

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 15 June, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

RETURN TO ORDER NO. 7

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file a Return to Order of the House No. 7, the Member for Turtle Mountain.

RETURN TO ORDER NO. 6

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table Return to Order of the House No. 6, the Member for Lakeside.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement, I have copies here.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Aluminum Company of Canada announced that it was postponing its long-term investment decision regarding the Manitoba aluminum smelter. I will now read that statement into the record: "Alcan postpones decision in Winnipeg, Manitoba, 15th of June, 1982."

"The Aluminum Company of Canada Limited said today it was postponing a decision on the possible construction of a 200,000 tonne aluminum smelter in the province.

The President of the Aluminum Company of Canada Limited, David Morton, said that the information exchange phase of the joint review undertaken by Alcan and the Government of Manitoba last January will be completed during the next couple of months. Ongoing discussions will also be maintained for the duration of the postponement. Mr. Morton stressed that Manitoba with its hydro potential remains an attractive future expansion possibility for the company. He said that the company's decision was made with regret.

"He added that the continuing recession and its many ramifications were the reason why the company decided on the postponement at this time. The decision, he added, reflects weak markets, lower prices, and uncertainty as to when and at what rate recovery will come. Morton said it was impossible to forecast when markets and financial resources will permit a reassessment of the Alcan project in Manitoba.

"The Alcan Director of Development for Manitoba, Jacques Bougie, said because of these developments

it was only fair to the people of Manitoba, who have expressed support for this smelter project, that the company present the facts as they are and not maintain expectations of an early beginning of the project. Mr. Bougie also said that the company would not be renewing its purchase options on about 4,000 acres of land in the rural Municipality of Rockwood. He said that the company would not freeze this amount of land for an indefinite period and impede any regional planning process. Mr. Bougie said along with the present commercial staff, Alcan will retain a liaison presence in the province to enable the company to keep abreast of developments in Manitoba, and to keep Manitobans aware of Alcan's plans and developments in the aluminum industry." That is the end of the Alcan statement.

I naturally regret this decision by Alcan, but given the weak markets faced by the company, I can understand it. The current recession is taking a heavy toll. Unemployment across the western world is up, and economic growth and rates of capacity utilization are down. The aluminum industry in general has reacted to the recession by retrenching. The start-up of the second line at Alcan's facility in Grande Baie, Quebec has been postponed. Over the last 8 months, 65,000 tonnes of capacity at two other Alcan facilities in Kitimat and Arvida were shut down. Capacity utilization rates of other major aluminum producers such as Reynolds, Alcoa, and Kaiser have fallen. World inventory levels have increased significantly.

In these circumstances it is to be expected that new investment decisions will be postponed. Alcan did not want to unfairly raise expectations in the light of current economic reality. We respect their candor. The joint review of the project presently being conducted by the company and the government will continue so that when economic conditions improve the information necessary for future decisions will be available.

On completion of this process the government and Alcan will maintain communications monitoring economic conditions and the health of the aluminum industry, in order that investment in a Manitoba smelter may be considered in better economic circumstances.

We recognize that the current recession is causing deferral and postponement of immediate investment by the aluminum industry, but we firmly believe that, as the health of the world economy improves, the aluminum industry will expand its capacity and will look favourably on Manitoba as a potential site for smelter development.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad day for all Manitobans. The confidence of Manitobans and the possibility of obtaining for our province the first off-seaboard aluminum smelter had been building since 1979 when our government first invited Alcan to come to Manitoba and to look at the feasibility of such a plant.

The announcement that we have heard today from Alcan is sad in every respect. While acknowledging

that international and world conditions played a large part in the decision by Alcan to postpone indefinitely any further negotiations for that plant in Manitoba, this government of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, must also bear its fair and full share of responsibility for the manner in which it has allowed the negotiations on this matter to deteriorate and to deteriorate greatly since assuming office on the 30th of November, 1981.

Indeed, as recently as January, February of 1982 Alcan was still advertising publicly its intention to come into Manitoba, advertisements which apparently were found to be offensive by the Minister of Mines and Energy and he called upon Alcan to stop making the advertisements in Manitoba because he and his colleagues found that offensive.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we find today that the first of these large projects, for which the previous administration had been working very hard to bring to our province, is now back to square one, far from having concluded a Memorandum of Understanding with Alcan, which would have at least been an island from which future governments could have moved forward. This government is in the very awkward position of putting Manitobans back right where they started. There is no land for the site in Manitoba; the land options are being given up. There's no agreement with Hydro on a long-term basis whereby Hydro power would have been available and Alcan would have become the largest customer in the history of Manitoba Hydro, taking something like 10 percent of its current production. Now all of that is lost and gone by the wayside and it remains for some government in the future, and it won't be a government of the political stripe of the ones who sit opposite us, Mr. Speaker.

It remains for a government of vision, understanding and prudence to restructure this whole agreement that has been lost and dropped by virtue of the announcement today. I, Sir, make a pledge on behalf of this party that we stand ready to make that kind of restructured agreement possible for the benefit of all Manitobans and not, Mr. Speaker, to permit our tunnel vision, to permit our ideology as our honourable friends opposite did to preclude them from negotiating in good faith with a company that was prepared to come to Manitoba in good faith, to bargain hard and to bargain fairly for thousands of jobs opportunities for Manitobans. So, Mr. Speaker, we don't welcome this announcement by the Minister at all.

We know, Sir, that this government has in the first six months demonstrated its complete ineptitude in trying to carry forward negotiations which were left to it to carry through and one can only have the gravest suspicion, having heard this announcement today, that the Western Inter-Tie Agreement is being faced with the same kind of recalcitrance by this government as indeed the Alcan negotiations were and that the potash negotiation is in the same sorry state.

So, Sir, that is why, as you are well aware, I will be moving at the conclusion of the Orders of the Day a motion to adjourn the House on this matter of urgent public importance so that we may have a debate here and now in this Legislature about this great body blow to the economy of Manitoba which has been announced, and about the plans of this government to try to restore some hope and some confidence to small business people, to farmers and to other people

in Manitoba that they know something, anything at all, about making our economy grow and expand for the benefit of future generations. That's why, Sir, I'll be moving that motion as you are well aware, your having previously had notice of it, and I will resume further remarks on this black day for Manitoba at that time.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Question Period, I should direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 25 students of Grade 6 standing from the Nellie McClung Collegiate, under the direction of Mrs. Mueller. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

There are 23 students of Grade 6 and 7 standing of the Barrows Junction School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Kustiak and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

There are 25 students of Grade 8 standing of the Pinawa Secondary School, under the direction of Mr. Bob Reimer. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that under Rule 27, the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance; namely, the announcement by Alcan of the postponement . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

If the honourable member will consult Rule 27(1), he will find that the Motion should be made after Oral Questions and before the Orders of the Day.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I did and I am moving the Motion after Oral Questions has been called and before the Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: It's my reading of Rule 27 that the Motion should be made after Oral Question Period has been completed, not the announcement of the beginning of Oral Questions.

HON. S. LYON: With respect, Sir, I think you will find that the Motion has been moved in this manner on other occasions and I dare say it has been moved in the manner to which you make reference. We are, of course, in your hands and I'll move the Motion now or at the end of question period. It will be moved, Sir, I can guarantee you that, but we're quite willing to abide by your judgment in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Just on the point of order, your ruling, with respect, is absolutely correct. The reading of the rule, and our attention has been drawn to the rules all too often by the Leader of the Opposition, is that after Oral Questions and the routine business, not after Oral Questions have been called. That was a gloss on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, but after Oral Questions in the routine business, and this side certainly supports your ruling on that point.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no other member wishing to advise the Chair on this matter - the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in my experience in this House, and I'm sure there are colleagues on both sides of the House who would agree, it's been done both ways. I certainly have been here when a motion to adjourn the House on urgent public business has been put and that the debate has been held prior to Question Period. It's simply a matter of your discretion, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member is correct that it has been done both ways and there seems to have been little uniformity in the past. However, my reading of the Rules says that after Oral Questions, and I will take that to mean after Oral Questions is completed.

Therefore, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will be entitled to make his motion upon the completion of the Oral Question Period.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in anticipation then of the debate, which subject to your ruling may take place at the conclusion of Oral Questions, may I ask a question to the First Minister? Given the news that we have had today about the indefinite suspension of Alcan's plans for the establishment of an aluminum smelter in Manitoba and the consequent loss of many thousands of job opportunities, can the First Minister give this House and the people of Manitoba any reassurance at all as to progress that is being made with respect to (a) the negotiations on the Western Inter-Tie, which are the key to resuming construction on Limestone Plant; and (b) the success or otherwise of negotiations that we expect are ongoing concerning the establishment of the first potash mine in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first in connection with the potash negotiations, the Minister will be meeting with the potash people in the next two or three weeks and as the Leader of the Opposition knows from earlier questions posed in the House, we're awaiting advice from the Minister in Saskatchewan as to the resumption of negotiations.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Minister of Mines and Energy was in discussion with Alcan as recently as April and May of 1982, and given the fact that we've had the unfortunate announcement today that we have had from Alcan, is the Minister not becoming a little worried like some of us; it may be that the more negotiations he has the least likely we are to get the projects in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think in response to the question from the Leader of the Opposition that we obviously have to speak about economic reality. I have in my hand an article which appeared in June 11th, Friday, Globe and Mail: "1,200 potash workers face a two-month layoff in the Province of Saskatchewan."

So, Mr. Speaker, honourable members may try to ignore the reality of the present international economic recession, but the situation is clear for all to review. With headlines like this, Mr. Speaker, involving some 1,200 workers being laid off in Saskatchewan in the potash industry, any person with any realistic bent knows that discussions at this time are against a background of economic recession.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, to get down to specifics, could we then ask the First Minister if he could advise, and if he doesn't have the information at hand, of course, I would expect he would take the question as notice, if he could advise as to the number of occasions on which he, or his responsible Minister or Ministers, have met with the principal officers of IMC since November 30, 1981, with respect to the establishment of the first potash mine in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: We'll accept that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister in charge of McKenzie Seeds, and would ask him if he could inform the House how much money the government will be giving to McKenzie Seeds in order to refinance its debt load, which occurred over the last ten years because of some fairly large losses?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks a policy question, and when a policy decision has been finally made he and the rest of Manitoba will be advised.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of the Minister making remarks that he will be making an announcement that has been reported in the Brandon Sun, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House whether or not they will be entering the Mexican market?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and consult with the management of

the company.

MR. R. BANMAN: Again, in light of the statements that the Minister has made in Brandon, I wonder if he could inform the House whether or not the company will be moving into other markets, such as the U.S. market, and expanding their operations?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Board and the management are considering certain expansions, but the details of that will be revealed in due course I understand.

MR. R. BANMAN: I wonder if the Minister could confirm that in Brandon he has said that the government will be refinancing the company within the matter of a week, and that he will also be making announcements that the company will be expanding its operations into other areas and employing something like 50 new people?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, either the article didn't quote me properly or the honourable member hasn't read the article correctly. In a number of his statements, therefore, that he's just made I reject, because I did not make those numbers that he refers to, nor some of those statements he refers to. The Government of Manitoba has indicated, and we've indicated this in Committee, that we're prepared to consider refinancing. Whenever that decision is made, an announcement will be made.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. Could the First Minister advise as to whether or not he and his government are making any progress whatsoever with respect to negotiations with other aluminum companies for the establishment of aluminum smelting facilities in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy and Mines has had some discussion recently and I would ask him to respond to the question.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions with some other aluminum companies. They have been informing us that the recession, the worldwide recession, is affecting all of them pretty severely, that some of them have gone down to as low as 45 percent of their productive capacity in the United States, and that weighs very heavily in terms of any short-term investment decision that they might be able to make anywhere in the world with respect to aluminum smelting.

We have had some interest shown by other aluminum companies and they are prepared to start - one of them is prepared to start some work in terms of taking a more detailed look at Manitoba. Another has expressed interest to probably undertake that work in Manitoba within the near future. I think all aluminum companies realize that Manitoba does have long-term potential with respect to future and potential alumi-

num smelters in this province to serve the midwest.

While that is being pursued, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be premature at this time to indicate the companies' names, because I certainly haven't been in contact with them as to whether in fact they would like their names released. If in fact that's the wish, I can certainly be in touch with these companies and indicate to them that questions have been asked, but certainly I would like to check with them first.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's certainly no secret that the previous government had preliminary discussions with Kaiser Aluminum and with Alumax, and those names have been used before in the House. With respect to those two companies, can the Minister of Mines and Energy give us any further progress report on those negotiations, and indeed if he has been talking to any other aluminum companies, and if he doesn't wish to name them without their approval that's understandable, could he tell us if there are any other aluminum companies with whom he is currently in either early or medium term negotiations, or what is the status of these alternate negotiations?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: We certainly have been in discussion with Alumax, and Kaiser. There are two other aluminum companies that have expressed interest and have been in touch with us, after we contacted them in the original instance. Indeed in respect to both Alumax and Kaiser, they were indeed contacted by the previous government. I believe one of the meetings between the previous government officials and one of the companies took place in Edmonton some time in September of 1981. So that at that stage, I think the other companies weren't sure of the seriousness of the government, but I think they were contacted by the previous administration to pursue the possibility of other companies being interested in setting up an aluminum smelter in Manitoba.

We indeed have had some follow-up sessions to that, follow-up correspondence. I indeed have had a meeting with one of the companies directly and it is hoped that I could be able to provide further information in this respect over the course of the next two or three weeks, or a month or so, to the people of Manitoba; but I certainly would want to be in touch with all the companies first in terms of talking to them about what they would like to have released to the public at this time, but we certainly are pursuing discussions with other aluminum companies.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the previous government and common sense had indicated that it was in the long-term and short-term interests of Manitobans to be on the lookout in negotiating with power-intensive companies, that is, companies whose industrial or other operations require a good deal of power in Manitoba thereby creating jobs from our electrical Hydro source in Manitoba for Manitobans, can the Minister indicate if he currently has

under negotiation, either he or his colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, any other negotiations with any other power-intensive industries in the world with the idea in mind that they could come to Manitoba, establish job opportunities here and take advantage in a way fair to Manitoba ratepayers of our Hydro resource?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, in this respect a few weeks ago some Ministers met with the Japanese Ambassador to Canada and we raised these specific points because the cost of energy in Japan is very high right now and since they rely on coal or thermal produced electricity future costs will be very high. We indicated to them that we believe there were some very good opportunities here in Manitoba for energy-intensive industries. We are hoping to follow that up with the Japanese Government and with large Japanese firms. We are hoping that may provide one possibility, especially since the Japanese companies, although they're feeling the impact of the worldwide recession, they don't seem to be feeling it quite as deeply as other companies. We hope that would be an area that could be pursued over the course of the summer and through the fall.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister responsible for the Environment. I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether or not his department was aware or has approved of the practice which has apparently been carried out during the past few weeks of dumping hundreds of litres of toxic and radioactive chemicals in the Charleswood Sewage Lagoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, the Environmental Management Division has been made aware of the practice as has many in the province through the media reports and, as a result of those reports, we have contacted the City of Winnipeg to discuss this matter with them.

As the member is aware, the transportation disposal of radioactive isotopes is a matter that comes under the responsibility of the Atomic Energy Control Board, so we have reviewed the regulations that are in place and have found that, in this instance, there are no regulations that would in fact prevent this practice.

The situation was such that these radioactive isotopes were disposed of previously by incineration but in May of 1979, as the former Minister of the Environment is aware, the incinerator of the City of Winnipeg was closed down. Since that time, they've been stored at the North End Pollution Control Plant. About several weeks ago, or a couple of months ago, workers at that plant became concerned about the storage of flammable radioisotope materials in a confined space and the City declared that it would no longer accept the storage of those materials at that particular facility.

Consequently, they informed the Health Sciences Centre and the university of that decision and the Health Sciences Centre has been dumping the

radioisotopes into the Charleswood Lagoon directly. We are informed that this is permitted under the existing regulations. However, the City has informed the Health Sciences Centre that they will no longer be able to pursue this practice and that they will have to store those radioactive isotopes until such a time as they can transport them to Chalk River or until such a time as they can find another suitable means of disposal.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Since the treated effluent from the lagoon is ultimately discharged to the Assiniboine River, is his staff concerned about the possible effects of these toxic and radioactive wastes downstream on the Assiniboine and Red Rivers?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, we're certainly concerned about any potential problems which may arise out of the disposal and the dumping of these radioactive isotopes in any area and we think that it is a matter which we share concerns with in regard to the general populus and the users of those radioactive isotopes as well. That is why we have been quick to contact the City, even although we have no direct responsibility in this regard, we have wanted to make those concerns well-known.

We are advised by the Atomic Energy Control Board that those concerns are unfounded. They advise us that there is no difficulty due to the low radioactive levels of the radioactive isotopes being disposed of in this way. However, notwithstanding their good advice, we agree with the City when the City has suggested that it is not a proper procedure to continue the disposal of those materials in the Charleswood Lagoon and we commend them on their action and are working with them at the present time to ensure that proper disposal means are found.

We are doing that without any direct relationship to the situation; however, we are doing so because we share his concern and the concerns of many that we find a proper disposal and transportation method for dangerous and hazardous commodities such as the ones that are being presently disposed of in this way.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the former New Democratic Government exempted the City of Winnipeg from coming under The Clean Environment Act with respect to surface water quality standards, is his government now considering placing the City under The Clean Environment Act with respect to the surface water quality standards so that they can have some direct involvement in the proper handling and disposal of such dangerous chemicals in future?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, the previous Minister of the Environment knows full well that his government had four years to undertake that sort of activity and failed to do so for whatever reasons. We will not fail to do so. I want to discuss this matter with the involved parties. I want to see if we can reach a satisfactory conclusion to what may become problem areas. I want to see if we can, as a government, bring to bear the responsibility which we have to ensure that the water quality of this entire province is well looked after.

We will do what is necessary to do that and if that involves sitting down and talking with the city about the current exemption we, unlike them, will not be afraid to undertake that activity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labour regarding the Career Internship Program. The Minister has told this House that he is maintaining an ongoing review of that program and that he is willing to look at ways of responding to the needs of young people seeking summer employment.

In light of the continuing economic problems we're faced with because of the worldwide recession, and in light of the fact that students were facing a more difficult time in finding summer jobs this year, I was wondering if the Minister could indicate whether the program is going to be changed in any way to accommodate the needs of these students.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is a very good question. As the member noted we had originally set aside \$2.9 million for this program and I had indicated during the Estimates that there might be some changes, and there were. We announced later on that there would be an additional, up to \$4 million allocated to this program and, as of today, we have approximately 2,000 positions which have been approved under the program and just a little less than two out of three are in the private sector.

We are concerned about the continuing economic difficulties in the province and high interest rates, etc., therefore, in order to attempt to open up the program further and to ensure that a significant portion of that \$4 million is used, we are going to change the program so that any employer who has less than 50 employees will be entitled to apply for the program and, of course, they would have to meet the same criteria that we had indicated in the beginning. We would not have been able to do this had we not added the money, so the two had to come together. If we didn't have the money, we couldn't have gone up to the 50 employees from the 10.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, again a question to the Minister of the Environment referring to the chemicals in the Charleswood Sewage Lagoon. In view of the fact that two of the chemicals xylene and toluene are insoluble in water and are labeled as highly flammable, is there a danger of explosion or fire at the lagoon because of their presence?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: I'm informed that the Atomic Energy Control Board, in its review of this matter, has suggested that this is an appropriate way, from their perspective and in their opinion, to dispose of these sub-

stances. I could only conjecture from that, that they have looked at the problem with flammability, as they are well aware that is one of the qualities associated with these particular wastes. That is not to say that we agree that it is a proper way to dispose of these particular substances and that is why we are now having the discussions, which I indicated earlier we are having, with the City to assist them in finding a way which is more to their liking in respect to disposal of these substances.

So to answer his question, according to the AECB, perhaps not. However, I don't believe that in any way should deter us from in fact attempting to find a better way of disposing of these hazardous wastes.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the fact that a great many wild fowl, namely ducks and geese, find this a normal habitat - the Charleswood Sewage Lagoon - a normal place to land, as their habitat, is there any concern on his part for the welfare of the ducks and geese and their existence there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered about the advisability of these birds landing on those polluted waters because they are sewage cells, but you know we can't do much about that. But we can do something about what the honourable member is concerned about and I share the concerns of everyone in respect to hazardous waste disposal and I think my colleague has quite properly identified the concerns of this government with that, and I fully subscribe to the position taken by the City that these wastes should be disposed of by Atomic Energy of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister responsible for Crown lands. I have noticed over the past several months that the government is continuing to sell certain Crown lands, among them some agricultural leased lands. My question to the Minister is, has the government come to a conclusion with respect to their future policy with respect to sale of agricultural leased Crown lands?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to make further comment about government policy in that respect. When we came into office, Mr. Speaker, we found that there was a significant expedition in the sale of Crown lands, a concern to market many more acres of Crown lands, and that erodes wildlife habitat that's a concern for all those who enjoy Crown lands for the multipurposes that are available with them. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to confirm . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Could the Honourable Member for Lakeside save his point of order?

MR. H. ENNS: It's only out of the generosity of my heart that I don't want the Minister to continue on in error. I specifically referred to agricultural leased land. This is land that has been vetted through the wildlife experts of the government and has been deemed to be suitable for agricultural purposes and is currently in light tenureship with agriculturists, with farmers.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not sure whether that was a matter of a point of order, but I thank the honourable member for his clarification.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member did not have a point of order but he added some information, but the information he added is incorrect. Now you see, Mr. Speaker, that indicates the lack of understanding of a former Minister as to what Crown lands provide for.

Agricultural Crown lands that are under lease are available to hunters, to berry pickers, to mushroom hunters, to naturalists, to anyone who wants to enter on Crown lands. We have not authorized lessees of Crown lands to prevent the public from using those lands for the multipurposes that are available to them.

Now, the honourable member wants to know whether there has been any significant change in policy. I have indicated we were concerned about very significant sales of Crown lands, 26 and 30 quarters of Crown lands to individual applicants. We are still looking at Crown lands sales policy but we have an ongoing process and we are dealing with individual applications, including residential Crown lands for full-time residents, individual recreational Crown lands and yes, agricultural Crown lands. We are not hung up philosophically about Crown lands. We want Crown lands to be used by the people of Manitoba.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm turning three bulls out on some of my Crown land. I would hope that they don't run into any mushroom pickers or berry pickers, that could cause a conflict of interest.

But, Mr. Speaker, specifically, in the Orders-in-Council passed on June 9 of this past week, there are agricultural Crown land leases that are being sold in the constituency of The Pas. My reason for the question is, I want to know how selective this policy is on the part of the government. Will agricultural Crown lands be sold in NDP-held constituencies only, or by NDP application? —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to know.

We either have a policy or we don't have a policy. Is it up to the Minister's discretion when Crown lands will be sold and when they will not be sold and to whom? We either have a policy or we don't have a policy. Now if their policy is, no Crown land sales, I can respect that; that's a well-known position of my friends opposite. But if I see weekly and monthly sales of Crown lands taking place in the absence of any stated policy, then they are open to charges of favouritism and political patronage.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, to begin with I don't know what the honourable member has against mushrooms or mushroom pickers. I don't know what

he's got against berry pickers. I don't know what he's got against people who love the environment for the environment sake, but what I do know, Mr. Speaker . . . —(Interjection)—

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

HON. A. MACKLING: What I do know, Mr. Speaker, is that the honourable member and some of the rest of the honourable members opposite have a guilty conscience about Crown land, and when an NDP government is dealing with Crown land then they suspect that we are going to look at the sales of Crown land the way they would look, in a partisan political way. That is not our approach to fair dealing in government and that's not a lot of bull.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Did the Minister authorize the hiring by MTS of the former president of Interdisc Systems Limited, and does that hiring in any way constitute an undertaking by Manitoba Telephone System to further advance Project Ida in the City of Winnipeg at considerable cost?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asked me a question related to a story that appeared in today's newspaper and as I read it, I first became aware of this particular hiring. Of course, the honourable member refers to a company who is involved in the MTS in a loan that was transacted while he was Minister, or at least when he and his colleagues were in government.

At any rate, upon reading the article I enquired, and I understand that the position became vacant as a result of an internal promotion within the Manitoba Telephone System. The position was advertised within MTS and outside in the newspapers and the individual, Mr. John Coyne, was chosen by a selection board as the most qualified candidate.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister provide the assurance to all Manitobans that this does not represent a furtherance by MTS on their own of further expenditures of funds on Project Ida in the City of Winnipeg, a point of particular concern at this time when MTS is going before the Public Utility Board for a substantial rate increase?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, I would imagine and my advice is that this is a very competent individual with a lot of technical qualifications and would be a useful member of an MTS staff regardless of what project the MTS happen to be involved in and I would trust that there is no connection whatsoever between the hiring of this individual, who happened to be involved in that project a year or so ago, and any expansion of Project Ida or, indeed, any other similar expansion.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister can't offer the assurance that this does not represent a furtherance of Project Ida, would he consider recalling the Public Utilities Committee and having the Manitoba Telephone System appear before that Committee to answer those questions directly?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'm not sure whether I have the power to recall or reconstitute a Committee of the Legislature myself or not. But at any rate, in light of the honourable member's enquiries, I shall certainly undertake to obtain that assurance from the Manitoba Telephone System.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In this morning's paper and early morning's news we had recognition of what we had feared may be just a start some month ago when Canadian National announced the layoff of some 1,200 workers. That layoff has now been extended an additional two weeks to a 10-week layoff, which will include a four-week shutdown, plus the four weeks they had previously announced, plus an additional two weeks.

Previous to that, Mr. Speaker, we had understood that there would be probably close to 80 percent, I believe, of their salaries will be paid over the full term. Has the Minister any indication from the Federal Government whether the provisions under The Unemployment Insurance Act, which were enacted previously, will carry forth to the additional two-week period layoff?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, there was quite a bit of noise during that question and I didn't get the whole thing. Could I ask the member to repeat it, please?

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try and make it a little more concise. We just had an announcement by C.N., Mr. Speaker, that the layoff that they had previously announced as eight weeks will now be 10 weeks. What I'm wondering, is the Minister aware whether or not the Unemployment Insurance Commission, the Federal Agency, will be able to extend the coverage to these workers for the new two-week layoff, as they did for the previous four-week layoff?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, as I understand The Unemployment Insurance Act, the workers would be entitled to more leave than the eight weeks providing they had worked for more than one year. Of course there was an arrangement made with respect to the first eight weeks because of the contract between the union and the railways which provides for an additional sum to the workers above that being paid by UIC. I have not been in communication with UIC or the railways with respect to whether that same provision applies to the next two weeks, but I have no reason to believe that it does not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. When the government first called upon the Federal Government to allow the value of the Canadian dollar to drop against the American dollar, the Canadian dollar stood in the range of 83 point some cents. Since that time the value of the Canadian dollar has dropped to the range of 78 cents. Has the Minister of Finance been in touch with the Federal Government to commend them and support them in their efforts which have led to that devaluation of the dollar?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, when we were in Ottawa at the First Ministers' Conference, we were calling for lower interest rates; that's what we were calling for. There was a suggestion at that time that with lower interest rates the dollar would fall several cents. The Government of Canada has for the last long period of time, artificially propped up the value of the Canadian dollar with the use of high interest rates and the purchase of large numbers of Canadian dollars and certainly that has cost an awful lot of money in the last while.

We have not commended the government for not following what we requested, along with all of the other provinces in this country at that time. We were requesting lower interest rates, which we recognized might lead to a somewhat lower dollar. Now what we have now experienced is higher interest rates and therefore a drop in the dollar, which is specifically what we were predicting in the long run.

If you kill the economy we are eventually going to have a lower dollar and that's what has been happening. We have followed, unfortunately, the advice of the people opposite and the Federal Government. They had believed all along that policy would strengthen the dollar; it is now proof and it's being proven that their policy is in fact giving us the worst of all worlds. We're getting a weaker dollar; we're getting high interest rates; and we have an economy that is not moving forward in this entire country, so this is again proof positive that their policy isn't working.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. Has the Minister of Finance communicated to Ottawa the range of the value of the Canadian dollar, which they would be prepared to see in return for say a drop of one percentage point in the prime interest rate?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, members on that side and the Federal Government - both the Tories in Manitoba and the Federal Liberals - were saying back in February that what we want is a high dollar; we want to leave the dollar, prop the dollar up where it is; and to do that we will have to have high interest rates. We were saying on this side that we want lower rates. That is something that was being said by everyone else in the country, including Tory Governments in other provinces, who were in fairly similar circumstances to us; some in better circum-

stances, some in worse circumstances. They were all saying the same thing, except these people who, with the Federal Government, believed that they are the only people in step in the march. Everybody else is wrong, just the Manitoba Tories and the Federal Minister of Finance are in step. We believe they're wrong.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the First Minister, in view of the fact that the Minister of Finance fails to answer the questions placed to him. If the Prime Minister of the country responds to the First Minister's call for a conference on the economy, will the Provincial Government be putting forward concrete proposals to the Federal Government, which will set out such things as the value of the Canadian dollar, that would be acceptable to the Manitoba Government, in return for a drop of one percentage point in the interest rate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we've already presented a submission to the Federal Government February 2nd to the 4th of this year and that submission was very clear as to the position of the Government of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it's regrettable that the contents of that submission, plus some excellent submissions from other provinces, were not heeded by the Federal Government. It's my view that if there had been a determined examination of the various proposals that were outlined February 2nd to February 4th this year to the Federal Government, we'd be in a much healthier situation economically now throughout the country.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for oral questioning having expired, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MATTER OF URGENCY

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, THAT under Rule 27 the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely:

the announcement by Alcan of the postponement for an indefinite period of the establishment of an \$800 million smelter in Manitoba's Interlake, and the consequent loss of thousands of job opportunities for Manitobans, and the adverse effect on Manitoba Hydro and the whole economy of our province.

MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with our Rule 27 the honourable member has five minutes to explain the urgency of the matter to the House.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as has already been alluded to in the course of comments made by the Minister of Mines and Energy and the brief response that I made thereto, this is a serious and a black day for the economy of Manitoba, and it is one of those days which requires that this House, Sir, under your guidance, absents itself from its regular line of business and starts to deal with an announcement that was made this morning.

I realize that the purpose of these few remarks at this time is to reflect upon the urgency of the debate and, Sir, I can think of nothing more urgent in the minds of thousands of Manitobans who are out of work today; I can think of nothing more urgent in the minds of small business people in Manitoba than the fact that the hope that they had for the establishment of this industry in our province has now been frustrated; I can think of nothing more urgent, Mr. Speaker, than the need in this province at this time to have our hope bolstered by the establishment of some major industry of this kind in order that we can see down the road some beacon of hope for the future development and growth of our economy in this province.

So I think, Sir, if I may say so, that the urgency of the question is almost without debate, because this is a body blow to our economy. It is something that deserves the attention of this House.

We had been proceeding under the expectation from the Minister of Mines and Energy, questions that have been asked on numerous occasions in this House, that all of the negotiations were proceeding satisfactorily, were proceeding very well and it was upon that, that people in the Interlake had sent petitions into the government, and they were assured that everything was proceeding well, that the Joint Review was under way and all of this was going along quite swimmingly. I believe the Minister said at one stage - and I have his direct quote here, I'll save it for another occasion - that he was hopeful that some sort of resolution of these discussions could take place later on this year. Then the hope was held out that Manitobans would be able to begin to taste some of the benefits of this huge industrial enterprise which could come to our province and add that new dimension to our economy that had never been here before. But, Mr. Speaker, that was all shattered this morning when Alcan announced that they were not proceeding. Not only that they were not proceeding, Mr. Speaker, but that the options on land for the site that they had selected had been given up; that thereby the negotiations which were well advanced with Hydro, those negotiations were back to square one, and that all of the work of two-and-a-half to three years had gone down the tube - to use the street expression - and that this particular project is regrettably, Sir, dead in the water.

Now, Sir, I suggest that this requires this House to give some attention to it on this day in order that we may hear from the government, their side of the story with respect to the Alcan announcement this morning; hear from the government hopefully some idea of hope or confidence that they can hold out for the tens of thousands of people in Manitoba who are counting upon this development to take place in our province, to provide jobs for young people, to provide that kind of economic buttressing that our economy so badly needs at this time.

It might be said, Sir, that the statement made by the Minister afforded debate. You know and I know, Sir, that is not the case because it can only be responded to and then only briefly by one member of the Opposition. It might be said, Sir, that because the Supply Motion is still on the Order Paper, that is the time to debate it. I say that is not good enough, Sir, because we have no guarantee that the government will call the

Supply Motion today. I say it's a clear case of overriding importance to the people of Manitoba which requires this House to set aside its regular order of business and get on with discussing one of the most severe body blows to our economy that has been announced for some years in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will also have five minutes.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, this is a motion to set aside the ordinary business of the House on a matter of urgent public importance. Now, no one would disagree with the notion that it is a matter of public importance. Indeed, I would like to think that most of the matters brought before this House during the business of the House, the business that we have to call this afternoon, is on matters of public importance. The question is that of urgency and I turn very briefly to the question of urgency as it has been traditionally addressed on motions of this kind and I will cite authority.

Look at the question of urgency in two ways. First of all, if I may describe it that way, injunctively, that is, is there something which the government can do? The answer is clearly, no, we are faced with a fait accompli. The citation which I will give in a moment from Beauschesne addresses that question. There must be something within the competence of the government which it can do to address the situation which is deemed to be a matter of urgent public importance. That is clear in the citations in Beauschesne and indeed we were met with a fait accompli.

Alcan not only said that this is what it is going to do, Alcan in the reply to a question by the President of Alcan, Mr. Morton, said that indeed there was nothing it could do. Answer by David Morton, "There is no specific action seen in Canada which can change a situation for the aluminum industry which is influenced by the worldwide recession. Alcan, particularly, which depends on the U.S. market, is influenced by U.S. economic conditions. Basically, nothing can be done in Canada to alter postponement decisions." That was a statement made today by the President of Alcan. If Alcan can do nothing, there is nothing which this government can do.

Secondly, with respect to the question of urgency, Mr. Speaker. On the question of whether or not there is an opportunity to debate the question, clearly there is. Given the very stage we're at in the proceedings in this House within a very short period of time, within days, the Supply Motion must be called, the members know that. It was adverted to by the Leader of the Opposition.

The nature of the Supply Motion, when Main Supply must be debated, is across-the-waterfront kind of debate which will give the Opposition every opportunity to debate the question. So the opportunity is there and there is no urgency as it has been defined in the sense of something that can be done resulting from the debate, other than satisfy the paltry ego of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition has talked about dreams being shattered; that kind of language we do not use. The dream has not been shattered; the matter has been postponed. Alcan has said they are continu-

ing to discuss with us. Alcan has said that they realize this is still a prime area for an aluminum smelter. They have not given up that dream; we have not given up that dream.

Finally, the citations. On page 91 of Beauschesne, Citation 285, in brief: "It must deal with a matter within the administrative competence of the government and there must be no other reasonable opportunity for debate." It's there in Beauschesne. There's a tradition with respect to this kind of motion.

Citation 286: "The specific and important matters requiring urgent consideration for the discussion must be so pressing that public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention."

On these two criteria, the motion fails and if I needed no other authority, the statement of the President of Alcan, that indeed there is nothing which it can do. What would they have us do, expropriate Alcan? They'll not move that, nor would we. What would they have us do, say "boo" to Alcan? We are still in very good relationship with Alcan; that relationship will continue despite the attempts of the Opposition to frustrate that dream; despite the attempts of the Opposition to make it appear as if there is some adversarial position between the government and Alcan when there is none. That is what this motion seems to do.

It is not a matter of urgent public importance. It is, like the state of economy generally, a matter of public importance; so are the things we have yet to debate in this House and I ask you to rule accordingly.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank both honourable members for speaking on this motion. I have read it over and find indeed that Beauschesne does refer, under 285, to the matter being within the administrative competence of the government.

I suspect that if there should be unanimity of the House, the House would very soon proceed with the debate. If there is a difference of opinion, as there obviously is, the matter will soon come to a vote; in any case then the House will decide.

Therefore, I will rule that the motion is out of order.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, will you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 21.

BILL 21 - THE COMMUNITY CHILD DAY CARE STANDARDS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 21, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to

thank the members on the other side and this side, for their support in rising to speak on Bill No. 21, The Community Child Day Care Standards Act.

To begin with, I would like to commend the Member for Wolseley for the remarks which she made a week ago last Friday in speaking to this legislation, and indeed, I believe, for the many hours that she had spent in helping to put together this legislation. I know that this has been a very great personal interest of hers and I'm aware, from many friends who are actively involved in the day care community, just how much time she has spent in meeting with various interested groups and constituent groups of the day care community of Manitoba in an effort to bring to fruition this day care Act for Manitoba. I believe that many of the remarks that she made in addressing the whys and the wherefores of the need for standards for enunciating what we believe in, in terms of quality day care in this province and how we ought to go about achieving it, are all valid and I think that she made an excellent summary in her address to the Chamber.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I have one major area of disagreement with her in that I believe that she attempted, by slipping into a great deal of rhetoric, to make day care a partisan issue and I do not see day care as a partisan issue. I believe that all of us, on both sides of the House, recognize the need for quality day care, the need to provide this type of opportunity so that women and men cannot be prevented from achieving their career goals, from achieving all of the opportunities that are available to them, fulfilling all of the opportunities that are available to them in society today because of the need to have their children well looked after, given the kind of care, attention and consideration that they deserve, and would indeed have from their parents and family at home, were it not for the necessity on the part of many to seek and utilize the services of day care.

I believe that we all agree on that and that's not something that's in question on either side of the House. I believe that we all agree that it is absolutely essential to a society such as ours in Canada to have high standards of quality for day care so that we know that we are providing the opportunity for all of those men and women, and I recognize that the vast majority who will be utilizing the services, who will of necessity seek out the services of day care are women, but I believe that all of us recognize that these opportunities must be provided so that they may fulfill their legitimate objectives, goals and desires as productive members of society. As I say, this is not a partisan issue and the only regret I have about the remarks of the Member for Wolseley is that I believe that she, in the latter stages of her speech, definitely attempted to fall into the rhetoric of making day care a partisan issue, saying that only those on the New Democratic side of the House were really interested in quality day care; I know that not to be the case and I was disappointed that she fell into that.

However, because she did, I'd just like to point out a few of the statements she made and show how easily they can mislead people and how easily, by slipping into that sort of rhetoric, she can take away the major focus of the major objectives of this legislation and the opportunities that it will provide for thousands of Manitobans who will utilize day care in the future and I

think to the detriment of the objectives of the legislation and to the real value of having legislation of this nature in Manitoba. The remarks that I make are said in the context of one who has utilized the services of day care in this province for, I believe, in one form or another, all four of our children and also as one who, because of having a number of close friends and, in fact family, who are involved in the provision of day care in this province and others, I am well well aware of the objectives of those who are in the industry and of parents seeking to place their children in quality day care facilities in this province. The member referred to, of course, figures in the Budget saying that the previous government wasn't very interested in day care, and for the first year or two of its term of office it didn't give sufficient increases to day care and so forth. Well, of course, those were difficult times and like any government faced with massive deficits we were faced with the prospect of not being able to give many sectors of society the increases which they would prefer to have had.

The fact of the matter is that under our jurisdiction, day care rose from a budgetary figure of slightly over 3 million, right up to 9 million in four short years. Certainly all of the former New Democratic administration did not produce anywhere near that kind of increase in day care funding. So we were aware of the monetary needs, the fiscal needs of the day care community. We increased the numbers of spaces that were available dramatically so that we could indeed provide the spaces for the burgeoning demand out there. I think that the Member for Wolseley will probably recognize and admit to the fact that the demand has continued to grow more and more dramatically in recent years than ever before. In fact, the need for day care and the provision of day care in general has grown dramatically over the last number of years, and the fact of the matter is that our government undertook to increase the spaces to provide the opportunities in the day care community and, I think, fulfilled that aspect of things very well.

I was a little troubled with some of the rhetoric that the members slipped into in attempting to sort of create that atmosphere of those who want day care and those who don't and trying to separate out classes of people or groups of people. She told a story which I didn't see any particular relevance to this particular Act and this discussion about a chairman of a board who was making \$800,000, and when asked how he can justify that salary responded, well, I have a wife at home too, you know. Well, it seems to me that it's exactly that type of debate that downgrades the importance and the significance of bringing in quality day care legislation. There's no place in this House or in this debate for obtuse references that kind of try and set the stage for class warfare in discussing day care. Day care is a necessity to people of all walks of life, to people of all economic circumstances.

The question is, of course, whether or not people can afford to pay for the quality day care, and that's all that differentiates. Therefore, it's incumbent upon government to have in addition to standards, in addition to a network and a delivery system for quality of day care, a system for financing day care for those who cannot themselves afford to pay for it. That's all part of the total package, but it doesn't break down

into this class needs day care, and this class doesn't. People of all walks of life and in all economic circumstances need and desire and are anxious to support quality day care in the province. So, I was disappointed that the member took away from the thrust and the real value of her remarks by slipping into that kind of rhetorical reference that I think has no place in this whole discussion.

In any case, referring to the Act and what it represents, I say that the member, I know, was a great deal involved in gathering together the material and the references and the information that led to this Act. I know that she has met on many occasions; I know that she has attempted to consult widely; I know that she's been given many different opinions and I hope that those opinions will not be ignored and I hope that she will not narrow her focus so that she is responsive to only certain parts of the overall day care community. I wouldn't probably have even said that except for the kind of rhetoric that she used last week, because it appeared as though she was attempting to hive off certain groups as having more concern and more interest and therefore being more acceptable to this government in terms of their views on day care, and leave off all of those others who maybe by virtue of economic circumstances are not as crucially in need of government support in the obtaining of quality day care for their children but, in fact, still need quality day care but by virtue of the fact that maybe they aren't in lower economic circumstances or in amongst the group of, shall we say, "professionally qualified people" for whom this Act and around whom this Act is going to be structured, that perhaps they shouldn't be listened to. I would think that would be very sad indeed, because that has the prospect of throwing out the baby with the bath water when we look at providing an Act that will serve the needs of Manitobans for all time in future with respect to day care.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I interrupt for a second. If the members would direct their attention to the gallery on my left, we have a group of 25 students, of Grade 7 standing from the Ashern Central High School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Schwartz and are represented by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

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

BILL NO. 21 (Cont'd)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself specifically to The Day Care Act, I have to in a variety of ways echo the sentiments and the thoughts that were expressed by the Member for Fort Garry yesterday. We are happy to see an Act come into this Legislature that will standardize, that will provide for all the ground rules that will set the stage for quality day care to be delivered throughout this province. We are happy to have that situation prevail.

What we are unhappy about, of course, is the fact

that this Act tends to be just enabling legislation, that just enables the government to set regulations behind closed doors in a Cabinet room, without being able to expose those regulations and their appropriateness to the people in all the communities of Manitoba who require day care and will, indeed, want to have adequate day care facilities to deliver throughout their communities. This Act merely says we have the opportunity to set regulations on this, that and the other thing. And although we can all support better standards and better quality of day care and all agree to the value of day care to society today, we don't know what we are going to get by virtue of this Act, so I don't know how we can adequately debate the pros and cons of this Act. We can talk about the pitfalls that may be faced, by virtue of structuring regulations too narrowly, so that people who are in a position and need day care in this province are not excluded from that opportunity; we can talk about the need to have regulations flexible so that those in rural Manitoba, who today are receiving quality day care in many institutions, are not excluded from receiving that in future, by virtue of regulations that are too narrowly drafted that will eliminate them.

The fact of the matter is that different standards exist today in rural Manitoba and remote areas than do exist in Winnipeg. The fact of the matter is that even in terms of space requirements; even in terms of wash-room facilities; even in terms of structural considerations with respect to their plant and their surroundings, there are slightly different standards in the rural and remote areas than there are in Winnipeg. It's all well and good for us to set standards, based on what prevails in Winnipeg, but we may forget that what is available may be fairly readily and fairly easily, in terms of buildings and facilities in Winnipeg, is not necessarily available in rural and remote communities. If that's the case, is it better to have an adequate facility that does provide quality day care, but doesn't quite meet those rigid standards, or is it better to close them down and have nothing at all?

Those are the concerns we would have with respect to the drafting of those regulations and the difficulty is that we will not be a party to those regulations, and I'm not sure who might be a party to those regulations, because I think there may be a great tendency on the part of the Member for Wolseley to tune in on only one particular group; on one particular special interest group; on one particular high profile active group and tune out on the rest of those in the day care community.

She referred to the fact that this was The Community Day Care Act and it was very significant she said, except that - I believe in reading a little bit between the lines - there may be a tendency to have the regulation and the authority and the whole administration of this Act go outside the community and into the hands of a bureaucracy; a bureaucracy that would not be responsive; that would not be flexible; a whole group out there who are the enforcers, the policemen whose only interest is in making sure that the "i's" are dotted, the "t's" are crossed, and not interested in the true and ultimate test of quality day care, the welfare of the children, the well-being of the children who are under day care.

I believe that there is a possibility that could exist because of just a number of little hints of messages

that have come across, either from statements made by the Member for Wolseley or others across the way; or in fact briefs, of which I have copies, of many that have been given to the Member for Wolseley for the Minister of Community Services And Corrections to see. I'm concerned that some of them are ignoring the differences; ignoring the need for flexibility out there in the community; writing their briefs only from a perspective of Winnipeg, where adequate facilities and buildings are bound. You know we have now the situation where, because of declining school enrolments, there are school buildings available; there are public buildings in which we are setting aside space, brand new attractive space where we can set up good quality day care institutions. But those are not necessarily in abundance in the rural and remote areas and I'd be concerned that the regulations may not be drafted flexibly enough so that all of Manitoba can benefit from such an Act.

Further, I am concerned, as I know many of our members are, that the authority and the responsibility of the Boards, the Boards of Directors of existing day care institutions, will be drastically reduced; that they will not take the full and proper part of their responsibility that they ought to, in ensuring that quality day care is provided in their institutions. They will be sidetracked by regulations which put the power in the hands of the bureaucracy and out of the hands of the democratically elected boards of day care institutions who, today, are running good establishments. They're made up of parents; they're made up of community people; active people who are concerned to provide full quality day care in their local communities who are going to be sidetracked by virtue of the fact that these regulations and the authorities that will be drafted through the regulations, as a result of the enabling legislation before us, will in fact result in a poor delivery of day care in the province if that happens. I would be concerned that those regulations ought not to be drafted in such a way to allow that to happen.

I know the legislation as it exists is probably in this bland form, you might say, that it does not have any strong statements in it because of the fact that the Member for Wolseley hasn't necessarily been able to achieve consensus within her own caucus and I know that she has some very strong feelings that would make this legislation very difficult for many people in the day care community to live with and, therefore, this legislation is purposely silent on the matter of whether or not private, profit-making institutions can operate within the day care community of Manitoba.

It's silent on the role of community boards whether or not these community-based day care boards will have any role to play, or authority, under the new Act. It's silent on whether or not there shall be a ceiling of fees that can be charged for placing people in day care in this province and you know, there is a concern. There are some very very good institutions, some very high quality day care institutions, that could be eliminated from existence if the government were to set a ceiling and say nobody shall be able to charge beyond that limit. Then you have the elimination of the opportunity for people to enhance their institution, or their facility, over and above the minimum standards that are set, because it costs more. If they want to reduce

the child-to-worker ratio down below limits and have more costs; if they want to have nurses involved; if they want to have specialized workers in their programs and all sorts of things, that will all cost money and it may well be that you have the situation that exists today in the Health Sciences Centre Day Nursery in which their cost of operation on a per diem basis is \$3.00 or \$4.00 per child per day greater than the maximum allowable under the current government subsidy program. If you say that there will be no opportunity for them to pass along those additional charges to the parents, who may well be able to afford them and who may well support those additional charges because they want greater quality day care and greater opportunities for their children in day care, that will not be possible if the regulations are drafted in a certain way.

They're silent on that, and I'm sure that they're silent on all those things because it'll all boil down to a battle behind the closed doors of the caucus room of that government over there, or perhaps in Cabinet ultimately, to decide on whether or not they should eliminate private operations from day care in Manitoba; whether or not they should put a ceiling on the amount that can be charged; whether or not they should eliminate the role of community-based boards on day care institutions and I think all of those things could happen if we are not vigilant. I know that it's still under consideration and I'll tell you why I know that, because a draft of the proposed regulations is being circulated by a prominent group in day care in Manitoba today and, as part of that draft, there's an endorsement which people who are involved in day care operation in this province are asked to sign. Part I of the endorsement is to say, we endorse these standards that are being proposed for the development of day care regulations in Manitoba; and Part II of it is, we believe that there should be no more profit-taking day care allowed in Manitoba.

So, at least one of the active groups are obviously soliciting people's opinions so that they can present them to the Member for Wolseley or the Minister or whoever and put this into the regulation. —(Interjection)— That's right. Private groups are obviously doing it with encouragement; they wouldn't be doing it if they didn't know there was a receptive group in government who would respond to this kind of thing. So, that's the kind of thing that concerns us because, as I've said, day care is not a partisan issue. Quality day care is an issue that all of us would support and do support.

The fact of the matter is, set the standards, set the highest possible standards that all of us can agree on, set the operating standards; set the physical standards. Tell people what is required, even in terms of programming - and I'll speak a little more about programming after - tell people what they have to achieve and let them go and achieve it, but don't badger them; don't say you can't do it if you're a profit-making institution; don't say that we don't care what the board wants, we've got coordinators and supervisors and other sorts of bureaucratic types who are going to tell you how to deliver it and what to do and are going to check on you and police you and all of that. Do it in a way that all of us can support with as much community input as possible and bearing in mind the differing

needs of all of the differing communities of Manitoba; that's what you need for quality day care in Manitoba.

What else is going to be in these regulations? Are we going to have in those regulations the fact that you shall not allow the children to watch television as part of your program; that you shall provide for them X-number of types of toys and play things and this structure? See, this is where you get into the difficulties in different areas; different areas have different resources to call upon.

In Winnipeg, they might perhaps be able to take them on a tour of the fire hall or a tour of Bunsmaster, or a tour of this facility, or McDonalds, or that facility; they have so many more things at their disposal for programming to keep the children's minds active in doing these things. See, the Member for Wolseley indicated what her biases are when she kept referring to kids being stuck down in a basement watching television. Well, if you're going to disallow any television whatsoever, or any passive activity, then I say to you, that's a problem that many day care institutions will have. As a parent, I can recall when our children were programmed into Yamaha and into gymnastics and all of those things, sometimes they get overprogrammed at an early age and they become so hyper that it's a problem to deal with.

So the fact of the matter is we have to be reasonable, we have to be flexible. We can't take these strong stands that say, you know watching television is out; we've got to be more reasonable about the types of programming and delivery systems in day care that we offer. I think that that's a danger, by leaving everything to the regulations, by being silent on all of these issues, yet talking about them in the Legislature as you introduce the legislation. I think that there could be a very very serious problem develop that would disallow many of the quality day care operations in this province today from meeting the rules.

I think that there is a good argument to be made for maintaining the community board system as part of the central network of delivery of day care. You know, the parallel is that we, under our education system, allow the final decision-making to be made at the community level by the school boards. We set the standards; we set the regulations and then we say to the boards, you ensure that you're happy with the final delivery because you're closest to the community, to the children, you hire the people and, as long as you live within these guidelines, then we're happy with it.

Well, I think that there's a parallel that can and should be drawn for keeping community boards closely involved in the operation of these day care centres and I would be very sorry to see this government, behind closed Cabinet or Caucus doors, pass regulations that would eliminate that opportunity in Manitoba today. I just place it as a caution because we're talking in a vacuum.

This is a very general bill; it has nothing specific. It enables the government to pass regulations to do anything and I'm cautioning the government that those regulations ought not to prevent people, who are today providing good standards of day care and will continue to provide good standards, meet all of the regulation standards and quality performances required by the government. So, let's not, by virtue of very narrow and stringent guidelines, eliminate them

from the market.

I also know, Mr. Speaker, that there are many different ways that children can and should be looked after in Manitoba, preschool children in future. Let's not say that this Act dictates the only way because there are people who work on shifts and they may not have day care facilities available to them. The Member for Fort Garry referred to day care in the workplace and how that is going to be more and more a part, and very rightly so, of day care in the future. So that people, through their place of employment, will have a day care institution available to them and maybe many of them who have people on shifts will provide evening day care or whatever is necessary under the circumstances, at different hours, because I know that many people are restricted from the types of employment they can have by virtue of the hours of day care that are available to them. For them it may be more opportunity to allow for a homemaker situation or to allow for tax breaks or subsidies, or any of those kinds of options and I would hope that this Act is not seen as the be-all and the end-all and the only solution that is available to people who need to have their children adequately looked after in Manitoba in future.

The other concern, of course, I would have is as to the qualifications that have to be met by those who will work in day care in future in Manitoba. I know they've suggested as a model, utilizing the diploma course at Red River, and that's a good starting point. But the fact of the matter is that there are many others who are providing quality day care, who are giving due care and attention and the kinds of tender loving care that we would all like to have our children get today and may not be able to meet those paper qualifications. I would hope that there would be ample opportunities for them to be brought in through a grandmother or grandfather clause, so to speak - grandparent clause - so that they can be brought into the whole day care community under this new Act. I would hope that literally hundreds of people are not thrown out because they cannot achieve the paper qualifications, even though they are acknowledged to have been providing quality day care up to this point in Manitoba. And again, it's up to the regulations and I would hope that those regulations will be drafted with some care and some reason, bearing in mind the different needs of all the people throughout Manitoba.

So those are all concerns that we would have and members opposite are chuckling saying, oh that can't happen. But again there are different resources and different opportunities available to people in the province and I happen to know that they're offering subjects under the Day Care Program at Red River Community College on an extension basis to various communities throughout the province. But in some of the communities that are reasonably close to Winnipeg, their workers or their people who need to upgrade themselves perhaps in order to meet the standards that are going to be set by the government, will not necessarily be able to come into Winnipeg to take the courses. How are you going to handle that? Or they may have very little flexibility in their opportunities to take courses that you make available to them at a community college or a regional school or so on. These are all more difficult for people in the rural communities than they are for people in Win-

nipeg and we don't always tend to remember that. We tend to take all of the resources that we have available to us; we have two universities; we have a community college; we have regional secondary schools and so on, we sort of forget about that when we try and apply that to a remote community such as Churchill.

So are we better off to be a little more flexible in allowing those people to achieve their standards, or in recognizing the standards that they have by virtue of their experience in the field? Or are we better off to just say, well, I'm sorry you don't meet the standards, you'll have to close down your operation? Obviously we're not better off to do that and I would hope that this government, in its zealous desire to respond to special interest groups and particular pressure groups, doesn't throw out the opportunity for others in the province to provide day care.

So, I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that obviously this bill, because it represents a move to standardize to improve the quality of day care in this province, is something that in general we can support. But without knowing what the specifics of the regulations are, we're in a quandary as to know just exactly what the government has in mind in terms of its bottom-line position on so many issues that are caught up in this network of ideas and concerns.

We leave as our bottom-line position to the Member for Wolseley, the Minister of Community Services and the government: remember the needs of the children and the parents in whatever you're doing in this. It's not just those people who are special interest groups who have the lobbying power with your government that you have to consider. There should be as much variety and flexibility of opportunity for the various modes of delivery. Quality day care standards we all support but for heaven sake, don't strangle yourself in the regulations so that you eliminate fine day care operations from this province by virtue of the regulations that you draft.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I just had a couple of questions for the Member for River Heights if he has sufficient time and is willing to yield to a couple of questions.

Mr. Speaker, the member talked — (Interjection) — well, this relates to the principle of the bill for the Member for Rhineland, so I want to get an appreciation for the nature of his argument. I got the impression the Member for Tuxedo agreed with the principle of the bill, in terms of providing the standards, yet I wasn't clear on how he felt his argument was justified in suggesting that we should have that kind of flexibility, particularly in rural communities where the level of services is not as high as he and I would both agree they should be and yet, he also suggests that we should provide some very hard and fast guidelines. I'm not sure I quite understand how we can both have the guidelines and have the flexibility the member wants without providing for it to be done by regulation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we proceed, is it the will of the House to allow these questions to be asked?

Is it agreed? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously there are certain areas in which one has to be very rigid about one's standards, in terms of what's the bottom-line position you'll accept and there are other areas in which you can be flexible and acknowledge the different opportunities for delivery of the services that you might have in a major urban centre versus a small remote centre. I say that the bottom line is a good quality day care. Are the children getting the kind of care and attention and love that they need and stimulation that they need? Let's not be so rigid as to get hung up on paper qualifications; on whether or not somebody is private institution or not; on whether or not you have X-number of square feet per child or Y-number of square feet, you have to have a bottom line. But when you get to that bottom line, make sure that the rural areas and the remote areas can live with it before you pass it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the bill then briefly in view of the member's response. Mr. Speaker, I have some concerns because I think what we're faced with here is a bill that the Opposition actually really likes. In view of the member's response to my question, I find that he can only look for contradictions in the bill, when really what he's saying and he said earlier in his remarks, was that he wanted high standards. That's what he was talking about in terms of day care; he talked about the very need for high standards. As soon as I asked him that question, Mr. Speaker, he started talking about the bottom line to accommodate the rural areas and those with less services.

So, Mr. Speaker, our problem here is that the Opposition, because of their role to criticize, has not been willing to recognize what a commendable piece of legislation this is, and although they've complimented the Member for Wolseley, have not gone near as far as I think they'd really like to, because I think they believe that the legislation is much better than they're prepared to say in this House. I think if we're going to have constructive criticism at committee level perhaps we should agree that the principle of the legislation and the way it's been brought in by the Minister, is exactly the way the member thinks it should have been for two reasons: (1) because he wants standards and he wants high standards and he said so; (2) because both the Member for Fort Garry and himself want to see the flexibility that I want in terms of those areas that require differing treatments.

So, Mr. Speaker, he's made those arguments and made them well. But he's made them as a method of criticizing the bill when this is exactly what the bill provides. Mr. Speaker, I take his comments today to be very complimentary to the Minister and the Member for Wolseley, even though he wasn't prepared to put it in that light. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that his criticisms, as I suggested from my seat, were like building 100 straw men to protect 100 acres of corn, because that's exactly what he's done. Those kinds of

scarecrows don't work. If you're going to go into committee we've got to come up with constructive suggestions about how to improve the bill.

One point I think he makes that has some value is the question of the community day care boards, in terms of how we're going to keep the community involved in regulating each of the areas that are going to be governed under this bill. I think it's important that each day care centre have that flexibility and that local community standards have some input. I think the member can contribute there.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't planning on speaking to this bill in the beginning but after listening to the member's remarks, I have a concern about another area. That is, he suggests that by some subterfuge - he didn't use that word but he certainly suggested it was going to be behind doors; it was something that was in some way less than proper because some private organization is out conducting a survey - that the Member for Wolseley, the Minister, caucus and Cabinet were going to be planning to do certain things. Mr. Speaker, there's no legislation in this province that provides very specific permission for private schools. There's no legislation in this province that says private schools must charge tuitions no higher than. There's no authority for us to enact such regulations because there's no legislation under which they could be enacted. Mr. Speaker, there's no such authority in this Act and yet the Member for Tuxedo makes the allegation that this government and this caucus would be prepared to do those kinds of things. I have to challenge the member. Show us where that authority is, because if that authority is not in these bills - it certainly isn't in The Public Schools Act and it certainly isn't in this day care bill - then, Mr. Speaker, what the member alleges is patently impossible and therefore patently absurd.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's not talk about ceilings; let's not talk about eliminating private day care programs, because if that were to be done it would be in the Act. There may be some who think that's desirable; I haven't heard the member say whether that's desirable or not. But it's not in the bill; there's no authority to do it. So, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about those kinds of concerns, let's talk about what's in the bill. There's no provision for the kinds of action the member suggests would be possible unless it's specifically in there. Any regulations to that effect would be beyond the authority of the bill and beyond the authority to Cabinet to implement.

So let's talk about the meat of the bill. I detect a real sense of approval that the Minister's concealing in these straw-man criticisms. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't serve our purpose. Let's get down to clause-by-clause and move this bill on to Second Reading.

Thank you.

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services on a point of order.

HON. L. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Have you ascertained whether anyone else would like to speak in the debate?

BILL NO. 23 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE LEGAL AID SERVICES SOCIETY OF MANITOBA ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 23?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 23.

MR. R. BANMAN: Stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to speak on this bill if there are no objections at this particular time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: As long as it is clearly understood that I just stood it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With the understanding that the bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I moved at this time to speak on Bill No. 23, which is an Act to amend The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act, for two reasons. One is to echo my support for the bill personally; I think it's badly needed here in Manitoba. The second is to respond to some of the concerns expressed by the Member for Virden when he last spoke on this particular bill on Wednesday, 2nd June, 1982.

Now in general, Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney-General pointed out when he made his opening remarks, this bill has two basic functions. The first function is to allow the Legal Aid Society to give legal aid assistance to groups who are conducting legal action in regard to matters of public concern. I mention specifically our consumer and environmental groups. That's the first part of it, Mr. Speaker.

The second is to introduce a number of what are basically housekeeping items in regard to the language used in the existing Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act, in particular those housekeeping changes relate to the use of masculine language. So in other words, what they're trying to do is remove any sexist bias, I guess is the proper term, from the Act as it exists now.

Now I'd like to address myself to both of these particular principles today. Looking at the first point, the

provisions of the bill which would allow for full or partial legal aid to groups, I would point out to the Member for Virden and to other members of this House, that perhaps there's been some misunderstanding of the basic principle involved with this new amendment.

Now first of all, it's a principle that has been raised in the past, as the Attorney-General pointed out, so it's not exactly a new problem. The fact is though, that by allowing groups to receive assistance from Legal Aid under this Act, we will not be in any way violating the existing principle of legal aid assistance. I would refer in this regard to the proposed Clause No. 10.1(2) Eligibility of Groups, in which it points out specifically that a group submitting an application for Legal Aid under Section 3.1 may be found eligible by the society, notwithstanding that the members of the group or some of them would not be eligible as individuals if the society in its absolute discretion determines (a) that the incomes of the members generally are at such a level that payment by the group of the legal costs in respect to which the application is submitted would work a serious hardship upon the group and would seriously hamper its activities; or (b) that the group does not have sufficient funds to pay the legal costs in respect of which the application is submitted.

So it respects the general principle that legal aid should go to those in society who cannot afford legal assistance otherwise. But it does not preclude, as the Member for Virden suggested, the possibility that such groups might have individuals as part of that group who would not themselves be eligible for Legal Aid. So that particular concern, I think, of the Member for Virden in reading the Act, is not particularly valid.

Now the real question is the general principle of providing legal aid to groups and in particular, providing legal aid to groups in consumer environmental issues. I, personally, have no objection to that principle, Mr. Speaker, because in the past in a number of cases, we've seen that there is a great imbalance in society on such issues when certain organizations, certain corporations perhaps, are seeking certain changes and when you have that group, which is well able to afford Legal Aid or legal assistance on the one hand, up against neighborhood groups such as the Attorney-General mentioned, a group such as the McGregor Overpass group or groups which are concerned about the environmental impact of these proposed changes who cannot themselves afford legal assistance.

I think this bill seeks to remedy that, seeks to balance the forces, Mr. Speaker, seeks to give these groups a chance to put forward their case because as members of this House know, today one's legal assistance often determines the degree to which one is heard in this society. It's unfortunate but true, that with the increasing complexity of society and the increasing number of rules, regulations, laws, you name-it, that the assistance of lawyers is badly needed. I think this ensures that such consumer and environmental groups get a chance at a fair hearing.

Now I would point out that the amendments to the Act do not provide for full legal aid to all groups. Section 3.1(3) says that the society may furnish Legal Aid to a group under Subsection 1, either without charge or with a partial charge, as the society may

determine. In regard to providing legal aid with a partial charge, it shall also determine the amount of the group's contribution to the costs of Legal Aid. So where a group may be able to afford a certain contribution but not the entire cost of the legal assistance they need, there is provision under this amendment that they receive partial assistance.

That is the first basic goal of these amendments, Mr. Speaker, and as I have pointed out, I think the concerns of the Member for Virden are perhaps not exactly the case if one looks at the entire bill itself, the entire portions of Bill 23, because some of the concerns he made are met within the bill. That's the first part of it.

The second part is in regard to the housekeeping measures, in particular, to the portions of Bill 23 which change male terminology to more neutral, what we'd call I suppose, nonsexist language. The Attorney-General has pointed out that this is not the only bill in which we hope to see this as the government; we hope to expand this general principle to other existing Acts, in fact, all Acts of the province eventually because it's a matter of keeping up with the times, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I've sat here for a number of months and I've noticed that certain members of this House have objection to these terms. Well, perhaps I can understand that. When one is used to a certain kind of terminology, it's often difficult to adapt to new ones. I would note in this regard the objection the Leader of the Opposition often makes to the use of the word 'chairperson' and he's quite vocal in his objections to that. But as I've said, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of keeping up with the times.

Ten years ago, the use of the word 'chairperson' was a rather novel one, it was a rather new idea. But today it's accepted by most people in society as a reflection of the fact that the previous term did have an implied discrimination against women and the use of the term 'chairwoman' does not really overcome that, so really the key thing is to try and use a neutral term. I say this, Mr. Speaker, as one who at times often slips into the use of the word 'chairman' from my own experience so I'm certainly not lecturing members on the use of this word. I'm suggesting that perhaps we should all try to use it a bit more often. But that really is up to the individual conscience, the individual choice of the members of this House, of any member of society, they can say what they want to, Mr. Speaker. But in the laws of the province, I think it's absolutely vital that we reflect the changing times; we reflect the desire of many people in society to eliminate terms which are biased towards male terms, Mr. Speaker.

I think we should do it not just in Bill 23, as the Attorney-General suggested, but in all bills in this province and they're not major changes at all, Mr. Speaker. I just invite some of the members of this House to look at some of the terms, you know, replacing references to "he" and "him," Subsection 13(2), for example, you can check with that, whether we're changing the reference to, "whether or not that other solicitor is practising association with him."

Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, as I've said, that's keeping up with the times. If it's not a matter of keeping up with the use of terminology, it's perhaps recognition of the fact that there are increasing numbers of female lawyers nowadays. In fact, if one looks at the

number of law students entering say first year, looks at the number entering this in the past few years as compared to may be 5 or 10 years ago, one will find that the number of female law students has increased rather dramatically. At one time the percentage was 10 or 20 percent; a female law student was rather unique. Today, I believe the percentage is approximately 50 percent - and the Attorney-General who is a former professor of law can perhaps advise me on that - but my feedback is that has now reached that level. So what we're talking about, Mr. Speaker, is a growing number of lawyers who will indeed be women and to use terms in an Act of this province which refer to 'him' as somehow being the only solicitors that are envisioned in this Act are male, I think, is merely sticking one's head in the sand. Because with that number of female law students coming up through the ranks, in a couple of years all the new practising lawyers will be perhaps 50 percent female and once they work their way through the ranks, perhaps the whole profession will reflect the 50 percent or 51 percent, I suppose, level of the population that women now make up.

There are two basic principles in conclusion then, Mr. Speaker, in this Act: (1) of providing assistance to consumer environmental groups; (2) of changing male terminology to more neutral terminology. I have no problems with either. I think it's a reflection of the times in both cases and I would urge all members of this House to perhaps review what objections they might have to this bill by actually reading the bill and talking to those who drafted it. I think if they do check into it, they'll find that there really aren't that many problems with the bill and that we should, in fact, as a House unanimously support Bill No. 23.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to participate in the debate briefly inasmuch as — (Interjection) — 20 minutes - it does present to this House, perhaps for some members a rather novel approach but as my colleague, the Member for Thompson indicated, nevertheless an approach that is appropriate for the times; an approach that recognizes that more and more there is a need and a requirement to assist groups in our society in group action before various governmental boards, Public Utility Boards, for example, in order to assist these groups in whatever way to cope with the problems that they perceive. And in this day and age, particularly when we're talking about matters that go before the Public Utility Board, we're talking about, in many instances, very technical matters; matters that have to be researched; matters that have to have careful presentation and I think it's very fitting that the Attorney-General, at this point in time, does bring in an Act which amends The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Act so that it now, upon passage in future, will be able to assist various groups.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will serve the cause of consumer interests very well. The consumers in Manitoba, the consumers in Canada very often find themselves very frustrated and very helpless in decisions made by large corporations, particularly corporations that may be described as

monopolistic, such as, Greater Winnipeg Gas or the Telephone System or the Manitoba Hydro or, indeed, a transit system - a bus system.

I can give you an example within my constituency, Mr. Speaker, of a current problem that is causing a great deal of frustration, a great deal of concern on the part of many, many thousands of citizens in the City of Brandon. I can say those numbers because there have been petitions to the City Council and it's public information with regard to the numbers of people who have signed petitions; with the numbers of people who have attended council meetings and that is with regard to the proposal by the City Transit System (a) to increase the transit rates, and (b) to seriously cut back the level of service to citizens in parts of the City of Brandon.

These people have come to me as their MLA and expressed their frustration, their concern, their inability to communicate their concerns to the council, but fortunately they have another avenue and that is to appear before the Public Utilities Board, if they so choose. If the City Council decides not to hear their appeal - or rather to act upon their appeal - and decides to carry out these drastic cutbacks, these massive cutbacks are going to affect many people in a very, very negative way. I can give you some examples of that. I'm told, in one instance, a young woman who is supporting a small child and wants to work, doesn't want to be on welfare, wants to work, will have to take another four hours in her day in order to be able to take the child to a day care centre from her home and then go from that day care centre to her place of work. Now with the new schedule being proposed, the cut-back schedule, there's no way that young mother, that young woman can possibly get her child to the day care centre, get herself to work and, of course, pick up the child in the evening and go home without spending four hours mainly waiting for buses because of this proposed cutback.

Now the avenue is open, of course, for them to go to the Public Utilities Board because the City Transit System must go to the Public Utilities Board, as I understand it, for approval of this finally. Of course, the Board is there to adjudicate in its wisdom; we've got some good people on the board; qualified people who have served this province for a long time and, although there is a new Chairman of the Public Utilities Board, nevertheless we all recognize his many years of distinguished service and his abilities. But no matter how well the Board is in its ability to make judgment and so on, these judgments and decisions are based upon facts presented. I suggest to you that the group in Brandon of many well-meaning citizens are going to have to take time and spend some money to try to make a presentation before the Public Utilities Board if they can manage it, because these hearings may be held outside of the city; we're not sure at this point. But it would seem to me that their cause, the cause of the consumers of that public transit system will be well served by this kind of legislation because this legislation then would enable that group to go to the Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba and point out the need for legal assistance, the assistance of professional lawyer or lawyers in order to help present their case to this Public Utilities Board.

So I say here is a current, vital example where this

legislation will help to ensure that the consumers involved in this transit cutback proposal at least will be heard and will not only be heard, but will have their case presented carefully and logically and in a way that will make the greatest impression on the members of the Board who will have to make the final decision. Before you make any careful presentation, of course, Mr. Speaker, there's always the need to have careful research and a matter of getting the technical data together is another matter that's equally important. So I think this is a role that Legal Aid Manitoba can very, very well play and will be appreciated by these groups.

I use the Brandon Transit System but the same is true for, let's say, a rate hearing by Greater Winnipeg Gas, or any of the other utilities that have this monopoly power, as I said earlier, and very often the detail that goes into rate making, and adjustments of rate, is just so immense and complicated that it is very difficult for the average citizen, the average consumer to be able to garner the facts and to make the case. There's always the exception, of course, Mr. Speaker, there are always some people who are willing to volunteer their professional advice, or professional service, which is fine, but I suggest that this perhaps is more the exception than the rule.

I suppose one could argue that we shouldn't use taxpayers' monies for an advocacy role, or for financing of advocacy groups, because this legislation does provide for that. I would suggest that there are many examples where this Legislature, over the years, has voted monies to various departments who in turn have funded groups for an advocacy role. I go back over some years, and I think of the Nelson Agency. The Nelson Agency, some members of the House may not recall, was an advocacy agency established, either by the Roblin or the Weir Government, I'm not sure which, but it goes back obviously many years into the 1960s and the role of that group was to advocate the cause of the people who may be adversely affected by the flooding of South Indian Lake. You recall, with the proposed diversion, whether it be a high level or a low level diversion, there was no question that people in the north were to be affected and some of them would be affected adversely. The government in its wisdom, and I do not fault those previous governments, or that previous government, in fact, I give them credit for that, that they saw fit to establish this agency which did advocate, on behalf of the people living in those local communities, those remote communities in northern Manitoba.

Today, in my own department of Community Services and Corrections, we have a number of associations, groups that you could classify as advocacy groups, that are funded by the taxpayers. They are in my Estimates, but they were in the Estimates of previous Ministers as well. The Citizen Advocacy in Winnipeg is one such group; they happen to advocate the cause of mainly handicapped people, both physically and mentally handicapped people, and they do an excellent job, a one-on-one job, but they nevertheless play an advocate role as is ultimately being referred to in Bill 23 which we have before us.

Another organization, Canadian Association for Mental Retardation, CMR, is financed in part by the taxpayers in Manitoba and, as many people have known and have experienced, this indeed is also an

advocacy group, advocacy advocating a particular cause, a particular point of view.

So the precedent is well established, Mr. Speaker, for the Legislature to vote monies to fund advocacy groups, to vote monies to set up organizations that can play an advocate role. I say this is fit and proper; I say that the funding and the assistance of advocate groups, as is being provided for in this bill, is fit and proper in this day and age that we live in, the latter part of the 20th century, because we are living in a very complex society. We're living in a society where decisions are made in a very remote fashion; where we have big organizations, big corporations, big Crown companies; where we have large government departments, big government; and where the average Manitoban or the average Canadian, or indeed the average citizen, feels very frustrated and helpless, feels an inability to do something about whatever is happening, whether it's flooding out his or her community; whether it is lack of adequate facilities for the physically handicapped and trying to get through the City Hall or the Town Hall to get some action on behalf of them; or whether it is, as in the example that I used earlier, to get through to the decision-makers with regard to an increase in gas rates or telephone rates or hydro rates or bus fare changes or bus route changes.

So, I think that what we're doing here is something that will be well received by the people of the province. I think it will be well received certainly by a number of organizations that I have come in contact with and I know for a fact, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill had already been enacted last year, or at some previous time, I can assure you that members of this organization in my constituency, that our ordinary citizens, housewives, young mothers, people who want to do something about this drastic cutback in the Brandon bus system service and feel as frustrated as all get out. They come to their MLA and I have to explain to them that although we, as a Government of Manitoba do provide subsidy to urban transit systems, it is not our direct responsibility to run those systems. It is essentially a responsibility of the municipal government and that they in turn should approach their councillors, their aldermen or go to the council meetings and make their views known and I've certainly encouraged them to do that and to do whatever else they feel fit and proper in order to mold public opinion, in order to affect the opinion-makers on city council. Indeed, they have been writing letters to the editor; they've had news conferences; they've had petitions; they've had hundreds and hundreds of names on these petitions and they've gone down to the City Hall in Brandon with the petitions, but thus far, at least the latest information I have, without success. But I think, and I'm not so sure whether up to that stage that I described in this one particular example, that you would necessarily have need for legal aid. I'm not suggesting in all those steps that you have need for legal aid. What I am suggesting though is when you go beyond the political level. When you go to a technical board, to the Public Utilities Board as in this case, where there is a need for legal assistance, it's at that stage that this bill will certainly be of assistance. I only wish that I was able to tell these people that phoned me or stopped me on the street or have written to me that this was another avenue that they could follow in order to fight

to the bitter end, as it were, this cutback that affects them so adversely.

I think that perhaps in the case of a bus system you may feel that it's a relatively simple matter, that you don't have to have professional advocacy, you don't have to have professional research and so on. The report on which it's based, well, it must be at least as thick as these various bills; I wish I had a copy of that report because it is filled with a lot of technical data, it has drafts, charts and I have studied it a bit and I must say that I find it rather difficult to follow some of the charts that the report contains. I'm not sure whether some of these citizens have copies of this report - but my colleague from St. Boniface here's not helping me - have copies of this report, but the fact is that one way to argue before the Public Utilities Board, of course, would be to go through the report which is the basis of the council decision making. Although my colleague from St. Boniface can make me smile at this, it is a very serious matter, in fact if there is number one issue in my riding at the present time, it is the issue of this cutback that is imminent and, as I said, I gave you the one example of this single mother who had this child to look after. I could give you other specific examples of elderly people who are going to be adversely affected and people who ride the buses in those areas at other times who are also adversely affected. So there's a lot of examples that I could use.

I think back also - is it three or four years ago? - when there were several groups in Winnipeg, they were extremely annoyed at the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company and they really felt they were being shafted. They were being shafted because they were being asked time after time, it seemed every three or four months, to pay more for their gas bill and they felt that they were being somehow manipulated, tricked by the data, the information that was coming out of the gas utility. Of course, everyone knows the gas utility is in the business of making a profit and is guaranteed a return on its investment. I'm not critical of normal reasonable profits, but the people of Winnipeg at that time felt that they were being taken to the cleaners, in so many words, because they'd not only seen one increase but they'd seen several increases over a very short period of time. As a matter of fact, they did get together and I guess they ultimately got some legal advice and got some technical advice, but surely there should have been a vehicle in place that would have enabled them to more easily, more readily, protect the interest of the consumers of the City of Winnipeg. This exactly is what the Attorney-General has in mind in introducing this very worthwhile piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We've reached the time of Private Members' Hour. When we next reach this bill again the Honourable Minister will have 20 minutes remaining.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: On Private Members' Hour the first item is the Second Reading of Bill No. 35.
The Honourable Member for River East.

SECOND READING PRIVATE BILLS

BILL 35 - AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE MENNONITE BRETHREN CHURCH OF MANITOBA

MR. P. EYLER presented Bill No. 35 An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate the Mennonite Brethren Church of Manitoba for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Aside from a few housekeeping amendments related to grammar there are three main objects to this amendment.

The first is to expand the objects of the corporation. When this church was originally incorporated in 1940 there was no provision for mass media such as broadcasting or for education in separate schools or for the provision of health and social welfare programs. The objects are expanded in this amendment to include these three areas.

The second change that they're requesting, Mr. Speaker, is that all lands "shall be vested" in the Mennonite Brethren Church rather than "may be vested." This has always been implicitly accepted; they just now wish to have it explicit in the Act.

The third change, Mr. Speaker, is insofar as the head office location is concerned. When the bill was originally passed in 1940, the head office was located in Winkler. It has since moved to Winnipeg and they wish to have the bill changed to allow for provision of head office to be located in Winnipeg or any other location in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The next item on the Private Members' Hour agenda is Resolution No. 6 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING RES. 6 - CPR LAND TAX ASSESSMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm just speaking on this in the absence of my colleague, the MLA for Minnedosa, and I'm not taking his privilege and right to speak at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution presents something of an anomaly in the House that of late we have become more and more accustomed to see coming from the present government. I think this resolution could be more aptly described as a sympathy resolution; sympathy for the MLA for Elmwood who introduced it, obviously without caucusing it with the rest of his colleagues in the government; and a sympathy resolu-

tion for the Minister of Transport who obviously didn't know this resolution was coming in, because on one hand the Minister of Transportation has a government resolution which says: "We shall not break a long-standing agreement with Canadian Pacific Railroad, vis-a-vis the statutory rate structure for transporting grain and grain products in Western Canada." That is a government resolution and I trust carries the full weight or did carry the full weight of the government behind it.

At the same time his colleague in the backbench, the MLA for Elmwood, introduces a resolution that says: "An agreement shall be broken, shall be further amended." Something of a quandary that the NDP must find themselves in, with these two resolutions appearing on the Order Paper in the same Session. Now, I realize that such honourable members as the introducing member and his benchmate don't see the logic behind that but I wouldn't expect them to. Logic is something that they're not accustomed to.

Now my concern on this particular resolution stems in part from some of the information that the Minister of Transport has put out in support of his resolution against any interference in an existing agreement with Canadian Pacific Railroads. He has said - and he has turned out a press release in support of his resolution - "That Manitoba does not benefit from any, or in a significant way from the major expansion in rail-line capacity which must take place in Western Canada, in order that Western Canadian commodities can move to their seaboard markets, particularly on the west coast."

The logic that the Minister of Transport uses, Mr. Speaker, is that because all of the spending on rail-line capacity upgrading is being funded in the Rocky Mountain region of the CPR, it has no benefit for Manitoba; therefore, any effort to sell the Pepin proposal is not valid in Manitoba. Well, that presents some interesting questions which I think the Member for Elmwood and his Minister of Transportation should get down and discuss because western rail capacity is the bottleneck in rail transportation in Canada. It is going to have to be resolved over the next 5, 10 years or Canadians will lose significant export opportunities, not only in coal and potash and other mineral concentrates, but in grain and those commodities are all of great importance to the western economy. Should we not have had a defeat in the last election, potash would have been an important commodity for Manitoba. It would seem as if it —(Interjection)— the Member for Elmwood repeats comments I hear from the Member for Inkster upon occasion, that potash mines, aluminum smelters, etc., are pie in the sky.

Well, I only asked the Member for Elmwood and his colleague, the MLA for Inkster, to read the prospectus that was put out and signed by his Minister of Finance, and to read the Budget Speech put out by his Minister of Finance which mentions aluminum smelters, potash mines to the investment community, the people of Manitoba in a Budget and a prospectus in which they borrow money. Now, is that the kind of pie in the sky you're talking about? If it is, you two venerable towers of intelligence in the back bench should mention that to your Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the honourable

member please address his remarks to the Chair and not to other members directly?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will. But, Mr. Speaker, we have become accustomed to the interjections by the government backbenchers about pie in the sky; the same pie in the sky their Minister of Finance has chosen to boast about on the New York money markets when he goes down to borrow money on behalf of Manitobans; the same pie in the sky that the Minister of Finance introduced in his Budget telling Manitobans that the future of Manitoba in part was going to be bolstered by an aluminum refinery in Manitoba, a potash mine in Western Canada; that's pie in the sky according to the Minister of Finance. He's telling the people of Manitoba that even a month ago they were a real possibility and today we find out, of course, the aluminum smelter is not a possibility that Manitobans can enjoy. So this issue of rail capacity is very crucially important to Manitoba.

The one other thing that's very important to Manitoba at this time - and members opposite, members in the government probably won't understand this - but I hope that eventually within the next year or two they might have some semblance of understanding of what we, on this side of the House are trying to tell them.

But Manitoba is not an island unto itself in the Canadian economic fabric. There are no barriers on each border of Manitoba which either contains investment within the province, or excludes investment from the province - and I say, excludes, because there never used to be barriers which excluded investment from Manitoba - but, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately that all changed on November 17 with the election of an N.D. Government in the Province of Manitoba. There are now barriers to private sector investment in the Province of Manitoba instituted by this government in six short months and their first Budget.

Mr. Speaker, let's analyze what is happening in Quebec because our honourable friends over there like to import things from Quebec, like payroll taxes. Now in Quebec, Mr. Speaker, the . . .

POINT OF ORDER

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for River East on a point of order.

MR. P. EYLER: I believe you called the debate on the CPR Land Tax Assessment Resolution? Would you rule whether or not he's speaking on that?

MR. SPEAKER: There does appear to be a rather long preamble that the honourable member is giving.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, and as I mentioned before, and I said before I started this discussion, that members opposite would not understand and the Member for River East has once again demonstrated clearly that he doesn't have much understanding of the economic system in Manitoba, that this resolution introduced by his backbench colleague has an impact on the investment capabilities of corporations in Manitoba. He doesn't understand that; I don't expect him to. That's why he would rise on a silly point of order such as he did; he

doesn't understand.

We have another one, the MLA for Thompson, preparing to rise on the same point of order because he doesn't understand either. He's the man that brought in the resolution on Reaganomics, that's his understanding.

Mr. Speaker, to deal to the satisfaction of the harking in the backbench on —(Interjection)—

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

MR. S. ASHTON: On the original point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member just started part of his remarks with the introduction, well, let's talk about Quebec. I don't think by any stretch of the imagination that could be seen as being relevant to a resolution on the CPR taxes in Winnipeg, so I would ask you to rule whether, indeed, he was out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In Quebec there is the head office of a firm by the name of CPR. In Quebec under a number of pieces of legislation that they have passed including the payroll tax and including various pieces of language legislation, there has become in apparent standards a disincentive for head offices to remain in the Province of Quebec and there has been a migration of those offices out of the province and into other provinces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that do for Manitoba with CPR? Well if, and this is only a possibility, but if the Canadian Pacific Railway - and bearing in mind that the major expansion and transportation capacity will occur in Western Canada - it will mean more corporate services required by CPR in Western Canada. Would there not be a possibility that as investment is made by CPR in the transportation system of Western Canada, that they may well want to expand head office management capabilities in Western Canada and hopefully in Manitoba? Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that's a distinct possibility.

But what does this resolution offer to the management who must make investment decisions on behalf of CPR? What does this make Manitoba look like in terms of an attractive climate in which to expand their operations? Well, I don't expect the members opposite to understand. But clearly if they want to talk to the investment community, the private sector - and I know that's a horrible word to them - they would find out that Manitoba is fast becoming an unattractive place to invest capital and there's no clearer indication of that today than the Alcan announcement.

What this resolution is doing along with the payroll tax that they imported from Quebec, is turning Manitoba into the same kind of an investment climate as Quebec where such major companies as CPR may well not look at Manitoba in terms of expanding their employment and their investment in the province. At a time like this when these people over here talk about the need for jobs, economic activity, they allow their backbenchers to bring in resolutions like this one, to make further disincentives to investment in Manitoba by at least one major firm, namely CPR.

Now I know that doesn't mean anything to these

people over here, because they don't understand economics. There's a saying that the former Member for Charleswood used to use every once in awhile about a former Liberal member of the Opposition, that his mother left him in school too long and some of the backbench over there suffer from that kind of a syndrome as well. They don't have an understanding of how the investment community views the possibilities of investment and the wisdom of that investment in Manitoba.

Now what this resolution is hoping to do is once again reopen an agreement which, I believe, in 1964 was changed by a former government of the Province of Manitoba and that change allowed a gradual indexation of CPR holdings and investment to be taxed and those funds to become available to the Province of Manitoba. Well, now the MLA for Elmwood wants to further move into that agreement and make further changes. I have no particular love, nor do I have any particular hatred for Canadian Pacific Railway. —(Interjection)— but the Member for Flin Flon says we do have a particular hatred for . . . oh, we too, I'm sorry.

But the government, in their constant deriding of the private sector and private sector investment, are fast making Manitoba a walled community in which private sector companies such as CPR will simply overlook Manitoba in making further expansions to their corporate offices, to their employment in the province, to maintenance and repair yards, to the very real job creation efforts that are needed in Manitoba. Now the Member for Elmwood calls that doom and gloom. I hope it isn't doom and gloom. I would hope that the MLA for Elmwood would realize what he and his colleagues in the N.D. Party are doing to the Manitoba reputation both nationally and internationally as a place to wisely invest private sector funds - and I only have to refer them to their own Budget Speech in which they had something like 16 references to public sector spending and one reference to private sector spending and that was only in joint public-private sector sense - there was not one single recognition of the private sector in its role of job creation in the Manitoba economy.

If you think the investment community does not recognize the antagonism that resides in the Treasury Benches of the N.D. Government today toward private sector investment in the province, ask yourself why Alcan put their plans on the shelf in the Province of Manitoba. Ask them if it was the wholesome attitude and welcoming attitude that the N.D. Party have toward private sector investment and you know what? The answer is no, because those people have consistently tried to throw up every barrier possible to Alcan and to other private sector investors in this province.

They have done it in the Budget with the payroll tax, which is a disincentive to employ people; they are now doing it with this resolution introduced by the MLA for Elmwood. And what did the aluminum smelter mean to a firm like CPR or for that matter, Canadian National? You know what it meant, Mr. Speaker, the aluminum smelter in Rockwood Municipality would have allowed —(Interjection)— the Member for Inkster once again says, our fantasies. I refer him once again, if he can read and has the intelligence to understand the prospectus put out by his Minister of

Finance, which mentioned specifically the prospects of an aluminum smelter in Manitoba.

The Member for Inkster is completely out of touch with reality. He's one of these - well I won't continue, Mr. Speaker. But the aluminum smelter in Manitoba would have represented a significant in-freight of alumina for processing in Manitoba. What that would have done, Mr. Speaker, is give to Manitoba and the maintenance yards of both CN and CP the job of keeping that hopper car rolling stock in repair. That meant jobs in the railroad that are now gone down the tube because of Alcan's announcement today and this new government's attitude toward private sector investment.

They won an election saying that mega projects were not good for Manitoba and now they are making sure that their election propaganda is coming true by having Alcan not come to the Province of Manitoba. To CPR, what did the prospect of a potash mine mean to Manitoba? Potash meant to Manitoba railroads, CN and CP, once again the prospects of hauling major amounts of a brand new product from a resource base in Manitoba out of the province; once again, centred out of the transportation hearts of CN and CP in the City of Winnipeg; once again, creating more jobs in head office, more maintenance jobs. But I will tell you ladies and gentlemen of this Assembly, that as sure as Alcan went down the tube today, potash will go down the tube tomorrow because this government does not like private sector investment — (Interjection) — that is not doom and gloom; it's your attitude. Your attitude is wrong. You're isolating Manitoba as a barrier of disincentive to private sector investment and the ponies are coming home. Alcan is gone and potash will next be gone and what that means to the railroads, Mr. Speaker, is the loss of jobs for Manitobans; loss of jobs in Manitoba in the repair shops; the head offices of CN and CP and whilst this is going on, the MLA for Elmwood brings in a resolution to add one more feather to the cap of hatred that this government has for CPR and for all private sector companies.

They, Mr. Speaker, if they remain in government for their full four years, will turn Manitoba into an economic wasteland because of their wretched attitude toward private sector investment as demonstrated by this kind of resolution, as demonstrated by their attitude toward major freight consumers which could have been in Manitoba within the next few years, namely Alcan, who would import vast quantities, 200,000 tons of alumina and potash going out.

This ND Government has lost one; they will soon lose two, not to the benefit of Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the resolution as proposed for the Member for Elmwood, the resolution to renegotiate the agreement with respect to municipal taxation and assessment of the CPR and to renegotiate with the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba.

Canadian Pacific Railways is one of the largest corporations in Canada and under other circumstances would have been required to pay full municipal taxation in the City of Winnipeg. In fact, I believe it's prob-

ably the only large corporation, one of the few corporations or companies that has that kind of exemption in the City of Winnipeg.

The Member for Pembina suggests that because of this resolution being placed by the Member for Elmwood in the House that it's an indication of the attitude of this government and members on this side of the House, that we're anti-development, that we're anti-business, that we're anti-CPR. That's certainly not the case, Mr. Speaker. Every other corporation doing business and having property in the City of Winnipeg, in fact, anywhere it crosses Canada, pays its fair share of municipal taxation.

The Member for Pembina is suggesting that the Member for Elmwood is bringing forth this resolution as an indication that this government, that these members are against the CPR. I would remind the Member for Pembina that this is not a new issue. There was Chapter 109 of the Statutes of the Province of Manitoba brought forward by Duff Roblin, the government of that day that changed the initial agreement that existed with respect to municipal assessment and taxation for the CPR. That Act provided for a general reduction in the exemption that existed for CPR for assessment and taxation in the City of Winnipeg to a point that they would be, in the year 2005, covered by full municipal assessment and paying full taxation in the City of Winnipeg. So it's not something new that the Member for Elmwood is proposing; it's something that was enacted by a previous Conservative Government.

It's also something that has been proposed very recently by the elected officials in the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker. They also realize and recognize the fact that the original agreement that was made with the CPR many years ago, that the same conditions don't exist today, that there is a need as there was a need some years ago, to renegotiate the agreement. This fact has also been recognized, Mr. Speaker, by the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee which was established by the previous government, of which the Member for Pembina was a Minister. That review commission recognized the validity of the arguments put forward by the City of Winnipeg and I would just quote, Mr. Speaker, as to what their findings were in this regard and their recommendation.

On page 243 of the Manitoba Assessment Review Committee Report, it states: "The Committee is aware that the arrangements as contained in the legislation enacted in 1965 were achieved after considerable negotiations by the City of Winnipeg, the Province of Manitoba and the Canadian Pacific Railway. While the Committee brings to the attention of the Government of Manitoba the above recommendation of the City of Winnipeg, it does not feel that it is in the position to make a recommendation in respect to this matter. While the Committee would not be averse to any renegotiation of this subject, it must be recognized that the City's position was improved through the 1965 legislation." And they go on to suggest that any further improvement would be most welcome, Mr. Speaker, but should be achieved through negotiations.

So this isn't a new issue and it's not only an area that's of concern to members on this side of the House, it was recognized by a previous Conservative Government. It was recognized in the report of the

Manitoba Assessment Review Commission after presentations were made by the elected officials of the City of Winnipeg who are the ones that suffer directly, most greatly, because of the exemption that exists with respect to the CPR in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, if the present resolution that's before this House is accepted I will, in partnership with the City of Winnipeg, request that the CPR meet with us in the near future to renegotiate this agreement so that, hopefully, we can bring about a situation that the CPR, like all other corporations operating in the City of Winnipeg, will pay their full share and their responsible share of municipal taxation in the City of Winnipeg.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to enter this debate, although I should retract that, I believe that the Legislature should not be used for cheap, crass, political opportunism as this resolution obviously represents. I'm sorry to say that about my friend and colleague, the Member for Elmwood who, after all, came into this Chamber at the same time I did back in 1966. I would have thought that perhaps, during those 16-odd years, he would have somewhere along the line picked up at least some modicum of respect for the debates in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, very simply put, I will tell you why it is a cheap, political, class-orientated resolution because, Sir, what does a resolution want to do? It wants to change something. I was privileged to be part of a government in the '60's that had some recognition of the problem that this resolution addresses; had some concern for the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg and we didn't Mickey Mouse around with resolutions or try to play politics; we did something about it. Duff Roblin and the government that I was part of, the Conservative Government, negotiated, sat down with the CPR and negotiated a substantial change to the original agreement. That's a reasonable, responsible way for governments to try to redress what some in our society believe is perhaps outdated, antiquated and a change is called for. Mr. Speaker, that was the action of a responsible government. Conservatives, of course, are always responsible and we're not prone to playing this gutter-type politics of the kind that this resolution represents.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, the Mover of this resolution, was part of a government for eight years, he was a Cabinet Minister for some of those years - in fact he's even written a book about that experience, about how it was to be a Cabinet Minister in the Schreyer administration. Now for eight years, if this question was of any concern to him, if he had any genuine feeling for the taxpayers of Winnipeg, why didn't the Schreyer NDP Administration do something about it? Why? Well, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't a concern then. Now they are in Opposition and they want to rattle the sabre a little bit, they want to get the little people mad at the big people and who better then to attack than the CPR. Heck, we've been doing that on the Prairies for decades and decades. If you haven't anybody else to damn, you damn the CPR.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to point out is that it might

have been a little bit more acceptable had the Member for River East, or any of the new members that now came into the Chamber, come in with this resolution, as a private member I would not be making the same speech that I'm making right now. Even had this resolution come in from the Member for Thompson showing his great concern for taxpayers in Winnipeg, I would not be making the same speech that I'm making now but having it come from the Honourable Member for Elmwood, who for eight years - and, Sir, you recall most of those eight years, Mr. Speaker. Was it a matter of urgent debate in your caucuses? Sir, you were then not bound by the rules and traditions that now inhibit you from partaking in those debates as the custodian, the Chief Magistrate, the Speaker of our illustrious Chamber here, but Sir, I'm sure - and you could just maybe wink at me a little bit or nod your head - you will tell me whether I am on the right track. Was the question of getting greater tax exemption a matter of burning concern raised by the Member for Elmwood during those eight years that you sat in caucus in Cabinet with him? No, of course not.

It's now a timely subject, particularly in times of rising taxes, rising taxes brought on by the spendthrift spending of that administration that we've tried to clean up. Pardon me, I've said that wrong but I say so many things wrong. I can recall one time, Mr. Speaker, when I was being pressed for a solution to a problem that I really didn't have the answer for, I can recall responding to that question by saying that I'll cross that bridge when I find the river or something of such sort.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I can tell by the gentle smile on your features, Sir, that I am hitting pretty close to the truth with respect to the remarks that I'm making. I can just tell.

I call it a cheap political shot at the CPR because it's not necessary and I cite you not words but action. We faced the situation in the mid-'60s; we didn't attempt to make cheap politics out of it; we did something about it. Honourable members opposite, if the Member for Elmwood obviously feels strongly about it - I know that he's somewhat removed from the Treasury Benches these days but he lives in hope that perhaps, even after this Session is over and the First Minister will appoint five or six more Cabinet Ministers - but surely he could have raised it at the NDP Caucus meetings and said, "Hey, let's do something about it, let's change that agreement." But no, that wouldn't serve the purpose of this resolution. The purpose of this resolution is to pit one class against another class; pit the ordinary people against the CPR because it's a favorite whipping stone; that's the only purpose of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the other thought that came to my mind in speaking to this resolution is the opportunity that it gives me to demonstrate how socialists generally, and these socialist in particular, view the commitment of a binding agreement or commitment and how it should be honoured. We have a colleague of theirs, the Minister of Transportation, introducing a resolution on the Crow, and what is the gist of that resolution? The gist of that resolution is, once an agreement is entered into, no matter when, in 1896, that is holy, that is sacrosanct, that shall not be tampered with. Never, because it's directed, of course,

against the CPR among others.

On the other hand, the CPR, for whatever reason, maybe the wrong reasons or maybe the government of the day was too generous in the exemptions that they made to the CPR in bringing about that major thing, maybe the City of Winnipeg was too generous in agreeing to the in perpetuity, the deferment of property taxes. Mr. Speaker, that's not the issue that I'm trying to make. I'm just saying though how they view long-term agreements. Governments can break agreements but when it's anything involved with the private sector that seeks redress from an agreement that is hopelessly outdated, that is antiquated, and more importantly when that agreement is beginning to hinder the flow of the most important commodity that we have in this country, namely, agricultural products, then it's fair game. Then the same government, the same group of people say, no, no, an agreement was signed called the Crow, 1896, and we cannot deviate one hairbreadth from that agreement. That's how long-term agreements are viewed by my friends, the socialists.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that, of course, comes as no surprise to any observer of the international scene. We understand how some of their cousins view long-term agreements in far more serious matters with respect to international relations or interrelations between governments and/or companies and people.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could not resist the opportunity of expressing my concern, because it's the attitude that is the prevailing gist of this resolution. It is pitting what is deemed to be good politics on the part of the Member for Elmwood - you know, ordinary people, little people, the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg against the multinational corporation of the CPR and it's for that reason that I call it a cheap, crass, political resolution. He has every means open to him to make some changes and, Mr. Speaker, it's particularly an affront to me and it is an affront to my leader, the only ones who were part of a government that recognized that problem for the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg and did something about it.

As a matter of fact, we negotiated arrangements whereby the CPR will pay full property taxes in due course. Okay. The honourable members say that's not good enough. They want that escalated. They want that full taxation to come sooner. Don't present these kinds of resolutions and don't create the opportunity for this kind of debate to take place in this Chamber unless, of course, you believe that there's polish to be gained to hit big business, to hit the CPR and to hit anything that has to do with the private sector.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, if I didn't know, if I understand the showmanship quality of my honourable friend with the years that we spent together here, I wouldn't believe what I heard today. My honourable friend talks about crass, about politics, about the language and the decorum in the House and — (Interjection) — you had your say, did you? Will you let me have mine now?

Mr. Speaker, coming from this member, this is a little bit funny. Now, he wasn't very strong but I guess he accomplished the task that he was asked to and

he's spent a few minutes discussing it. He was, in fact, on both sides of the issue. First, he said a contract or an agreement is an agreement; you shouldn't break it; it's there for eternity. Then he tells us, what did we do? We tried to change this agreement because we thought it was wrong — (Interjection) — right. Somebody said negotiate - and it's the only way that it's going to happen. There's protection in this land for people and contracts are contracts. It doesn't mean that you haven't got a responsibility to try to rectify what is wrong. It's not a socialist government or a socialist Premier in Newfoundland that is trying to rectify something when the former government gave it all to Quebec. I think my honourable friends know what I'm talking about. In fact, they applauded the Federal Government when they felt, fine, there'll be measures to correct that injustice, that's alright. Now they say, why? This is a cowardly way of breaking something. The Minister stood up before - not after but before - my honourable friend and he said, I intend to negotiate, sit down with the City of Winnipeg and the CPR to negotiate a fairer settlement. So to say that we're afraid of doing something, we don't take action - my honourable friend, if he reflects a little bit, will see that is wrong. It might be that sometimes you prepare the speeches, might be that he didn't understand, that he was too busy taking notes of the things that he was going to say and he forgot that the — (Interjection) — oh, that's another thing, 8 years. You know, we can hear that on everything. When we say anything, they say well don't talk about Ontario, talk about here. Then you talk about 8 years - all right, seven-and-a-half years.

So, you know, if you don't do something immediately, well then, you should never do it again. If that was the case, what kind of governments would you have? They say we are not responsible for what the Conservatives do in Ottawa or what they do in other provinces, although they did come in with a big smile and a big flower when the Conservatives in Saskatchewan out-socialized the socialists and won an election. They were very proud on that day. It depends where you sit. If I have any trouble with some of the members on the other side, it's that certain things are sacred and you should never mention it. You know, you don't say, is somebody doing the right thing? Is a poor person, a rich person, a corporation doing the right thing? It is divided and you know they sneer when the words 'labour federation' are mentioned or 'unions' - that's supposed to be bad - but any sin is forgiven if it's done by a large corporation.

What is this thing asking? We've heard motives. There wasn't any constructive speech today. Nobody said it shouldn't be done because — (Interjection) — yes, there were speeches, I said constructive. But I was just implying motives. Nobody said it shouldn't be done because of that. You know, just reflect who has done . . . they're stupid. They don't understand anything by your friend that were used; crass, dirty. That's it. Well, that's the dirtiest word of all when you mention socialist. It's the dirtiest word of all. There's where my friend is, out there, the name-caller.

So, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is giving a chance to all the members of this House, so they can participate; so they can say to the Minister, yes, these are difficult times. They could say to the Minister of Urban Affairs,

we support you; go back to the CPR; they're reasonable people; they weren't so mad. Last time they did so well that the First Minister that renegotiated got a job with them. They couldn't have been that mad. He did so well that they were happy. They understand. I think they'll get away with things. They're not going to come voluntarily saying, hey, we want a fairer share. They're going to try to go in to get a cheap ride, a free ride like everybody else, like we do too.

If there's a loophole in income tax, we're not going to come in voluntarily and change it. —(Interjection)— I admit that I'm not that zealous that I'll go back and say maybe I'm the only one but I will not go to Ottawa and say hey, you made a mistake here, there's a loophole that's not fair.

I will try collectively as my responsibility especially in provincial affairs - because I have no responsibility federally other than that of a Canadian - and then again Trudeau, that's supposed to be a bad word. If Trudeau does something well, of course, I'll support him, if not, well fine, I'll criticize. I mean nobody, even my honourable friend is not all bad. —(Interjection)— Well, if you didn't know before it wasn't my fault. Even my honourable friend, there's nobody that's all bad and there's nobody that's all good. So you judge the things and try to judge things on their merits not by their name, by their colour, that's not the way to judge things and then you look at the things to see if it's fair, in this resolution, it doesn't warrant the kind of abuse that was —(Interjection)— what company? What company? Well who's talking about multinationals? No, no, this is what you say, but when did you hear me say anything about big business? When did you see me knock big business? You've never heard me knock it. —(Interjection)— All right, I heard you. Let's wait till this happens and if I start telling him off for something I don't like I'd be out of order, and I don't want to be out of order. We're discussing the CPR. It's not time to take a whack at these people. I might have a chance and they might have a chance at me too but that's not the point - I don't want to be out of order.

I want to say that in this resolution there's a reason for private resolutions. It might be - how do we know? - that he brought this in Cabinet that he wasn't supported, you don't know that. This is his chance as a private member to bring in a resolution of something he believes in. I haven't heard him knock anybody. I didn't hear him knock anybody and he certainly doesn't deserve the abuse that you try to heap on him because he dared bring a resolution, and he dared say that there was something wrong with the sacred cow, and that's what it is. It's this privileged class, or privileged people that I can't stand, this is the idea. So, Mr. Speaker, what the member said is absolutely —(Interjection)— I haven't got my glasses I can't see a thing —(Interjection)— don't worry about it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that there'd be other members that will speak on this and then it will be a little more constructive; and if they're against it don't just come and vote. The only time that you imply motive, that you try to talk, there was all kinds of tricks. You ruled earlier, Mr. Speaker, that there wasn't an urgent debate on the question of Alcan and the member there, we thought he was so cute, spent all his time talking about bringing all this Alcan and going through Quebec and all this kind of thing and he

thought that was quite tricky, but we did not talk about the resolution. Nobody said they are paying too much now. They said why didn't you do something eight years ago? Okay, why didn't you? You ask him.

But that's not the subject that's on the table now. The thing is that you're going to be asked to vote for it or vote against it. All right, you're going to vote against it, well at least tell the people why. Is it just because you don't like Russ Doern? Well he says yes. Well now, Mr. Speaker, we have the proof. The honourable member shakes his head and he says he doesn't like the Member for Elmwood, so therefore he's going to vote against it. We were talking about intelligence awhile ago. Let the record show that he said, yes he will vote —(Interjection)— what are you yapping about? You're split. Well, we're split. They're the people that didn't know what to do. I would suggest that you invite the honourable member and he'll explain his resolution because some members did not understand. Well, I won't say it to you but I'll say to your colleagues, if you like Don, sure to hell you can like Russ, so that's a justification within itself.

Mr. Speaker, look at the situation, there was something. I'm sure that the government of the day thought it was fair and it was the same thing. I remember when I was an alderman in St. Boniface, they had this fixed assessment and it was supposed to bring these people in. They did that with Swift's, it was fixed assessment for about 20 to 25 years. The minute that fixed assessment was finished - you say you've got to provide this political climate, this economic climate - and the minute that fixed assessment was finished, goodbye, they're gone; the same thing in East St. Paul on Henderson Highway with the Imperial Oil. These are the things.

So the people are looking and if they think that it's fair they're going to try to get away with everything they can. They're going to say, fine we're going to try to be helpful. So I would suggest that the members think about this - and, in fact, maybe I'll do you a favour if I speak a little longer because you say you're going to caucus this tonight - so you don't want this to come to a vote right now.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had a lot of fun this afternoon but I don't think that we're being serious with this resolution and we're facing difficult times. A company told you today that because of the economic situation, and the world conditions, and the lack of market, that they cannot proceed at this time not only in Manitoba but where? - in Austria, in Australia, in maybe Quebec and other areas - so the times are difficult. Especially when times are difficult you think that the people that have had a free ride or a cheap ride would be willing to pay their fair share and that's all we're asking. Nobody is going to try to expropriate anything.

The Minister stated that he will sit down with the CPR and the officials of the City of Winnipeg and try to negotiate a better deal, the same as Peckford, the Premier of Newfoundland will try to do and he's involved the Federal Government. He's asked for the support of the Federal Government to correct what is in effect an injustice to the people of Newfoundland. They give their resources away and it's the same thing here. Why should generations and future generations have to pay for that? So I would like to hear, before I'm

asked to vote. I would like to know if there's any reason why I should not support this resolution, but I don't want to hear, why didn't he do it eight years ago. I don't want to wait until you have your poll and your vote to see if he's popular and if you like him or not; I want to vote on the resolution. I can tell Russ where to go anytime; I don't need a resolution for that. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that there'll be somebody that'll tell us today why we should not support this bill. If the intention is to —(Interjection)— well, all right, but you've had three-quarters of an hour and I'm sure you won't say it in four minutes. If you get tempted enough, you get mad enough, maybe you'll get up and tell us and that's what I want. You haven't got time. I want to be fair with you; I want to give you a little time —(Interjection)— you can say it in four minutes? Now he's saying that he can't —(Interjection)— What? Oh, four minutes today. Okay, I'll sit down and let you go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on this resolution. I've been waiting for quite some time because I wanted the opportunity to speak because I thought I had something constructive to add. I was listening to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface - and what resolution are we on, Mr. Speaker? I couldn't tell from the previous speaker but I have prepared it and I know it's Resolution No. 6 and it's the CPR Land Tax Assessment.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind everybody and I know what it's about - it's about let's try and take back from the CPR what we allegedly believe that they had taken from the people of the Province of Manitoba. I think that we're forgetting what the CPR has done for the Province of Manitoba and for all of Canada. How soon we forget. What has the CPR done for us today? I just wanted to bring to the honourable members' attention something of the CPR background before - and you've got to pay close attention because I'm going to be paying close attention to what I say because I haven't made up my mind on whether I'm going to be supporting this resolution or not. So, if I come up with something interesting, I might support it and I might not.

But I just wanted to establish one thing - that I do like Russ Doern; not enough to vote for him or his party, but I do like him. I think he contributes a great deal of expertise to this House. I think that he will probably be one of the next Ministers appointed from that side - and I'm not leaving the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I'm bringing this in because I think that Russ Doern does use the CPR railroad on occasion so I think that's the connection with Russ Doern, but I think if he had the opportunity, once the Royal Alexander Hotel was removed from the CPR property, I think that he had plans of building a second shelter similar to the one that he had built over on the corner across the street.

But the Royal Alexander Hotel was eliminated; it had deteriorated to the point where it couldn't stand any longer and it was removed. Just as a passing remark, my grandfather - I guess my mother's father - worked on the CPR Hotel, the Royal Alexander Hotel —(Interjection)— no, and I got to tell you what he did.

In those days when the hotel was being built - that's the CPR Hotel - he used to have to climb up a ladder with bricks in a hod. You people who haven't been around too much don't know what I'm talking about, but I think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would know. It was a long stick and it was sort of U-shaped —(Interjection)— I've seen it when they were building the CPR, I've seen it. Anyway, they used to climb up these ladders, carrying these bricks up in this hod and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The House will have to wait until this resolution next comes up to hear the end of the story. When the resolution next reaches the floor, the honourable member will have 17 minutes remaining. The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.

It is moved by the Honourable Minister of Health and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance that the House do now adjourn. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon (Wednesday)