that to the European performance ratings, it would cost 46 cents to produce the hydrogen energy equivalent of 100 cubic feet of natural gas. I looked at my gas bill last night and I see I'm paying Greater Winnipeg Gas 48 cents per 100 cubic feet of natural gas and they want to raise it more now. So I think it seems obvious to me that we're getting within striking distance of substituting hydrogen for natural gas. The ratio of 46 cents per 100 cubic feet, of course, does not bring into consideration the capital costs or transmission costs.

It was suggested in the late '70s, estimated by G.E. I believe, that it would cost \$304 million to build a 400 megawatt hydrogen production facility using Electrolyzer Corporation's technology or \$92 million using the perfected G.E. SPE advanced technology for the same 400 megawatt facility. Now you don't enter into a project like that without a little bit of investigation ahead of time, so it was also suggested in 1978 that a demonstration plant of 25 megawatts be built at a cost of some \$10 million. At the time, it was rejected, primarily on the basis of the cost of natural gas which was a lot lower then than it is now. I would suggest it's time, maybe, that we bring out these plans, dust them off and have another look at the possibility of a demonstration project for hydrogen production.

Transmission costs, of course, are another factor and using the proper transmission, we could reduce the

cost of hydrogen even further. For example, the electricity which is exported from Manitoba is produced in the North and there is a large amount of power loss as it's transmitted to the south. If we converted electricity into hydrogen at the dam site and then piped it south, there would be considerably less loss of energy and a more efficient use of the Hydro facilities on the Nelson River.

One of the suggestions which has been made is that rather than installing AC generators in the Limestone project or some other Hydro facility of that nature, we could put in acyclic generators, DC generators, which would then be used to produce hydrogen right on-site and then build a pipeline to the south which would produce much cheaper hydrogen.

The uses of hydrogen, of course, are many and I'm sure that the agricultural area representatives here know that it's one of the main components in anhydrous ammonia which has a chemical formula of NH_3 . It's nitrogen and hydrogen. The nitrogen comes from the air and it's available wherever you build a plant. The hydrogen currently used comes from natural gas or petroleum and, as long as natural gas is cheap, it's a cheap fertilizer, but as we know the price of natural gas has skyrocketed in the last few years. Despite that, 76 percent of Canada's hydrogen comes from natural gas and 23 percent comes from petroleum. Only 1 percent currently comes from electrolysis.

It used to be that anhydrous ammonia, ammonia, was produced by electrolysis at the Cominco facilities in Trail, B.C. They operated that facility - it was a 36 megawatt production facility - which produced hydrogen until they were lured into Alberta in the '60s to the sources of cheap natural gas which then came on stream.

Last year, the Member for Pembina mentioned that the only way to make anhydrous ammonia is with natural gas, but right now at the Aswan Dam in Egypt, they make hydrogen and use that to make ammonia fertilizer for Egypt. So it's a technology which is already in practice elsewhere in the world.

Another use of hydrogen, of course, is to upgrade heavy oil. For instance, in the Canadian Petroleum Journal for October, 1980, there is an article called, "New Process Promises Higher Yield from Heavy Oil," and it starts out, "The art of coking to convert bitumin and other heavy oils to salable syncrude may be well advanced, but nobody will be completely happy until an alternative hydrogen addition process can be perfected." The problem is, of course, heavy oil can be looked at two ways. It's a hydrocarbon and you can either look it from the point of view that it has too much carbon and take the carbon out, or you can look at it from the point of view that it doesn't have enough hydrogen and put the hydrogen in. Of course, it only makes sense that if you add hydrogen, you're going to get a lot more production from a barrel of heavy oil than if you take the carbon out.

So this article goes on to say, "Nearly 300,000 will be spent on processing a viscous Lloydminster crude by combining coal gasification and water electrolysis with steam injection and fire flooding. The water yields hydrogen for processing the heavy oil and oxygen is used to run the gasifier." So they're already using this process or they are getting into the operational stages in Alberta of using electrolysis to produce hydrogen to upgrade heavy oil.

There is another article that appeared in the Oil and Gas Journal, May 26, 1980. It's entitled, "High H₂ Purity is Key in New Refining Era" and it starts, "The residual barrel must be exploited to replace the white products lost through diminishing crude supplies and ever heavier crudes. Simultaneously, the need for hydrogen will increase." This article goes on to detail the need for increasing supplies of hydrogen in the refining process.

Now, I remember in the 1980 Throne Speech, it was announced by the previous government that in conjunction with the Western Grid discussions my Ministers are also exploring the possibilities with the Government of Alberta of obtaining feed stocks for heavy oil upgrading and other petrochemical operations in Manitoba. Such operations relate logically to the adequate supply of electrical energy available in Manitoba for the production of hydrogen involved in the process. On the basis of these discussions, my government is proceeding with feasibility studies for these specific major undertakings and into the broad question of hydrogen production from electricity as a fuel of the future. Well, that was announced in the Throne Speech and I never heard of it again. I don't know what happened.

I think maybe the problem was that we were trying to run before we could learn to walk. You don't jump into immense mega projects of this nature without having some sort of a background of expertise or knowledge to start with. You have to start small and work up to the big. You just can't jump into something. So this basically deals with the possibilities, the potential of hydrogen, and it's more or less a preamble to what I really have to say which is the political framework within which this energy system is going to have to develop.

Now, back in 1980, there was an All-Party Commons Committee on Energy Alternatives, a non-partisan committee, which presented the report and I'd like to read a few of the recommendations and conclusions that they made in 1981. For example, the committee recommends that an energy system based on hydrogen and electricity as the principal energy currencies be adopted by the Government of Canada as a long-term policy objective.

A further recommendation: The committee believes that hydrogen will be an important element of Canada's future energy system and recommends that we begin now to develop the technology and infrastructure for the hydrogen production, distribution and use.

A few of the conclusions were: Canada has a momentary advantage possessing all of the essential elements for developing an electrolytic hydrogen system. What is missing is a commitment to taking full advantage of our position. Further, federal funding of hydrogen research and development is totally inadequate to allow Canada to gain or maintain for long the position of world leadership in any area of hydrogen technology. The committee believes that Canada has a unique opportunity to become the world leader in hydrogen technologies if we follow an ambitious route to the early establishment of a hydrogen-based system.

So the major recommendations that this particular report made was: The committee recommends that the Federal Government be prepared to spend up to \$1 billion over the next five years to foster the broad

development of a hydrogen-based energy system and to establish Canada as a world leader in hydrogen technology.

Well, the question I'd like to ask, Mr. Speaker, is what happened to that recommendation? Where is this billion dollars? I haven't seen much evidence of any real meaningful activity on hydrogen development on the part of the Canadian Government.

I think that perhaps what happened was that it got lost in the cutbacks, and I think that a lot of what's going on now is being kept more or less undercover. I would refer to an article which appeared in the journal called, "Energy, the Invisible Hydrogen War for November, December, 1981," and it charges, "The Quebec dominated Federal Liberals have secretly decided to funnel all hydrogen R&D into Quebec." It goes on to say, "Two-thirds of Ottawa's spending goes into a special project at Varennes and Pointe Claire, both suburbs of Montreal, involving the Random Mines Limited, Electrolyzer Corporation and Hydro Quebec. Ottawa is spending \$2 million on the Hydro Quebec research facility at Varennes where Noranda, Electrolyzer and Hydro Quebec are building a 1.2 megawatt hydrogen generating pilot plant and on an engineering development project at Pointe Claire."

"Why is Ottawa stalling Ontario?" The most obvious explanation is that the feds are secretly committed to putting most hydrogen research into Lalonde's home province. Well, that raised some questions from the opposition in the House of Commons just after this article appeared where Mr. Gurbin, the Member for Bruce-Grey, asked the Minister why he wasn't dealing with the Province of Ontario and co-operating with them in funding hydrogen research in that province. Mr. Lalonde responded at that time, "There are discussions taking place, I believe, with the Government of Ontario and with officials of the Government of Quebec." I also note that he said, "We have indicated to other provinces which are interested in this particular technology that if they have any proposal to put forward we would be happy to discuss it with them." Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm putting forward the proposal and I hope that Mr. Lalonde will see fit to enter into some discussions with the Minister of Energy in this province regarding hydrogen research in this province.

We've got our Jobs Fund set up. There's been a request for projects to be suggested to the Ministers in Ottawa and I think that this is one particular area which we could go a long ways in developing a good sound alternative energy base for Manitoba and perhaps for the other prairie provinces as well in the near future. I don't think I need to remind people here that we do have the cheapest hydro in North America, and if it's the cheapest hydro it only stands to reason that we would also have the cheapest hydrogen.

So I would like to suggest to the Minister of Energy and to the Minister of Energy in Ottawa that they start to discuss resurrecting some of the projects that they had in mind back in 1978 when there were some considerations for a demonstration project. I think it would certainly be a good start and it's something that Manitoba Hydro should certainly be looking into. They would certainly follow in the same course as Hydro Quebec, so I would like to commend this resolution to all members of the House as non-partisan, non-political, simply a clear-cut, straightforward resolution requesting

the Federal Government to fund some hydrogen research in the province which is best suited to produce it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Proposed resolution to be non-political, I accept it as being non-political. The honourable members made a statement, I'm putting through this proposal to see if we can get something rolling, condemning the previous administration for sitting around after making the Throne Speech announcement that they were going to get into this type of energy development. But the honourable member is putting this through to urge the Federal Government to fund hydrogen research in Manitoba where the economies of the production are the most favourable in North America. If we want to get something done, why don't we put a little clout into it. Why don't we get the Province of Manitoba, rather than just a member, and I can't belittle the member because he knows what he's talking about, because I've done some research on hydrogen power in the last few days, in the last few months, in the last few years. At my urgence, I had asked the Honourable Minister of Energy if he would do something about it, and at the previous investigation of spending for Manitoba Hydro, he advised me that he was going to do something. If what he advised me he was going to do was turn it over to one of his caucus members, I guess that's the importance that he attaches to this great project. — (Interjection) — That's right.

We are now making plans - not for today - but possibly for 20, 25 years in the future. None of us will be in this Legislature when hydrogen power will come into effect in Manitoba. We are planning for the future for the young people of the Province of Manitoba and that's always the way that I make my plans and I support projects that will help those people.

I think that what we really have to do, and I'm not going to get into the technological part of it, because I'm not that well versed it in. I'm not an engineer, I don't know these things, but I do know what's good for the Province of Manitoba. I think we have to look at the whole picture in perspective - where we are going.

I'd like to get back to where it says "urge the Federal Government to fund hydrogen research in Manitoba." I think the first thing we've got to do is throw out the word "urge" and put in the word "demand." Who are we to demand? We are the people who are going to have to pay if it doesn't come into effect, so I think "demand" rather than "urge", and I think we're in a good position to demand.

There will probably be a Federal Election before too long and the honourable members of the Federal Government in Ottawa are looking to win some seats here in the west, particularly in Manitoba, and I think that with that in mind, if we ask them for some help to develop hydrogen power in Manitoba, we just might get that assistance. I think we're talking about great amounts of money and let's not make it political, inasmuch as we are going to fight them, and we're not going to make them promises that they're going to get any extra seats, because they're going to build a new

hydrogen plant in Manitoba and possibly in St. Boniface where they're looking to win the seat back in the next Federal election, but I can't think of a better place to put a plant, a hydrogen plant.

We have the space there and we've got the hydrogen lines coming in; we've got access to water, which are the main things for developing hydrogen power - electrical source and water. There are other sources that we can combine with water to get hydrogen, but at this point, I think that I want to talk on electrical sources and water rather than some other sources, and we do have some other sources, which are being developed right here in the province right now - refined biomass fuel, which could be combined with water to create hydrogen, but we'll throw that to the side for a little while, because it's just developing and I want to see this progress at a state where it's going to be of some benefit before too many years.

From everywhere that I've spoken, and I know that we are using hydrogen power in some locations now, it is 20 to 25 years into the future. You can develop power now to run buses, but half of the source of the power is going to take up half of the space in the bus. So it has to be developed, it has to be investigated, so that we could get it down to a fine state, where it will be productive and not cost more than other sources of energy.

I have a book that I received from - well it was printed in Europe - it's "Naturopa" and I'm going to make some quotes from "Naturopa" and I think that we've got to be very, very careful, Mr. Speaker. We cannot proceed just helter-skelter and just throw our hands in the air and say, let's go, let's do this, let's do that. We've got to plan. There are environmental studies to be made.

I see where there's problems now about problems in the environment in other locations, because of some of the energy sources that they are using. We can't run into those problems because even though I want to plan 20, 25 years into the future, I don't want them to have the problems that could come with these things that could come about if we don't plan properly.

"The search for energy sources may lead to drastic changes in the natural environment, such as the disappearance of mountain streams, the raising of river temperatures, the danger of high tension wires to avifauna and the pollution of probably all the waters of this earth, if we're not careful, if we don't plan properly."

The Honourable Member for River East mentioned that the cost for Canada is going to be somewhere in the area of, I believe, \$1 billion. That's just a start, but you've got to think of the benefits that can come in the future, and I'm not saying that the Provincial Government should just jump in because the Federal Government says, well we're just going to sit on it a little while. The Provincial Government can't sit around doing nothing any longer. We've got to get in there and start to develop this hydrogen power, but we can't just jump in because that's what the cost will be and we can't bear the cost of \$1 billion.

We've got a deficit coming up this year of somewhere near three-quarters of a billion and, you know, that's for everything. I'm not suggesting to the government to go into a higher rate of a deficit. I'm suggesting to the government that they could probably reduce their

deficit by looking at some of the costs that they have incurred, but I don't think that I want to start playing politics and playing the game where I'm going to force you to reduce your deficit and then ask you on the other hand to increase it by developing hydrogen power. So, I mention and we'll just throw that to the side, because now let's work together towards developing hydrogen power.

In the resolution, and I'm still disappointed that the Honourable Minister didn't bring in the resolution, but I've got to accept that it's starting to roll and I'll support that because I won't try to turn it back. In the resolution it says, "Whereas the most promising method of producing hydrogen is by electricity." I want to believe that statement. Manitoba Hydro has electricity and I've always supported the development of electricity with Manitoba Hydro. We have a resource that can develop this source of power and it will be to the benefit of the Province of Manitoba. I'd mentioned before about biomass fuel, which is another source, but I say, we'll leave that to the side for the little time being, but I want to believe that producing of hydrogen is by electricity is the best source and it is probably right.

In this article, in *Naturopa*, and I don't know where it was printed, but it's somewhere in Europe - "Hydrogen, a promise for the future." We all agree. Hydrogen is the promise of the future, but we can't do it on our own. We can't get the Federal Government to throw in a billion dollars, because really politically it's not that acceptable to throw it into Manitoba. But centrally, this is the place where it should be. This is the place where hydrogen power should be the main source of power to all of Western Canada, the Northern United States. We should be planning right now in co-operation with Northern United States, the Power Grid, that's been - I guess the word is screwed up, but let's try to get back to it where the Power Grid will come into effect again, because we will have something to offer the people in Saskatchewan and Alberta at no increased cost.

The honourable member came up with many good points about the heavy oil out of Alberta. If we've got this type of power to refine that oil, I can see a development in agreement and this is what's going to have to happen. The Honourable Minister of Energy should be negotiating with the Province of Alberta right now to supply them with hydrogen power. We haven't got it, but he should be negotiating with them right now and have an overall picture where he has got everything working together so that things will fit together. This is what we're looking at, have it fit together. He should be working with the northern states.

He mentioned that he has been going into Wisconsin in the next short time to sell them electrical energy. He should be negotiating for hydrogen energy at this point right now, at least getting them interested, and let's not be ashamed to take some of their dollars if they want to invest it into the developing of hydrogen power. Let's take some of their dollars. Let's take some of the dollars from Saskatchewan and Alberta. Let's not be ashamed of taking them.

I am not saying that we are going to give away our Manitoba Hydro. Every time you talk about bringing in some extra dollars from somewhere to make a development, what happens? You are accused of selling or giving away Manitoba Hydro. It was done when Alcan

was here. We were accused of selling or giving away Manitoba Hydro. That's the last thing in my mind. I don't want to give away Manitoba Hydro. Manitoba Hydro can be the salvation of the Province of Manitoba, I've always stated it and the Honourable Speaker of this Legislature has supported Manitoba Hydro as I have supported Manitoba Hydro.

I want to see it developed so that Manitoba, in the future, can stand high and not have any problems concerning a Western Power Grid. If and when Alcan wants to come back into the province, we will have an energy source for them that they will be able to come back and compete with any production anywhere in the world. We were able to almost give them that assurance before, and I'm not going to accuse the government of screwing up on that deal also, but I think that if we had hydrogen power or the potential of hydrogen power at that time, I think that Alcan would have come into the province even under the adverse situation of the economy of Canada today.

We are planning for the future an environmental study. I don't want to keep going back into the environmental study saying that it has to go on and on. If it's a matter of pushing a little bit faster and not having as much of an environmental study as what we should have, I say, let's proceed. I don't want to accuse the Provincial Government, which is the NDP Government at this time, in the future because I am going to be around for a little while and I imagine some of the members will be around here. We're going to be changing sides, but we will be around for a little while. I don't want to say that we are sitting down. We're not jumping up onto our feet, we're not starting to negotiate and we're not checking the environment. I think that we've got to check the environment because that is the thing of the future where the environment could cause us such great problems that are even unforeseen at this time, but they have to be checked.

For instance, whenever I drive by the Canada Packers, I go through an area where the environment - it wasn't anticipated that the damn smell would be there when they first developed it, it's there now — (Interjection) — the stink, that's right, rather than the damn smell - but it stinks just as badly, Father, but these things all have to be checked into.

Due to the physical properties of hydrogen, it needs storage and transportation techniques quite different to those used for liquid fossil fuels. At room temperature, hydrogen has to be stored and transported as a gas, or bound in metal hybrids, or in the form of a liquid ammonia. It can also be stored and transported as a liquid at very low temperatures, -253 degrees Centigrade. That could be a danger to the environment, but I think that if anything — (Interjection) — that's colder than Portage and Main and it's colder than the Premier's heart.

There are some dangers, as I mentioned earlier, dangers to the fauna, dangers to the environment, dangers to the lakes, dangers to everything. These have to be developed. I am prepared to say that a development location - and we've got all kinds of locations in Manitoba where these places could be constructed - I would like to see it in St. Boniface, as I mentioned earlier, partly because I represent a part of St. Boniface. The Honourable Minister of Health represents a part of St. Boniface and it's all to the

benefit of a particular area and we are looking to create employment. Let's get it into St. Boniface and create employment. I think there are locations, particularly somewhere around the TransCanada Highway and that Bishop Grandin Boulevard where there is a lot of space that has been designated — (Interjection) — three minutes? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm sorry that I can't carry on a little bit longer. I do not normally get up and I would hope that maybe I could have leave, but there is a place in St. Boniface that would be absolutely the perfect place. It would generate a construction business of this hydrogen plant and, in addition, there is enough location there that we could probably develop a vocational school close by. I know that there is one plant and the government is planning a vocational school somewhere in the area and it's certainly needed, why not in conjunction with a hydrogen resource plant in St. Boniface, a vocational school in conjunction? Because you're going to require to develop and work in this hydrogen plant. Let's train them ourselves. I think the government has plans right now for a technical school. Why not start to work together? This is what I said earlier about how you have to look at the overall picture.

In addition, it would develop construction of houses. There are areas in there - and the government owns some property over there, Mr. Chairman, in that area along Bishop Grandin Boulevard - which could develop a housing industry. There are some private developers too and they're going to make a few dollars when they start to develop these houses. It's not a sin to make a dollar, but it's going to develop — (Interjection) — that's right. It is not a sin to make a dollar, a legitimate dollar. I'm not saying that you can't make an illegitimate dollar, which would be wrong, but I'm saying let's give these people the opportunity to develop in that land so that construction can go on that land and we can have a school in conjunction with the developing of hydrogen power.

Hydrogen, as I say, is something in the future. We could get benefit of it right now, just by getting something started. But it boils right down to dollars and I think that the dollars are available. There are power lines - I mentioned this location because I haven't just jumped up on my feet on the spur of the moment to talk about this - we've got power lines coming right into St. Boniface. I think that we could take off that power right from there, the water that goes with it and it's that easy, it's that easy.

If the Honourable Minister of Energy would just make some arrangements, and I know that he has discussed this with the Federal Government, but I think that he can't sit back and just let the Federal Government say no, because that's what has happened. I hope I'm wrong. I hope the Honourable Minister will jump up in the House tomorrow and say, "We've got the money to start." I don't think he has that money to start.

There are some provincial monies that he could use to start, but he has to make arrangements with the Federal Government, and I would support those type of arrangements 100 percent. He has got to go to the Federal Government and I'm not going to make an amendment to the resolution where the word "urge" was used, and demand, but that is what he has to do. He has to demand. And if he hasn't got the strength and the support of the people of the Province of

Manitoba, and particularly his own group, the NDP and if he doesn't feel that there's enough strength there, then I would hope that the government — (Interjection) — Yes, it looks like time is running out and I would hope that the government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: If I could just have one more minute, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I think that hydrogen can be the salvation of the Province of Manitoba. I think that Manitoba Hydro should be the form in which we help that salvation. We have people there that have been in place to develop some of the power sources in the province and haven't really contributed too much in the last little while. Let's put those to work. We've got

them now. Let's put those people to work, or as an alternative, let's get rid of them, because we've got a lot of people at Hydro — (Interjection) — that's right. We've got a lot people at Hydro that are just sitting there waiting for the development of the resources in the north. So let's not get rid of them, that's not really what I want. I want to see it developed. Let's use them to develop hydrogen power and let's work together to see that hydrogen power can be the salvation of the Province of Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.

HON. A. MACKLING: So moved.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs the House do now adjourn, and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. (Friday)