



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)

37 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan
Speaker*



VOL. XXXVII No. 41 - 1:30 p.m., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1988.

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fourth Legislature**

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIBERAL
ANGUS, John	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BURRELL, Parker	Swan River	PC
CARR, James	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIBERAL
CHARLES, Gwen	Selkirk	LIBERAL
CHEEMA, Gulzar	Kildonan	LIBERAL
CHORNOPYSKI, William	Burrows	LIBERAL
CONNERY, Edward Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James Hon.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Emerson	PC
DRIEDGER, Herold, L.	Niakwa	LIBERAL
DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIBERAL
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Laurie	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
EVANS, Leonard	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen Hon.	Virten	PC
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Ellice	LIBERAL
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HEMPHILL, Maureen	Logan	NDP
KOZAK, Richard, J.	Transcona	LIBERAL
LAMOUREUX, Kevin, M.	Inkster	LIBERAL
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANDRAKE, Ed	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
McCRAE, James Hon.	Brandon West	PC
MINENKO, Mark	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
OLESON, Charlotte Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald Hon.	Pembina	PC
PANKRATZ, Helmut	La Verendrye	PC
PATTERSON, Allan	Radisson	LIBERAL
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	Rhineland	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren	Lac du Bonnet	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
ROCH, Gilles	Springfield	LIBERAL
ROSE, Bob	St. Vital	LIBERAL
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
TAYLOR, Harold	Wolseley	LIBERAL
URUSKI, Bill	Interlake	NDP
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
YEO, Iva	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, September 21, 1988.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the petition and it conformed with the privileges and practices of the House and complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read? (Allow the return of Sally Espineli to Canada.) Dispense.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, I would like to direct all Honourable Members' attention to the Speaker's gallery, where we have with us this afternoon from the great State of Kansas, Governor Mike Hayden; Harland Priddle, who is the Secretary of Commerce; Sam Brownback, Secretary of Agriculture; and Harry Salisbury, Director of Trade Development.

On behalf of all Honourable Members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

We also have with us this afternoon from the Charleswood Junior High School 20 students from Grade 9 under the direction of Mrs. Carol Freynet-Gagne. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst).

On behalf of all Honourable Members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

* (1335)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Reid-Sigurdson Report Recommendations

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae). The Reid-Sigurdson Child Abuse Report indicated clearly that additional police resources were required in the City of Winnipeg to investigate child abuse cases in our city. Since the completion of that report, unfortunately, the situation has deteriorated still further. At present there are 49 child abuse complaints which remain uninvestigated, four of which date all the way back to May. As Manitoba's chief law officer, can the Attorney-General tell this House what discussions have taken place between his department and the City of Winnipeg to ensure the appropriate delivery of service to these vulnerable children?

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): The revelations in today's news are disturbing, to say the least. The matter of policing is a subject of discussions

on a regular basis with Chief Stephen of the City of Winnipeg Police and Commissioner Lunnie as well. I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) that the matter of policing in this particular aspect is the subject also of discussion. The City of Winnipeg Police is in the process of beefing up its complement of police personnel. I will be ensuring that an adequate number of officers are assigned to this particular task.

Child Abuse Police Services

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): The City of Winnipeg, for example, has six officers today and expects to get three more by approval of - (Interjection)- City of Calgary, I am sorry—the approval of three more to bring up the total to nine. Can the Attorney-General please tell the House today what he considers to be an acceptable complement of officers for the City of Winnipeg to deal with child abuse cases in that we seem to have a load this year of about 600 cases?

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): In the context of the staff allocations of the City of Winnipeg Police, those allocations are a matter of responsibility of the Police Department and City of Winnipeg officials. But as chief law enforcement officer for this province, I do indeed take an interest. As a matter of fact, prosecutions that come forward are the responsibility of my department. The general application of the law in the province is a matter of some concern to me. I will be wanting to be assured by officials of the City of Winnipeg that proper allocations are made available for this particular task.

Police Services

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a final supplementary, this time to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), and I want to make it clear that we know that there is genuine concern on that side about this situation. I listened to them when they were on this side and I do not believe that has changed.

I want to ask the First Minister in all seriousness, and with no political mileage, will he meet as soon as possible with the official delegation from the City of Winnipeg to impress upon them the seriousness of the need to have adequate resources for child abuse victims in the City of Winnipeg?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for her question and for ensuring that it is on a very non-political basis.

We will be meeting with the official delegation of the City of Winnipeg next week. I am a member for the official delegation and I can assure her that item will be raised on the agenda.

Mrs. Carstairs: I do thank the First Minister for that reply.

* (1340)

Social Worker Cutbacks

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): My supplementary, my question actually, is to the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson). There was an alarming 82.5 percent increase in reported child abuse cases from 1986 to 1987. Recognizing that this is a major concern, the Minister did—and we congratulate her and her Government for the additional funding for the child protection centre. At the same time, however, Child and Family Services agencies, we believe, will be forced to cut back on staff. In light of the increase in child abuse complaints, can the Minister tell us how they can possibly deal with the increasing number of abused children if they are forced to cut back on the number of social workers working in the range of agencies, not only in the city but throughout the province?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Community Services): Yes, in the context that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) was raising, with regard to the Child Protection Centre, we feel that with additional resources there will not be the backlog of cases of children in that system, and that will tend to reduce the need for foster care and other care within the Child and Family Services Agencies. That is one way of addressing it, but I realize that, of course, does not go all the way.

My staff are meeting with each of the agencies in the six Winnipeg agencies and will be reporting to me their findings on the impact of trying to live within this Budget. We may have to make some adjustments before the end of the year to be sure that children are protected because that of course is our ultimate goal, that children in need of our protection get our protection. But in the longer term, I have asked the staff to report back to me the full impact of what is happening in the agencies. What is happening is something that we inherited and it cannot be addressed in the short term, its lack of planning and foresight in the way the agencies have been funded in the past. We will certainly attempt, make every attempt to be sure that children are protected and look at ways we can ameliorate this in the longer term.

Police Services

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question to the same Minister. Can the Minister tell the House if child welfare agencies have reported to her department about the difficulty of obtaining proper police service on complaints in child abuse cases?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Community Services): That has not directly been brought to my attention, but I certainly can inquire into it.

Mrs. Carstairs: With a final supplementary to the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson). Will the

Minister undertake to contact the agencies to find out what difficulties they have encountered with regard to the failure to lay complaints properly through police channels, and will she make that information available so that the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) can take it with him to the official delegation?

Mrs. Oleson: Yes, I can certainly undertake to do that. My staff are meeting, as I said in my previous answer, with the agencies and that is one of the things that can be gathered and I will forward it to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

Reid-Sigurdson Report Recommendations

Ms. Judy Wasylcia-Leis (St. Johns): My question is for the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson). Concern is obviously growing on a day-to-day basis here in the House and in the broader community about child abuse and about effective response by this Government to child abuse cases.

In addition to recommendations around assistance to the police force, the Reid-Sigurdson Report recommended additional funds for each agency to support child abuse treatment workers and training programs for those workers. That money, money for that program of about \$1.2 million, was included in the previous Government's Budget.

Could the Minister tell this House if that \$1.2 million for child abuse treatment workers for each agency and for training programs for support of those workers is in this Budget, and whether or not she is prepared to commit herself to moving quickly and sensitively forward on the recommendations of the Reid-Sigurdson Report?

* (1345)

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Community Services): We have been attempting to meet the suggestions and recommendations of the Reid-Sigurdson Report. Many of those recommendations have already been met, but as I said before in response to the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), reports on all matters concerning funding are being brought back to me for an analysis in the very near future and we will be looking at all the needs of the agencies at that time.

Child Abuse Program Funding

Ms. Judy Wasylcia-Leis (St. Johns): Given that the Minister has indicated the money is not in the Budget for abuse treatment workers in each agency, could the Minister indicate here and now in this House, given the growing concern, if she is prepared to reinstate that \$1.2 million in her Budget to meet the going concerns of each agency, to allow each agency to provide front-line service and assistance for victims and families in crisis dealing with child abuse?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Community Services): I have indicated to the Member and to the

Members of this House that we are looking at all aspects of funding for every program in the Child and Family Services Agencies. This has been a gross lack of funding and attention over the last number of years, and that is why we got to this stage in the Child and Family Services Agencies where the system seems to be collapsing around our heads from lack of planning and foresight by the Government of which she was a Member.

Osborne House New Facilities

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, with another question to the Minister, I regret that we were not able to get assurances from her for reinstatement of the money to meet the Reid-Sigurdson Report. This is a sad day for the abused children and women of this province.—(Interjection)— Yes, and as I indicated to the Speaker—through you, Mr. Speaker, this is a new question.

Mr. Speaker: I have recognized the Honourable Member for a supplementary question. The Honourable Member for St. Johns will kindly put her question.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Given the fact that today is the deadline for the Government to put an offer in on a new building for Osborne House, in fact, the deadline is 15 minutes from this very moment, could the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson) indicate whether or not the Government was able to make that deadline, put in an offer on a new building and meet its commitments for a decent shelter for abused women and children in the City of Winnipeg?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): First of all, our department, the Housing Department or MHRC, has put in an offer. The offer went in a couple of days ago. However, at the time that we put in our offer we did not go in on a tendering process. As the Member probably appreciates, we cannot get involved in the tendering process. We even met with the delegation from the Salvation Army and gave them the offer two days ago, hoping that they would accept our offer. They are holding our offer pending until they receive all tenders.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: With a final supplementary to the Minister—I guess now to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). Given the fact that it has been seven weeks since this Government and this Minister responded to the fact that Osborne House came forward with options on buildings—it could offer as options for a suitable shelter—and given the fact that it is now once again facing the possibility of fines from this Department of Health, City of Winnipeg, for too many cases per space allowed under the regulations, could the Minister of Housing indicate to this House, give some assurances to the abused women of this province that this Government will deal with that situation, will ensure, while plans are being under way and to put a new shelter in place, that no fines—that the Osborne House board of directors will not be faced with dealing with the fines, and that this Government will take some responsibility for the situation at hand?

Mr. Ducharme: First of all, it has been a priority of this Government to deal with Osborne House. We started several weeks ago meeting with the people from Osborne House. They did select a couple of sites. We looked at these several sites. We put in an offer on a particular building that they felt was suitable for themselves. In the meantime, their solicitor had gone to the tendering process.

I can assure this House, on behalf of this Government, that if we are not available or that particular building that we put an offer on is not available, and I hope it is available, I can assure you that we will obtain another one.

* (1350)

Rafferty-Alameda Project Environmental Impact Study

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): I am not certain if I should pose my question to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) or the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner). They seem to be interchangeable these days.—(Interjection)— Exactly. They will decide when they hear the question.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner). As I mentioned yesterday in this House, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is not going to accept the environmental impact work prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Late yesterday, the EPA, in a public statement which I will table in the House, indicated its opposition to this inadequate and incomplete report and said the \$41 million of U.S. contributions should be withheld. The question is when is this Minister and this Government going to insist that the federal Government assist in carrying out a system-wide public environmental impact assessment for the Souris River Dam Project so that it, the Government, and Manitobans can fully know the repercussions likely from the project?

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources): The question that has been put is a question that is rather predictable in light of the fact that the EPA paper came out yesterday.

I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have assurances from the federal Minister, Mr. McMillan, and I have a letter in my hand, which I want to table, which indicates quite clearly that our interests are being protected and will be protected under new agreements.

It is also interesting that the EPA report indicates very clearly and supports the position that Manitoba has taken all along which indicates that we want a committee, an authority, that will have an ongoing responsibility of dealing not only with water quantity but also with water quality. We are quite pleased at the report. It will reinforce our position that we are taking at the negotiating table that will assure Manitobans of water quality as well as quantity.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Wolseley, with a supplementary question.

Mr. Taylor: Members on this side of the House are getting more than a little exasperated with the stonewalling that is going on by that Minister. When is the Minister going to accept that Manitoba's interests are in jeopardy as long as he is in ignorance of issues of water quality, water quantity, impacts on wildlife, dollar implications and the need for and to determine the scale of compensation?

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I somewhat resent the reference made to ignorance in this Chamber. When we want to compare knowledge of the issue that is before us, I think it is important also to recognize that when you negotiate, when there are four Parties negotiating—and when I refer to four Parties, I refer to Manitoba, the federal Government, the American Government and the Government of Saskatchewan—in protecting the standards of water quality in this province, you must recognize that there are certain things that have to be kept in confidence and are being kept in confidence.

I indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that the reference made to water quality here and the operation of the total Souris River system, which is referred to in this report, we concur with. It will, I indicate to you, substantiate our position and support our position in negotiations. We are quite pleased with this report.

Mr. Taylor: It will be interesting to know what the heck Manitoba's position is. Someday we might hear.

* (1355)

Technical Participation

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): The question, Mr. Speaker, is to the same Minister. In view of the fact that the negotiating committee euphemistically called the Technical Committee, in which the Minister places such great faith, is composed of representatives from Ottawa, Washington, North Dakota and Saskatchewan, as well, we think Manitoba, what assurances can the Minister give this House that Manitoba's concerns will not be bowled over by the contrary and obvious political interests of the other parties?

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources): As I have indicated, we have assurances from our federal Minister that our interest will be protected. However, I want to reiterate again what I have said previously in this Chamber. That is that we have an agreement between North Dakota and Manitoba which indicates very clearly the amount of water that will flow across the U.S. border. The agreement of 1909, which established the International Joint Commission, indicates also fairly clearly what the qualities of that water will be that will flow across that border. That protection we have today as we have always had.

It somewhat confounds me that the Honourable Member opposite has not taken the opportunity to read those two documents and assure himself that Manitoba's interests have been and will be protected at least to that level. However, we are negotiating at this time a better standard of water quality that we are

even assured under those two documents. If we can, and I think we can, because our American counterparts, our friends across the border, are as concerned about water quality as we are, and negotiations that are going on now will probably, hopefully, lead towards the establishment of a board that will not only monitor water quality but will in fact have the authority to operate the whole Souris River watershed system.

Headingley Jail Building Improvements

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, at a time when I was unable to hear the Honourable Member, he put questions to the Honourable Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health (Mr. Connery) regarding three issues of concern at the Headingley Correctional Institution.

The first issue was the matter of range bars which I understand has been an issue for some years. I can advise the Honourable Member that this Government has decided not to quibble or quarrel with Workplace Safety and Health or with the union involved at Headingley, but that we would move quickly, and that we have done. I can tell the Honourable Member that range bars will be installed by November 1 and that the work is proceeding according to schedule.

The second issue had to do with the removal of asbestos from the Headingley Institution. I am told that asbestos, to this date, has been removed from 95 percent of the inmate living areas and other high traffic areas. In lower traffic areas, asbestos tears are being reencapsulated as necessary and, where identified, the work is currently being performed. So on those two issues, virtually all inmate living areas and high traffic areas have been removed of this asbestos material; and the low traffic areas, asbestos tears are being reencapsulated as necessary where those tears or rips are discovered.

There was a third question raised by the Honourable Member on Monday. That question had to do with training of guards at correctional institutions for hostage-taking incidents. There is a training program for hostage taking situations provided to all correctional staff at their basic training. In situations where a hostage or hostages have been taken, the situation is immediately turned over to the RCMP or the Winnipeg City Police, whichever is applicable, so that their trained specialists can move in and look after those situations.

* (1400)

School Psychologists Licensing

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): My question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). The educational psychologists in Manitoba are not required to be registered in the Psychological Association of Manitoba. On the contrary, many school divisions in Manitoba have non-registered individuals providing extremely sensitive services to our most vulnerable citizens, our children, yet other health professional screening and

Wednesday, September 21, 1988

regulatory procedures are fairly restrictive when their services are provided in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education, what is this Government doing to protect Manitoba's children? Will he bring his department psychology registration practices in line with those of other regulated health professionals practising in Manitoba schools?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education): The programs that are offered throughout Manitoba with regard to the psychologists that offer services to school divisions certainly are in short supply across this province. There are some areas where we do not have psychologists who are operating in schools with current licences and the appropriate licensing conditions.

I can indicate that we have met with several school divisions who have raised this to our attention. At the present time, we are investigating the matter to ensure that in fact those psychologists can be licensed in an appropriate fashion as quickly as possible so that services provided to students are adequate and, indeed, we have the interest of students at heart.

Regulatory Standards

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): I have some real concerns that some individuals are merely calling themselves psychologists. Does the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) and his department have a position on whether or not the standards of the Psychological Association of Manitoba are met?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I guess in any field you will find that there are those individuals who perhaps do not meet the qualifications no matter which field you go into. I am sure you are going to find that. There are standards in place. The Department of Education is going to ensure that only those people who meet the criteria will be licensed.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, with a final supplementary.

Mrs. Yeo: To the same Minister, if rural school divisions wish to meet psychology regulatory standards in the same way that urban school divisions do, would the Minister provide these rural school divisions with the supervisory services of the department's own registered psychologist?

Mr. Derkach: That problem goes back a long way. It is not one that has just developed over night. As I had indicated to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo), we have met with several rural school divisions who have brought this problem to our attention. It is a problem that goes back to, I believe, 1980 or 1981. Although the past administration did not see fit to address it because of shortages in Budgets and for whatever other reason I do not know, I can assure the Honourable Member opposite that we are going to address this problem in the very near future and we will ensure the rural divisions are given the kinds of services that they surely deserve.

Rafferty-Alameda Project Federal Environmental Study

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). In light of the statements of his Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner) that he is delighted with the report which says that the project should stop in North Dakota, from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency—and the Minister has stated that he is delighted with that kind of report which says there will be major degradation of water quality in North Dakota and major degradation in water quantity in North Dakota—will the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) please take charge of this issue and write the Prime Minister in light of the fact that Mr. McMillan gave the House of Commons assurances on April 19 that the federal environmental review process would proceed with a mega project of this nature? He has broken his word when he issued that licence. Would he write the Prime Minister of this country now so Manitoba's interests could be looked at in a federal environmental impact study?

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources): Let me set the record straight, please. The document indicates that additional work on water quality protection is necessary before the project should proceed. That is what the document says.

Let me quote once more from the document: "Additional water quality documentation is necessary for the proposed action to comply with Section 3(13) of The Clean Water Act, and the 1909 Water Treaty Agreement." We agree with that. "Such assurances should be provided with the proposed operational plan in a national agreement and the upcoming agreement between the City of Minot and Saskatchewan, prior to the U.S. transfer of funds."

I would like to quote one further section from the statement which indicates that: "The proposed International Monitoring Committee to oversee operations will be an essential component to advise on the means and methods to avoid water quality problems. The proposed operational plan should include"—and the proposal, by the way, was presented by Manitoba—"the method to assure that water quality delivered across the border from the proposed project is able to meet State standards, not harmful, not harm the beneficial use of the Souris River in North Dakota." We agree with that.

Mr. Doer: You could read this report out of context all day long. The bottom line is the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States has recommended that this project cease and desist until certain environmental guarantees are made to North Dakota.

Water Quality

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). Given the fact that the federal Minister of Environment has given a licence for this project to proceed full speed ahead, will this First Minister write the Prime Minister

to overrule the federal Minister of Environment, who has totally neglected all of Manitoba's interests and has been contradicted by five officials now, independent of this issue, in terms of its impact on the water quality and water quantity to Manitoba?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Just to ensure that there is no further misinformation put on the record, it is not a final licence. It was an interim licence that was granted by Mr. McMillan that allows as part of the conditions of that licence that they have to provide assurances for Manitoba of quality and quantity of water supplies. Those are the assurances that are currently being discussed as to the form in which those assurances are committed and the form in which ultimately that water that is delivered to us is both of the quality and quantity that we must have here in Manitoba. That is part of the ongoing process. That is part of the discussions that involve all the decision makers at the table.

Our final guarantees are under the Boundary Water Treaties Act of 1909, whereupon the water coming to us from the United States into Canada is the water that we have to ensure is of the quality and quantity that we must have. That is the assurance that we are seeking as part of the discussions; that is the assurance that we have been told in writing by the Honourable Tom McMillan we will be getting. Until there is any evidence to the contrary that we will not be getting the quality and quantity that we are assured of, we cannot take it a step further. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we have been assured of that quality and quantity. Should there be any evidence to say that we are not going to get that quality and quantity of water, we will take further action.

Federal Environmental Study

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Concordia, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there have been five independent sources in seven days that have completely contradicted this Government and these Government Ministers. My question to the First Minister, why will he not stand up for Manitoba? Why is he playing second fiddle to Grant Devine? Why will he not write the Prime Minister and immediately demand the federal environmental impact study which all the evidence in the last six days totally directs this province to push for in terms of our rights as Manitobans?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this matter continues to be the subject of discussion and negotiation with all of the various players at the table: the federal Government of the United States, the federal Government of Canada, our Government, the Government of Saskatchewan.

We have had comments from five different sources that said, if we did not have the assurances of flow, if we did not have the assurances of quality, then we ought to be concerned. That is why we are saying we are not satisfied unless we get those assurances that

the project is a worthwhile project. We have made that position known, it is exactly the position we are putting at the table. No final sign off, no final agreement will be reached until those assurances are provided in the form that is acceptable to us.

Mental Health Psychogeriatric Care

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): My question is for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). The Psychogeriatric Planning Committee researched and prepared a report which is dated March 1988. This report contains a number of recommendations which could have a big impact on the provincial services. Could the Minister tell this House if he has read the report and discussed it with that committee?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, no.

Mr. Cheema: My question is again to the same Minister. Will the Minister now table this report and inform Manitobans what are the recommendations?

Mr. Orchard: As we have discussed on many occasions, the Deputy Minister of Mental Health Services, my department, people in the Manitoba Health Services Commission are all focusing on issues of mental health. Psychogeriatric care is one portion of this range of services that Manitobans are expecting us to deliver in growing quantity and quality. I simply tell my honourable friend that the direction that will be taken in mental health is in the formulation stages because, quite frankly, there has not been in the past number of years the kind of focus on the delivery of mental health services necessary to assure complete and quality delivery of mental health services.

I look forward to the Estimates debate, if we can ever get out of Industry, Trade and Technology, and Community Services, to get on with the discussion of pressing issues in health, and I look forward to my honourable friend's contribution at that time.

* (1410)

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary, we had this report which was ready in the month of March 1988, and its recommendations will have a great impact on the elderly services for Manitoba. My question is to the Minister: what are his plans to implement such a program and why has he not read this report so far?

Mr. Orchard: In the very specific discipline of psychogeriatric psychiatry, there is no training program available in Manitoba. It is my understanding there is no training program available in Canada. For psychogeriatric psychiatry as a specialty, we have to access training in Great Britain is the last indication I received from the department on that. That specific discipline is in very short supply, not only in Manitoba but indeed across Canada.

We are faced with a number of challenges, not only in Manitoba but across Canada, of an elderly population

who are in our personal care homes and indeed in their residences, who are disoriented, who are suffering more and more, it seems, from Alzheimer's disease which is indeed a very serious affliction of the elderly. Across this nation, we are having difficulties as Governments, regardless of political stripe, in (a) addressing those needed services; and (b) having the competent and trained professionals in psychogeriatric services available to bring those programs to focus.

Affirmative Action Removal of Restrictions

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): My question is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). Yesterday in this House, the Minister responsible for Labour and the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission (Mr. Connery) said in a statement in response to a question that the Affirmative Action Program in the province was in jeopardy because the collective agreement signed between the province and the Manitoba Government Employees' Association was restricting affirmative action candidates from applying for two-thirds of the jobs in the Civil Service.

My question is does the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) agree with this Minister's interpretation of the collective agreement? Does the First Minister believe that there is anything in the collective agreement which conflicts with The Civil Service Act? Does the First Minister believe that this Minister should still be in charge of the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The point that has to be made—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Filmon: There is a star in the East and it shall be a sign, right?

The fact of the matter is that this Government is committed to affirmative action. This Government is looking at every avenue that might prevent us from having a proper Affirmative Action Program, whereby men and women of all walks of life, of all backgrounds in Manitoba can equally access opportunities within the Civil Service of Manitoba. My Minister responsible and all of his colleagues and I are going to do everything possible to remove the impediments to ensure that affirmative action can be properly implemented in Manitoba for the benefit of all Manitobans.

Minister Removal

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): I would be afraid to say I agreed with that Minister, too. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister on Monday evening gave a diatribe to this House on his views of affirmative action. He was told at that time by the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), he has been told by the commissioner of the Civil Service, Mr. Hart, and the president of the MGEA that he is wrong. My question is a simple one to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). Will he remove this responsibility from this Minister?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): My Minister responsible for the Civil Service (Mr. Connery) has said on numerous occasions that he wants to ensure that affirmative action can be utilized for the benefit of all the minorities in Manitoba, can be utilized to ensure that they are represented well within the Civil Service hiring of this province. He has indicated that he is prepared to remove any impediments and to ensure that artificial targets that restrict the ability of the Civil Service to apply affirmative action principles are removed. That is what we are working towards. That is what is the policy of this Government, and that is what my Minister responsible is working to accomplish.

Policies

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that it concerns all of the people of Manitoba, particularly those who might fall into the affirmative action category, that the impediments that the Minister sees are in his mind not in the collective agreement and not in The Civil Service Act.

Will the First Minister, at a minimum, request the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission (Mr. Connery) to send a letter to the various groups who have an interest in affirmative action and set the record straight so that people can be assured that there is an affirmative action policy, it is not contradicted by the collective agreement, and that The Civil Service Act will be enforced in this province and we will have an effective Affirmative Action Program?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, throughout the time that we were in Opposition, Members in my caucus and I constantly met with minority groups who complained at the fact that affirmative action under the NDP was only so much rhetoric. There was no conviction involved in the application of affirmative action and there were no results that they were satisfied with under the former Government. I will not take any lecturing from him or any Members of his caucus or any of his colleagues about affirmative action. They had an opportunity for six-and-a-half years and they failed miserably. We are going to achieve our goals and the goals of the minorities in Manitoba with respect to affirmative action.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Bills as listed on today's Order Paper, with the exception of Bills Nos. 21 and 23?

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 4—THE RE-ENACTED STATUTES OF MANITOBA, 1988, ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 4.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Am I talking to myself? The Re-enacted Statutes of Manitoba, 1988, Act. Order, please.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, that Bill is standing in my name. I would like it to continue to stand in my name but, if there are other Members who wish to speak to it, I certainly would have no objection.

BILL NO. 5—THE STATUTE RE-ENACTMENT ACT, 1988

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 5, The Statute Re-enactment Act, 1988; Loi de 1988 sur la réadoption de lois, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): No, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I did not hear the motion. Could that remain standing in the Member for Thompson's (Mr. Ashton) name? Certainly, again, if there is anyone who wishes to speak to it, we would be more than happy to concede.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of the Environment and Workplace Safety and Health (Mr. Connery), Bill No. 6, The Fires Prevention Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la prévention des incendies, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz). (Stand)

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): Mr. Speaker, just to . . .

* (1420)

BILL NO. 6—THE FIRES PREVENTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Niakwa on Bill No. 6, but is there leave to leave it in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz), leave it standing in his name?

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): Standing in the name of Mr. Pankratz, but—

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

Mr. Herold Driedger: Mr. Speaker, we have here before us a small amendment to be added to the The Fires Prevention Amendment Act with respect to having tuition fees payable at central fire colleges to be established so that these fees, when the students come to these colleges, actually can pay for part of the cost of their tuition. I believe that there is ample precedent for this particular Bill to be added herein.

For instance, at all of these colleges, teachers need to be paid, equipment needs to be purchased. Labs and the facilities therefore need to be provided, and

all of these are costly items. When a citizen, regardless whether they are being asked to come from external areas or whether they come internally, come to get this particular training and experience, they leave with a skill. The skill is transportable to other jurisdictions. Since it is transportable, it is legitimate to ask that since there is vested interest on the part of the student to gain this skill, there should be also some concomitant responsibility on his or her part to provide for some of the training that they are obtaining. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that some of the costs should be borne by the recipient.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mark Minenko, in the Chair.)

Although I do wish to call as an exception here when we ask for volunteers who may be pressed into service for the sake of fighting fires due to the exigency of the moment. Being called into service, to be pressed into service, they require quick training which must be provided for them. Since they are not actually attempting to gain the skill for themselves, it is understandable that they should not be expected to pay for the cost of their tuition.

Furthermore, it should also be pointed out and it was pointed out by several of the other speakers that, particularly for our northern region when you have volunteers being asked to serve in small communities, to serve as the only expertise for the purposes of extinguishing fires, be these fires local, in a town or in a village or whether they are burning out of control on Crown lands and forests, we have people asked to provide this service. Since they have been asked to provide this service, it is also needful that the people who ask or the agency that asks be prepared to underwrite to some degree the costs of their training.

So we have actually two exceptions that could be introduced here, two exceptions to the requirement that students pay for or help pay for some of the tuition costs of their training, these exceptions dealing with volunteers whether they are, as I indicated, called to serve quickly because of an emergency or asked to serve as a body of expertise, a body of trained personnel and, for this reason, then being brought to wherever the college may exist, whether that provision for that service is in Winnipeg, in Brandon, Thompson, or wherever. Their costs should then be underwritten.

There are also ample precedents within the Act itself, that people who are—not necessarily the people, but the fact that charges that can be attributable to, or expenses that are incurred by in any case of fire, fire hazard removal or whatever, the costs are turned back either to the municipality in which the fire occurs or to the town in which the fire occurs or even to be borne by the person to whom an order may be attributable if a cost of any work done is taken by him or her.

There are ample precedents; Section 25(2) is one of them. There are also ample precedents within the Act under Section 27(1)(3) which also clearly indicates that if there is a cost incurred in the suppression of a fire, in the extinguishing of a fire, then say the council of any municipality within a wooded district, for example, after it has done everything necessary to extinguish the blaze, the costs thereof, the expenses thereof, shall

be borne by the municipality. It is also clearly indicated in the same section that any costs and expenses incurred by Government in controlling or extinguishing fires can be put back to the municipality if the Government has actually undertaken to put those fires out on behalf of the municipality.

There is also further precedent within the Act—precedent for preventative action under which the training of firefighters could be classified under, if there is preventative action required to the cost thereof, and I believe this is Section 57(18) and (19). If the action is taken by the municipality under a preventative situation where the building may be deteriorated to such an extent or it may be under such conditions that its removal is desired, as though it is not a fire hazard, the municipality may cause the building structure to be removed or destroyed and charge the cost thereof to the owner of the building or the structure.

Furthermore, under 57(19), costs charged against an owner under subsection (18) are a debt due from him or her to the municipality and may be recovered by an action in court of any competent jurisdiction. So once again the precedent for having this amendment in The Fires Prevention Act is clear. If there is a cost incurred and the suppression of the fire, or the training, or the prevention for having a fire occur, the costs incurred can be charged back to the people who benefit directly.

In this instance, I think we have, very specifically, to point out that the student who either from within the province or from without the province comes to one of our local fire colleges for training, it is understandable that they are going to get a skill from this which can then be charged back to them. Therefore, they should know these things up front.

Furthermore, before I leave entirely the section on precedents, there is a section under 66(2) where the administration of the Act is declared to be costing money and expenses for the administration of the Act can be defrayed through the imposition of taxes. Here again, since the administration of the Act costs the Government money, the training of firefighters costs the Government money at this moment in time. If you wish to defray some of those costs, you can legitimately charge them back to the student.

Now, the tuition fees, we all understand, are not wholly and totally recoverable. Even in our university situations, if we say that the student is paying tuition fees, he or she is certainly not paying for the full cost of their instruction. There is still much cost thereof, which is supported through taxation, through grants from the provincial Government, perhaps even grants from the federal Government under certain instances.

So once again the tuition fees, although not wholly recoverable, should help defray the cost of instruction. This is a legitimate charge to be laid back to the student who is gaining the benefit of the particular instruction.

I wish also to draw some attention to some of the comments made in this House with respect to this amendment by speakers. Now I am not sure in their comments, whether they were speaking in favour of

the amendment or against, but suggesting perhaps that the amendment was not precisely written sufficiently clearly enough because I believe the intent, when the Member from Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) spoke, I believe his comments dealt with the fact that the amendment was not explicit enough.

* (1430)

I believe he was drawing attention to the fact that at some future point in time, because laws are written in clear English, and it is the interpretation of this law which is actually applied, so that at some future point in time the intent which might not be that people from inside our province, particularly in this case northern residents who were to receive training in our fire colleges, should not be expected to pay for the cost of their tuition. Volunteers or fire chiefs or deputy fire chiefs should not be expected to pay for their tuition.

I believe the intent of that comment was to state that these people being asked to come to gain this expertise by the Government or by an agency should not be expected to pick up the cost themselves. I believe I addressed that myself earlier when I said that in such a case this is a certainly reasonable statement to make.

In the same address to the House, the same Member mentioned and referred to the fact that the Minister, when he introduced this particular amendment, indicated that the previous Government had this amendment in the works and that it had actually been the previous Government that wished to add this amendment to the Act, and that because it was attributable to the previous Government, therefore nobody on this side of the House should oppose the amendment.

Well, I can sympathize with that particular comment because I do not believe anybody on the other side can state categorically that this specific amendment was the amendment that was intended by the previous Government. But flowing out of that line of argument then, the Member from Thompson (Mr. Ashton) suggested then that because it was not the intent that counts in a court of law but rather the specific wording, he felt therefore that the amendment should be amended still more to be very, very explicit as to what the words intended.

I maintain that if all of the previous rhetoric is accepted as fact and this amendment was actually to be introduced by the previous Government as written—and I will not claim that this is the case—but if we follow the rhetoric of those two particular Members' addresses, then it seems to me that actually the intent of that particular amendment was to include the tuition fees to be paid by all people gaining the particular experience within any of the fire colleges in Manitoba, whether they came from outside of the province or not.

I use as my rationale for that conclusion simply some of the things that were already addressed by the previous Government, particularly with respect to some of the taxes imposed in the Budget of '87, where we had all those statements to the contrary made in the news releases to state that these taxes were not actually unfairly assigned, but actually most of the taxes that

were imposed would impact most heavily on low income earners. I refer specifically to the tax on net income, also the increase in sales tax, and even the general increase in diesel fuel tax which would hit, although I know we have large corporations which do not find these taxes quite in the same detrimental light, but small businesses, small truckers would be hurt thereby.

Also in that same Budget, we had the typical increase in taxes to tobaccos, the increase in taxes on alcohols and including a land transfer tax which hits people who are purchasing and selling homes—first-time home buyers.

In addition, that same Government did apply increases to cost of Government services such as the application and receipt of births—birth certificates and increases in the cost of licensing. All of these costs did go up.

So I maintain that the arguments that were made by both those speakers as they spoke to this Bill—and I cannot, from the kind of comments they made, decide that they spoke in favour of or against the particular amendment—indicated in their comments that actually the intent, if the amendment can be interpreted to be so general as to actually include all of the students that come to fire colleges, whether they be northern students, rural students, urban students, Manitoba students, or out-of-province students, or even out-of-state students, that the cost of their tuition should be borne to some degree by them. I believe that was the intent even if the amendment, particularly if the amendment was part of the previous Government's desire to introduce it before it was so hurriedly precipitated out of office.

However, with respect to the specific amendment in front of us which states that the desire on the part within the Act to have the students pay tuition fees payable at a central fire college cut on behalf of their own training, if that comes specifically right out of the new Government and the new Government's desire to amend this Act, then once again, as I stated in my first comments, in my earlier remarks, these are precedented throughout the Act and should be included therefore. Furthermore, except for the two exceptions where we actually state that the Government or an agency asks a volunteer to come to its aid in one respect to another, those should then be accepted and should not be required to subsidize the cost of their education.

But in all other cases, where people are coming specifically for training which will provide for them a skill, a skill which is transportable to another jurisdiction, in those cases I believe it is only sound and only proper that the student does provide for some of the cost of his instruction, and I grant you that none of these costs will be totally absorbed within the tuition fees. It is impossible for us to actually charge the full value for what that student will get. But at least some portion of that training should be attributable to be the responsibility of that student. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe the debate stands in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz).

Is it agreed by the House to allow the Bill to remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye? (Agreed)

* (1440)

**BILL NO. 8—THE COURT OF
QUEEN'S BENCH SMALL CLAIMS
PRACTICES AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 8, The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak).

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I wish that the Bill would continue to stand in the Member for The Pas' (Mr. Harapiak) name. However, I would like to speak on this Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to speak in support of Bill No. 8 which is an amendment to The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act. I think that these amendments are ones that we had planned to implement while in Government. We had made a number of improvements to The Small Claims Practices Act. The Member for Virden (Mr. Findlay) has indicated there was an intervening event that made our plans go awry insofar as this was concerned, although this was a very high priority. We had, a number of years previous, increased the maximum limit to \$3,000 from, I believe, a few hundred dollars at one point—\$500 I believe it was. I believe that the move to \$5,000 is indeed a good one and one that most people in Manitoba would applaud.

Most average citizens out there who have not a lot of understanding of the court system are intimidated by the whole process, I believe, have had very little experience in dealing with the courts, and therefore feel compelled in many cases to let justice be put aside, even if it is not in their favour in some instances because of this feeling of intimidation of the court system.

I believe therefore that these amendments will be very acceptable to a broad spectrum of Manitoba society who would like to see greater access and expediency in the court system. Certainly, in many cases, the delays that are put in place in remanding cases are just deplorable and are cause for concern by so many people who really do not see justice done in the court system because of this enormous cost and enormous time that is lost because of remand of even small claims that they may have. In many cases the only reason they pursue them in the end is because they want to see justice done, not because they believe they are going to get a rightful benefit as a result of the court case, even if they win it.

It is an amendment that is long overdue and one that I feel very strongly about in supporting. In saying

that, I think as well there are some other benefits here, and one of them is that I think this will reduce the court costs involved in processing claims. A lot of the small cases would actually be heard in the Court of Queen's Bench courts, and in those particular cases would be very time consuming and again, as I mentioned, the remands which are of course are of great concern to people who are involved in those cases, but also the costs involved, the costs of judges and other employees of the court system, the tremendous costs of processing these claims certainly has to be dealt with.

I believe that this Bill will to some extent meet that end because it will reduce the number of cases that are actually being dealt with by the higher courts, and in doing so, in reducing costs there and time there, will ensure that cases that are legitimately before those higher courts can be given the time that they should be given in a timely way, and that the kinds of investment in effort and time in processing those claims in the higher courts are legitimately dealt with there.

I think this has a number of the benefits, and I am hopeful that it will reduce the log jam in the Court of Queen's Bench and therefore again restore some credibility in the court system in terms of perception by the average person out there who is faced with court cases.

I think as well an important feature of this Bill is that it does allow for default judgments in favour of the plaintiff even when the defendant has not disputed the claims. In the current situation, the fact is that for those people who may not even dispute a claim, the defendants, hearings still have to be undertaken in a court system, thus again resulting in costs in processing those claims and harassment of a plaintiff in an unnecessary way, putting him through that kind of pressure-filled situation even though there really is no contest insofar as the dispute is concerned. There is no desire even to dispute the fact that the plaintiff has a legitimate case and yet they are tied up in court, and at times indefinitely in a very costly way.

So I think that is a very important factor and will ensure that those people who are using the Small Claims Court system will get results within a 60-day period in most cases, instead of having them remanded for an indefinite period of time, and will indeed get results even when there is no defendant filing a dispute to the case, without having to have a hearing.

As well, I want to indicate that in the raising of the limit from \$3,000 to \$5,000, I am not sure \$5,000 is the right limit. I think it could perhaps even be higher than that and of course, with experience in the small claims system over the next number of years, that we will be able to undoubtedly determine whether that is a legitimate level. Perhaps it should be \$8,000 or \$10,000, but I think it will open up the number of claims that are heard in the Small Claims Court, again adding to the credibility of this particular court jurisdiction.

I have not had personal experience of having a claim in the Small Claims Court, but have a number of acquaintances who have had that experience in the past. I, in speaking for them here today, would indicate their frustration with the process, would indicate their

lack of confidence in the process, would indicate the failure of justice, in many cases, in the process at the present time; and, therefore, I would indicate that they would very strongly support what we are doing here today.

I think we might even want to go further in the future to consider whether, indeed, when lawyers are billing individuals for work that is carried out, that perhaps their clients would even be able to take their lawyers to Small Claims Court if they disagreed with the figure. At the present time, I just do not know how an individual can dispute the level of the billing that he gets from that particular lawyer. In many cases, it is very costly and it looks that maybe only a few hours work were done, as Mr. Deputy Speaker may appreciate, having had some experience in there—certainly very valuable time, I have to admit—the legal profession, of course, being very demanding.

On the other hand, I am not always certain that there is justification. I think there could be a valid argument made, to put it in a very soft way, as to whether that level of billing was indeed fair for the individual client. I believe that there should be some consideration given to an opportunity for an individual person to have some recourse somewhere if he does not agree or she does not agree with the billing that he or she is given. I would like to see that considered, for example, in the Small Claims Courts.

There may be other areas that should be considered, such as institutional billings that occur. To the average citizen, it is very difficult to meet those kinds of payments in some instances. It might be Government charges for various services or Crown corporations, and yet I do not know that it is the right of an individual to take those kinds of Government institutions to Small Claims Court. Again, some consideration could be given to meeting that need, that gap, in the future.

I think we have to make the court system more accessible to the public in general, to demystify the court system. I think if we look at even the whole issue of real estate transactions, the costs there, the legal costs associated, to say nothing of the real estate costs at some 6 percent which seems outrageous, or 7 percent of the costs of a particular home with the costs going up in many cases, particularly in eastern Canada, one would wonder. In western Canada and homes in Manitoba are fairly reasonable, but the argument is made even more strongly, I guess, in those jurisdictions where there is a very high cost of homes. The percentage does not seem to make sense. It does not seem fair that these real estate agents will have to do relatively the same work for a house worth \$10,000 or \$20,000 as opposed to one worth \$200,000 or \$300,000; yet they get 10 times as much money for the same effort in those cases. I just do not think it is a fair and reasonable system.

* (1450)

In the same way, I do not think that the individual who is purchasing a home and one who is selling should have to pay the kind of legal costs that are associated in many cases with these transactions, in many cases,

quite routine and I believe could be handled by non-legal people, whether it be the individual him or herself or other paraprofessionals who could conduct this work on their behalf. As a matter of fact, I understand that legal secretaries actually do most of the work in these transactions. Very little work is actually done by the lawyers themselves. It is all handled by their secretaries. So they are paralegals. In some cases, some of the home builders have paralegals on staff to do most of this work.

I think we have to look at that area and see whether there is some opportunity to demystify the process and allow the average citizen to by-pass the legal complexities of some of these deals or at least the legal requirements. I guess I am contradicting myself when I say complexities because I do not always believe that there are those complexities and yet the requirements are there that you have to get a lawyer to do this certain work.- (Interjection)- That is the point being made. A Member is raising the fact that in legal firms, even though they have paraprofessionals carrying out and undertaking most of this work, they still charge the same as if it was a lawyer's time involved. There is the unfairness in the current system. It seems, in those instances, we should have some major changes.

I know that in talking to constituents, to neighbours, to friends, that there is widespread concern for the requirements for lawyers in many instances where the general belief is, from the rank and file citizens, that indeed it is not required and it should not be required. I think that the Government could do well to work in that area to demystify some of the processes involving real estate, involving legal fees, so that the citizens would not have to pay the kinds of exorbitant fees that they have to pay at the present time and would have some recourse to dispute those fees if they feel that they are not fair. That does not seem to be available to them at the present time.

With those few words, I want to indicate that I do support this Bill. I believe that it will serve to provide accessibility to the legal system for many, many people. It will tend to demystify the system somewhat to make it less intimidating and certainly more accessible. With that, I would like to support the Bill and indicate that it is standing in my colleague's name for debate when it next comes up. Of course, if anyone else wants to speak at this time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure that my colleague would have no objections to that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to allow the debate on this Bill to continue in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak)? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 9—STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (RE-ENACTED STATUTES) ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 9, Statute Law Amendment (Re-enacted Statutes) Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway). (Stand)

BILL NO. 11—THE CHILD CUSTODY ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 11, The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), 16 minutes remaining.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): I am delighted to be able to carry on with discussion on Bill No. 11, and to raise general concerns and issues pertaining to child access and enforcement provisions, both through this legislative proposal and by way of the pilot project announced by the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) on July 29, 1988.

When the discussion on this debate closed on Friday, September 16, I was referring to the active role and participation of many of the groups in Manitoba around family law provisions, and specifically around access enforcement, and had focused particularly on the advice provided by the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and was proceeding to comment on the advice and recommendations of the Charter of Rights Coalition, the Manitoba Branch. The advice of that organization must be taken into account by the Government, must be heeded very carefully by all of us as we deal with this legislation since it is a very important umbrella group here in Manitoba.

It is a coalition of 10 different member groups, including the Elizabeth Fry Society of Manitoba, Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba, Junior League of Winnipeg, the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women, Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, the Manitoba Association of Women and the Law, National Action Committee on the Status of Women, the Provincial Council of Women, the United Church of Canada and the Young Women's Christian Association.

So it is important to recognize the significance of this coalition organization, but it is also important to recognize it for the fact that it has an independent voice and speaks separate from all of those individual entities, as well as constituting an umbrella voice for the 10 different organizations. That organization, CORC of Manitoba, has made some serious suggestions to the Government of Manitoba, has made some serious recommendations to the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) with respect to both the proposed legislation, Bill No. 11, as well as the Pilot Access Assistance Program.

Let me refer specifically to a couple of their recommendations since they impact very heavily on both the legislative amendments and on the pilot program. In correspondence that does date back to even before the time of this Government, CORC had made a serious recommendation that any move, any attempt to introduce a program, to deal with access assistance or access enforcement must, of course, be preceded by legislative amendment. It recommended that any such amendments be passed prior to commencing any portion of the program. I think the intention of that was to ensure that all components of a very important program such as this one would be

put in place and operational from the outset, and that this would clearly demonstrate the Government's commitment to ensuring the needs of custodial parents are addressed in a real way by an access enforcement program.

* (1500)

That relates to the comments I made last Friday regarding the timing of the pilot program and, of course, the legislation. My counterparts in the Liberal Party, in the Liberal Opposition, have focused to date specifically on a perceived delay in the program and on the fact that although it was announced to commence on February 1, there are some real signs in the community that the commencement of this pilot project will actually be much later.

Certainly, timing is important and chaos in the system is something that must be taken into account since there would appear to be some chaos or some uncertainty around this Government's timetable and this Government's plan of action. I certainly share some of the concerns around the confusion with respect to the start of this pilot project.

However, I think the position of the NDP caucus would be somewhat different from the Liberal Party's position in that our first concern would be the full passage of these amendments and implementation of all components of the program before this pilot project is actually under way, because, as I said in my remarks previously, any false start, any wrong start, any additional chaos or confusion in the system would not be good for the future of such a project, would not bode well for the work that must be carried on in the weeks and months and years ahead.

As well, related to the question of timing, there is a real concern on our part about adequate resourcing and adequate compensation. I mentioned in remarks previously that there must be a commitment on the part of this Government to ensure that this program is resourced to meet the many demands and the many dimensions of such a major undertaking.

As well, it would be important to ensure that this legislation adequately addresses the question of compensation as it relates specifically to custodial parents. There is certainly a concern on my part, on the part of my caucus and on the part of organizations like CORC about the compensation provisions in the legislation, and certainly a feeling of uncertainty about what the compensation or reimbursement provisions of the legislation actually mean.

In both sections of Bill No. 11 that refer to compensation, there is a mention of "reimbursement to the applicant for any reasonable expenses actually incurred as a result of the wrongful denial of access." It would certainly be a matter of concern on our part to have some clarification of that and to ensure that the legislation adequately compensates beyond what I would assume to be part of this legislation, the child care costs and inconvenience, to ensure that it includes compensation for such things as job loss or loss of seniority as a result of repeated late shows or no shows. So it will be very much our intention, as this Bill is dealt

with by the Chamber and at committee level, to seek clarification of the extent of compensation that will be possible through Bill No. 11, and to have some clarification of that very important matter.

A second concern that has been raised, a second suggestion that has been raised by organizations like the Advisory Council on the Status of Women and now CORC, the group I am referring to most recently, is about the referral of the custodial parent to the access enforcement lawyer. It is their view that it is essential where access enforcement through the program is denied to the access parent because the caseworker assesses enforcement to be detrimental to the child.

Let me put that again on the record so that I will quote directly from a presentation made by the Charter of Rights Coalition so that it is clearly understood by the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) and Members of this Government. To quote from this document: "CORC remains of the opinion that referral of the custodial parent to the access enforcement lawyer is essential, where access enforcement through the program is denied to the access parent because the caseworker assesses enforcement to be detrimental to the child."

In other words, where the worker assesses that a child is at risk, where access is to be enforced, surely there is a responsibility, particularly for a Government department, to ensure that such risk is alleviated or removed altogether.

Finally, let me mention, Mr. Chairperson, a concern that has been brought to our attention and I hope is being considered by the Attorney-General and his colleagues—a concern that relates to confidentiality and privilege. How will we ensure that information gathered in confidential mediation remains privileged if it is also subpoenaable, and how do we ensure that necessary and appropriate variation in orders occurs if caseworker reports are not subpoenaable?

What we have been able to determine from the press release and from the legislation does not really indicate to us whether the caseworker reports would be subpoenaable, as has been suggested in the past. So there are some contradictions on this point and we certainly want to seek clarification around this program and around that particular aspect pertaining to confidentiality.

There are many aspects that one could cover with respect to this legislation as it covers a very important far-reaching area, that of child custody enforcement. I am sure that the committee dealing with this legislation will fairly review every angle and every aspect pertaining to child custody and child enforcement.

Let me conclude my remarks by again saying, as I have said on previous occasions, that it is very important for all of us in this Chamber to take a very serious look and give serious attention to family law and to do so from—and to ensure that it is done so from the Status of Women perspective. Often that perspective has been ignored, often it has been too late in coming to the attention of decision makers, and as a result, we still have considerable distance to go in order to ensure full treatment and equal treatment of men and

women before the law and through our judicial system. I would, on that note, reiterate in as strong a way as possible what I said earlier, and that was to seek from our Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) a commitment to table the published and ready to go White Paper on Family Law. Again, I was very, very disturbed to receive a letter from the Attorney-General suggesting that, and to quote from his letter of August 18: "The White Paper that was being prepared by the previous administration is in part obsolete because the Government has decided to proceed immediately with the Access Assistance Program."

In fact, access assistance was just one tiny, tiny part of the White Paper on Family Law. That White Paper on Family Law was a review of all family law aspects, was a review of every major area that has been a part of family law as we know it for a good number of years. It was certainly the intention of the previous administration to seek the opinion of Manitobans about all aspects of family law with a view to updating and changing our legislation and programs as was suggested by those organizations.

* (1510)

To conclude, since my time has come to a close, I would like to emphasize that we, once again, ensure that all aspects of family law are dealt with thoroughly by this Legislature, that we move forward on reasonable amendments and provisions around access enforcement, but at no time should we lose sight of the work that is before us, and that we continue to find ways to update and upgrade and renew a commitment to existing legislation and programs in the family law area. I will certainly be urging, and all of us will be urging the Attorney-General to table the White Paper on Family Law.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member's time is over.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): I rise with pleasure this afternoon to speak to Bill No. 11, The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act.

Our society has developed into one in which divorce is almost as frequent as marriage is, and we know that at least one in three marriages in this country will end in divorce. The very fabric of our society is being torn apart, and society is forced to come to grips with the fact that the nuclear family does not always remain together. We are forced as a society to actually reweave that fabric into a different pattern and ensure that we have social services which are available, not to support the existing nuclear families but to also assist families where in fact divorce does occur, where family breakup does occur.

As politicians in particular, we have a responsibility to grapple with the issues which do face our society and their families, issues which face not just Canadians but of course Manitobans. We recognize that it is incumbent upon politicians and particularly the Government of the Day to make very tough decisions about the priorities for providing social services, and to make very tough decisions about the types of social services which the Government will afford to families.

We are not talking, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about services just within the realm of health care, providing services to young families in the area of health promotion and disease prevention. We are not just speaking about social services which deal with care of the elderly and our mentally handicapped in the community. We are not just speaking of services to families in regard to child protection services. What we are referring to as well are services to families who are in chaos in their life, where the nuclear family is in disarray and where very much needed social services must be made available for the children of those families, for the parents of those families, and for the extended family as well.

In the Province of Manitoba, we have seen a move in the last four or five years towards a recognition that such services, the Unified Family Court system, Family Conciliation Services, that these services are very, very necessary and in fact should be an integral part of the social services system.

The Family Conciliation Services have moved, within Winnipeg anyway, from a dismal existence in the basement of the Fort Osborne complex where they were not as a group of individuals and services given access to information such as even how to create a database. They were not in a location which was at all amenable to having families come in and spend some time with them. There was no development and no written objectives as to what exactly the purpose of Family Conciliation Services was. We saw a service some five or six years ago which was very, very much in disarray, relegated to the basement of a Government building and which never saw the light of day in terms of the staff or in terms of the services.

In the last four or five years, and we must give credit to the previous administration, in particular to the managers who were involved with Family Conciliation Services and to the staff who decided that it was time that some priority be given to Family Conciliation Services. One of the first steps in priority was that they remove from this basement atmosphere and were allowed to have their office space at the Woodsworth Building which was far more accessible to the courts and to lawyers. What we saw was the beginning of a system whereby Family Conciliation Services became part of a very comprehensive, multidisciplinary team approach to services to families who were in the midst of family break-up.

We have developed in this province one of the best across Canada in terms of the REMO Program, a Reciprocal Enforcement Maintenance Orders Program. Our Family Conciliation Services provide conciliation counselling for families. They provide comprehensive mediation services and they also are involved with the assessment and reporting. So we see again where the multidisciplinary team approach comes into play. We have judges who specifically ask Family Conciliation Services to provide assessment, home studies, to provide reports to the courts as to the atmosphere, where there are custody disputes, where might be the best place in the best interests of the child for that child to remain either with the father or the mother. We see services where lawyers get involved with family

disputes and then parents may come to a lawyer and say the family is going to break up; where there seems to be, in the eyes of the lawyer, some reason that perhaps there can be some mediation that is done or even some conciliation.

The lawyers then do refer to Family Conciliation Services so that there can be some conciliation counselling carried on or in fact, where it has been decided that a breakup is inevitable and rather than wanting to go into a long expensive custody dispute, the Family Conciliation Services do offer mediation services, so that a father and a mother are afforded the opportunity of sitting down with a third person who is neutral, who can assist the father and the mother in perhaps working out some agreements in regard to the best interests of the children in relation to custody.

In some ways, it is unfortunate that society has moved in the direction whereby we find it necessary to offer these types of services. However, there has to be the recognition on the part of politicians, particularly, that our changing society and our changing families is a fact of life and what we must do to provide social services is ensure that when we are dealing with situations such as this that the best possible service is available to these families.

As we review The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act, I think a recognition has to be made that this is not simply a woman's issue or is not simply a mother's issue. Certainly, we recognize that in the past and still today oftentimes it is the woman, it is the mother who is disadvantaged when it comes to family break-ups in terms of her feelings of responsibility towards the children, in terms of the economics as to what her economic status is. We recognize that our Family Law in this province has come a long way to ensure that the women's rights are protected.

But we must not lose sight that fathers have rights too. What we want to do is ensure that both parents, in a given situation, are treated as fair and treated as equal. I think that is very, very important. We know that it has become necessary for groups of fathers to actually band together and form organizations. They feel, in the past, that they have not had equal representation and have not been dealt with fairly by our Family Law system.

I think, with this type of amendment, we recognize that when we are dealing with orders where access has wrongfully been denied, that access could wrongfully be denied by either the father or the mother. We certainly do find that in many instances the difficulties can be in regard to the mother, where the mother has had a very, very difficult time in dealing with a father who has not wanted to pay maintenance. We know that statistics do show us that in most cases it is the fathers who do pay maintenance and, in a lot of situations, they are the ones who are delinquent, which is why we have developed the REMO program to ensure that the maintenance orders can be enforced across the province. We also have a reciprocal arrangement as well with some states within the United States.

* (1520)

We do have to recognize with The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act that what this Act is looking at is to ensure that there are appropriate measures for access where it has been wrongfully denied, whether that access has been wrongfully denied by the mother or by the father.

This Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act does raise, certainly, some questions which have been outlined by my previous colleague, the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), and we do have some concerns, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about how is the reimbursement to applicants going to be enforced? What are the regulations that are going to be set up to ensure that this reimbursement is easily accessed, that parents who are applying do not have to go through a lot of red tape and legal entwinement to actually receive what is due them according to this amendment Act?

We do not want to set up a system and have an Act whereby it is the lawyers who win and not the parents. With this particular Act, again we wonder exactly what kinds of compensation are going to be considered in this particular Act. What will be the parameters of this? Is there going to be accountability built in, and who is going to ensure that what is mentioned in this Act will be carried out?

We do have the Family Conciliation Services who, at this point in time, are providing a very valuable service. They are not overstaffed by any means and they do find themselves with waiting lists of families who want to see them. The Family Conciliation Services, I assume, would certainly very much be involved in this particular type of Act. Are there going to be adequate resources that are available to Family Conciliation Services, so that the spirit and the intent of this Act can be carried out and we do not have something written down in law or written down on paper which cannot be enforced because of unrealistic expectations placed on existing staff?

There has been mention made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the Access Assistance Pilot Project. We would certainly encourage the Government to take a very careful look and to very carefully consider the specific objectives of this pilot project, and what the methods for implementation will be. We have seen far too often in a very short period of time, four-and-two-thirds months, a Government which tends to rush ahead in a particular project, decide on what they are going to do, only to realize a few weeks later that they really had not considered all the ramifications of their decisions and that they had not consulted with all the groups in the community, the people who would be concerned about this, the people who would be the receivers of this services, the Family Conciliation Services. In fact, there had not been ample consultation and discussion that had gone on.

We certainly would encourage the Government to read our comments, as we comment on this Act, to listen to the concerns that we have expressed in regard to this particular Act, because it is very, very important that, as well as the written word, there be some substance behind the Act and that there be some clear guidelines and some clear regulations set down. So it is very, very clear what exactly this Act is intended to

do, and that we allow easy access for parents to ensure that, where appropriate, they will be reimbursed.

I would also like to add, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we are speaking about the principle and the spirit of this particular Bill, we recognize that with the growing need for Family Conciliation Services, we also recognize that within those services that are provided to families, nuclear families, or to families who are breaking up, that there is a very large gap in Community Services for providing services to families. Family Conciliation Services do not specifically deal with family counselling. Where families are in turmoil or where families have broken up and there are a lot of concerns about access and who will see the children, there are no services out there currently within the Government system whereby families can access adequate family counselling.

We have some private services within the province, Family Services of Winnipeg, we have some services through the university, and if the Government would take the time and look into the kinds of services that are provided with these private agencies, they would find long waiting lists exist, two and three and four months of waiting lists exist.

We do have some family counsellors, family counsellors who are probably a dying breed, if I can use that term, dying in the sense that through attrition these family counsellors leave the Government, leave the Department of Community Services, and they are no longer replaced. Those positions are reconverted and rediverted into other health care and social services areas.

So we have a situation in rural Manitoba and within the City of Winnipeg whereby one family counsellor may service a population of 60,000 or 70,000 people. We have a situation where families are phoning the Department of Community Services, the regional operations, and they are saying we would like some counselling: I have just been divorced from my husband, and I am having some difficulties in my communication with him. We seem to be having difficulties in working out the following, what has been allowed for us by the court. The children are in a turmoil because of all this and I really need some assistance. There is no assistance out there. When you have one family counsellor who must work with a population of over 40,000 to 50,000 individuals, it is not possible to provide this service.

* (1530)

I call upon the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson) and also the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), who is involved with this issue as well, to seriously look at the particular amendment Act, and to not just consider the Act as is written, but to consider the ramifications of the kind of services that we are providing within the Government, and to ensure that in fact for the system to run as smoothly as possible and in order for families to be able to receive appropriate services that we really take a look at the services that are out there, take a look at the fact that the family counsellors in the offices are no longer there

in very many cases and are not able to pick up on family counselling issues. They are being rediverted into other programs.

I think it is very, very important for the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) and for the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson) to fully understand what Family Conciliation Services does, very specifically what they provide for programs, and to recognize that as far as ongoing family counselling, they do not provide that service. We need to look at the Community Services system to see where that service can be provided.

I do encourage the Government to listen to those comments, and again to ensure that as they look at this amendment Act and the implications that they really sit down and very, very carefully outline, and we hope they will share with this House as well exactly how they plan to implement this particular Act and ensure that what we receive is the best quality service for the parents, that we eliminate red tape and we ensure that there is equal and fair treatment for all parents out there in the community. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to allow the debate on this Bill to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park (Mrs. Hammond)? Agreed?

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): Stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed.

BILL NO. 14—THE REGULATIONS ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 14, The Regulations Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards). Is it agreed to allow the Bill to remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James? (Agreed) Order, please.

BILL NO. 15—THE COOPERATIVE PROMOTION TRUST ACT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Evans). Is it agreed to have leave of the House to allow the Bill to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East? Is leave granted? (Agreed) The Chair recognizes the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise today—I appreciate -(Applause)-

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Maloway: I appreciate that the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) is here, and the Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), to cheer me on, give me encouragement. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is here as well, and expressly arrived here to help me

Wednesday, September 21, 1988

out if I run into any trouble during the course of the next number of minutes.

Bill No. 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act, is in fact identical to Bill No. 10 which was brought forward in the last Session by the previous Government. It replaces the Wheat Board Monetary Trust Act. In case anyone is wondering about what the Wheat Board Money Trust Act was about, it was passed in the 1920s when the federal Government transferred monies to the provinces. At that time, the province invested the money in Canadian Government debentures and used the income out of those debentures to promote co-op development in the province. The board, in various forms, has existed over the last number of years. It now has approximately \$300,000 held in trust. It gives out approximately \$30,000 per year in grants to help set up new cooperatives in the province.

Now, of course, this Act is being presented as a new Act. I did want to just take a minute to point out that the objectives of the board, as stated in Section 3—and I just wanted to read those—the objectives of the board are:

- (a) to assist in the development of cooperative organizations;
- (b) to encourage cooperation among cooperative organizations;
- (c) to examine cooperative organizations and the laws relating to cooperative organizations in Manitoba and elsewhere, and to report thereon with recommendations to the Minister;
- (d) to promote the general welfare of the cooperative organizations in the province;
- (e) to promote the general welfare of rural residents of the province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find it interesting that the Government appears to be somewhat schizophrenic when it is dealing with the cooperative movement. On the one hand, it is introducing a Bill which we, on this side, support; which we, on this side, actually introduced ourselves originally. It has introduced a Bill and is pretending to, in fact, be assisting the cooperative movement by virtue of this Bill, but while this is going on, it is downgrading the cooperative movement in the cooperative sector in Manitoba. By virtue of the fact that in an effort to, as it says, save some money and reduce the deficit, or at least reduce the rate of growth of the deficit, it is attempting to rationalize the Government by cutting out the Cooperative Development Department and bringing it into the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the irony of this situation, that the Government, on the one hand, pretends to be promoting cooperative development in the province while, on the other hand, they are downgrading the position that the Cooperative Development Department has enjoyed in Manitoba since 1972.

I did want to point out at this time that the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) is our critic for the Co-op Development area, and while the Government has put the department under Consumer and Corporate Affairs, it is our intention to leave the critic responsibilities with

the Member for Thompson, and I believe the will of the caucus and the Party is that once the NDP achieves Government status again, which may not be that long, we would seek at that point to redress this terrible situation and reinstitute the Department of Cooperative Development in its current form and perhaps even enhance that new department's responsibility.

The Members suggest that the Party has a lot of time to get ready and perhaps that is so, but we are going to use our time very, very productively. I think we are doing that as we speak. Right now, our people are working very hard and we are going to turn this thing around.— (Interjection)— You heard it here; you heard it here, but I am sure that things will develop.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would like to just remind all Honourable Members that on second reading, it is the principle of the Bill under consideration which is debatable, and I presume that the Honourable Member was going to continue his debate on the principle of the Bill.

* (1540)

Mr. Maloway: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will certainly continue to deal with the principles of the Bill.

The priorities of the cooperative movement are different from those of private business. Private business goals are to make a profit and little beyond that. I mean there are private businesses who have somewhat of a social conscience. They, of course, do contribute to the community in many ways, but the bottom line is that the corporation or the company, the private business, is there to make a profit; and if it does not make a profit, it will certainly, or the Board of Directors, will certainly hear from the shareholders of that company.

The priorities of the cooperatives on the other hand are a little different. Cooperatives will set up shop in many areas where private business would not. You have to only look at northern Manitoba to see that there are lots and lots of areas where little cooperatives have sprung up over the years to satisfy a certain need in a given geographic area or a certain need on the part of the people up there that private business could not deal with and would not deal with. So there is a very big need and a big demand for encouraging co-op development in those areas where private businesses certainly either do not have an interest or do not really have the ability to operate with the degree of success that a co-op movement would in fact have.

Now I am very, very concerned about the direction of the Government as to where it is going in general, but, more specifically, where it is going on co-ops specifically. I do not really know that they really know, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I see them lurching forward day by day. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) is too busy bailing water out of the leaky boat with his hard hat, as fast as he can, to try to prevent the Government from going down. I think the Government lost a lot when it lost its former House Leader and is trying to make do with what it has recovered.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, dealing with the Bill, I did want to say that the objectives of this Bill are quite a bit

broader than the previous Bill. In fact, the Bill includes all cooperatives in Manitoba. There is a reference in the Bill to encouraging cooperation among various cooperative organizations, and certainly that is a very, very important aspect to co-op development in the province. If you have cooperatives who can not get along among themselves or are not coordinated among themselves, then that certainly leads to problems in the movement in the sector.

Of course, the Bill also is designed to promote the general welfare of cooperatives in the Province of Manitoba. I did also want to point out that co-ops are more than just co-op stores. A lot of people think that somehow when you are talking about co-ops, you are talking about modern co-op stores in an urban environment and that is certainly far from the truth.

In fact, several years ago, back at the University of Manitoba, we had a cooperative that was very, very popular with the students at the time. It was called Fast Eddy's. This co-op was one that sold food and sports equipment, calculators, and things like this. It was very popular. This was at a time when the co-op spirit, I think, was very, very much alive at least for me and with the students at the university. I have always thought of it as the golden age of cooperatives. Of course, that was at a time in the late Sixties and early Seventies when there was quite an environment for the cooperative spirit, but what has happened, I think, over the years, is that we have tended to degenerate into a media-type generation in the 1980s and you have the advent of the yuppies. In the 1960s, people were content with Arts Degrees and learning for the sake of learning and the carefree lifestyle; but in the 1980s, we have seemed to have gone back to the Herbert Hoover era, the stodgy strait-laced conformist commerce student environment where you only learn what you have to and computers have basically taken over.

There are many other co-ops that have had a very good history in Manitoba that I have had some connection with. Harvest Food Co-op operated for several years, Wheat Song Bakery, and there were many others. Direct charge co-ops—there is a co-op gas bar in Thompson which has been a very successful operation over the last few years. This co-op has been successful in bringing down the price of gasoline. If any of you know anything about the North or about Thompson you know that gas prices in the North are very, very excessive because of transportation costs. I think that a lot of private gas companies do use that as an excuse to perhaps do a little gouging, or make a little excess profit because they can couch it under the guise of transportation costs being excessive and handling costs and so on and the economies of scale. To a certain extent, perhaps they have a certain amount of validity, but we believe that a gas co-op could bring down the price of gas.

In fact, what happened in Thompson was that gas dropped approximately 10 cents a litre, lower than what it was in the other retail stores. The co-op had approximately 75 percent of the market; that is how fast they grew in the market before the private companies reacted and started a price war about one-

and-a-half years ago. The point, of course, is that it took cooperative action to get the price of gas down in the first place. Had it not been for the development of that co-op in Thompson, the price of gas would be still at the very high levels it was before that gas co-op or that gas bar was set up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, co-ops bring together a network of people working together in co-operative fashion. Housing co-ops reduce the cost of housing. In Manitoba there used to be, three or four years ago, approximately 10 housing co-ops, and I believe that number has increased somewhat higher than that in the intervening period. I understand now we have housing co-ops that are set up in the form of, I believe there is one on Kennedy, in sort of an apartment block variety. So there are many, many new ideas that are being developed by the cooperative sector, by the cooperative movement, that are being adopted by the Government, supported by the previous government at least, and the federal Government to a certain extent, to promote various forms of cooperative activity.

So it is rather disconcerting to see a move by the Government that might be interpreted as a move to reduce the profile of the co-op movement in Manitoba. I think that is not a very good sign. They are great at talking about business climates—just reduce the taxes and reduce the regulations and let business develop in a proper business climate.

* (1550)

This is what Conservative Governments traditionally get elected doing. They suggest they are going to do this. We are suggesting if you believe that, then why do you not practise that when it comes to cooperatives? Why are you discouraging cooperatives? We will get into that. We will get into how the history of the Co-op Development Department was under the NDP and under the old Sterling Lyon Conservative years. We will get into that in a few minutes if we have time left over.

It is very clear that the NDP has a much better record in co-op development than those four, some would say, rather miserable Sterling Lyon years. I know you can blame a little bit of it on the depression and the recession at the time. The Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) will be the first one, since he is now in the front row, to remind me of that. I know in advance what he is going to remind me of, and I concede to him that there is a certain amount of truth to that, but the fact of the matter is that does not explain the huge drop in corporations and co-ops. When the NDP came in, in 1981, it does not explain the huge increase that happened just after the election. You cannot blame this on the recession exclusively.

Co-ops do get involved in bulk purchasing, which seeks to reduce the per-unit cost of the items. It helps to bring down prices and, of course, we have seen in Manitoba over the years the development of worker co-ops. We have had examples such as Pioneer Chain Saw in Ontario that has been successfully run by the workers and those workers' co-ops have been around for decades. Some of them never made money until they did become co-ops. I mean, the reason they

became a co-op in the first place was because the private ownership could not make a go of them and the workers took over and successfully turned them around. I think that flies in the face of what some of the Conservative Members tried to suggest, that private business is the only way to go.

I would just like to make a comment at this point about the titans of industry, the people who know all about business. Was it not the former Premier, Sterling Lyon, who was a director on the failed bank, the Canadian Commercial Bank? Here is a Premier, former Premier at that point, of Manitoba who was put on the board of this disastrous enterprise, and this is a—contribute a lot of business expertise—and this is good business.

I suppose I would like to say the Member for Burrows (Mr. Chornopyski), who was making a rather negative speech the other day about co-ops and suggesting that co-ops that he has known have gone bankrupt, it is true. There are co-ops that do go out of business, but to suggest that somehow co-ops are an inferior form of economic activity and that somehow business has the monopoly on good management is absolutely nonsense. I wish the Members opposite, the Members in front of me, would recognize that.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the previous Government was planning to set up a labour investment fund such as we have in Quebec so the workers could establish equity in their companies, and this, of course, would also go a long way, I believe, to furthering the cooperative spirit in the province.

A few days ago, we saw an atrocious example of privatization by the federal Conservatives. Three years ago, they privatized Route Canada, the CN trucking arm, and just a few days ago, 1,300 workers were out of work. What happened here was the private operators bought this firm for about \$30 million three years ago, proceeded to cut away the real estate parts of the corporation—which I understand is now worth about \$80 million—and then, once they lopped that off and separated it off, they just let the trucking company go down the drain. They basically starved it into submission. This is an example of Conservative privatization. I mean if this is an example of how privatization is going to turn out, I do not think people in Canada are going to be overly supportive of large-scale privatization.

While we are waiting to see what—the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) yawns—you know, we are waiting to see what the Highways Minister (Mr. Driedger), if given the opportunity, if they had a majority Government, he would be setting up toll roads right now. He, even in a minority situation—when he should be protecting his backside—gets up and says that we should have toll roads. Give them a majority and they will be toll roading Highway 75.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Health.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know you have had to caution the Member

for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) on a number of occasions to be relevant to the topic at hand. I know he has difficulty focusing his thoughts relevantly. I simply suggest to you that his precedent and contribution has been set in this House where he was ejected by this House earlier on.

Please, I would ask you to consider whether his comments are relevant to the Bill at hand or whether he should simply sit down and discontinue further making a fool of himself.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the same point of order. I think we are all grateful that the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) is not the final arbitrator when it comes to relevancy. He has been irrelevant practically all his life.

Beauchesne, also, I think, makes it very clear that the question of relevancy is difficult to define. I am sure if the Member for Pembina would have been patient, my colleague from Elmwood would have made it very clear that his comments about the intentions of this Government, overall, relate very directly to the Cooperative Promotion Trust amendments that we are discussing. It is the impatience of the Member, I think, that is perhaps leading him in error to the conclusion that the comments are not relevant.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to thank all Honourable Members for their advice. As a servant of the House, and the Rules of the House, I would like to draw to the attention of all Honourable Members the provisions of relevancy. I again would thank the advice of all Honourable Members and would call on all Members of the House to keep that particular rule in mind.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

Mr. Maloway: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Bill No. 15. I listed to you the objectives of the board just a few minutes ago. One of them is to assist in the development of cooperative organizations. That is one of the mandates of the board.

Another type of co-op that is very prevalent in Manitoba right now are the day care co-ops. A lot of people in this province believe that non-profit day care is better for the children. In fact, our previous Government believed that was the way to go. That was borne out by Senator Spivak as well. If the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) would like to educate himself on the ideas of Senator Spivak, I think he might learn something. Certainly, she represents a different philosophy of the Conservative Party than he does.

Fishing co-ops are very prevalent in northern Manitoba. In fact, there are somewhere over 24 fishing co-ops in the province.

Now what we have in addition to fishing co-ops are farming co-ops. I believe that these should be encouraged as well. They, of course, encourage the joint use of farm machinery. In Saskatchewan, the department was eliminated there as well, supposedly to reduce the deficit. Maybe this is where this Government got that idea, because, heaven forbid, they

could not come up with an original idea on their own. They would have to look at Grant Devine's example, the western king of privatization, to pattern their own efforts.

* (1600)

The Saskatchewan Government, when they dismantled the Department of Cooperative Affairs, in effect, reduced the ability of Saskatchewan residents to form cooperatives. It has made it difficult for existing cooperatives to relate to other co-ops. In fact, it was very detrimental to the co-op movement in Saskatchewan.

Once again, if this Government seeks to use Grant Devine as a role model, it is certainly down—actually, it is heading over a cliff, but I think most of us know that this Government is headed that way anyway and we do not really have to encourage them that much. They are going there and they are going to go over on their own, with or without the help of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery).

An Honourable Member: You would know what it is like to go over that cliff, very likely.

Mr. Maloway: Well, I have some recent knowledge of that exercise, myself.—(Interjection)—You have to learn from these things.

But they are using Grant Devine as the guiding light in this. Here is a guy who is taking advice from Margaret Thatcher's privatization chief, the person who is advising the Conservatives in England to sell the airports.

The Conservatives, I think a lot of them would believe in fewer co-ops because they believe in the trickle-down theory. You have heard of the trickle-down theory of education, of economics. There are a certain number of Adam Smith laissez-faire capitalists in the caucus here whom I will not identify now.—(Interjection)—Oh, sure, I know. I have done it many times before, but I do not want to be repetitious and I want to get back to the Bill.

We believe that Bill 15 is a fairly good Bill, but we do believe on the other hand that the winding down of the department is ill-considered, is wrong-headed. I think time will prove that and when we do ascend back into Government here in due course, you will see a new Department of Cooperative Affairs re-established.

We, under the NDP, had the greatest number of co-op incorporations in history. That was a big increase over the PC Governments of the years 1977 to 1981. But I think the real Tory agenda here is that they are trying to turn back the clock to the Lyon years. I think there are some of them here who secretly long for those good old days.—(Interjection)—Well, the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) is probably one, the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) is probably another. The Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) is a definite in that department and he always is ready sing the praises of that ill-fated, four-year stretch.

The roots of the CCF really go back to the co-op movement itself. As a matter of fact the CCF, when it

was originally formed, was formed largely by co-op people. In fact, the Government in Saskatchewan in 1944 set up the first separate Department of Co-op Development and—but I do believe that private sector has to work with the public sector and work with the cooperative sector together for harmony within the economy. I think that is the overriding concern within the comments that I have been making.

Again, the problems with the Conservatives is that they tend to over rely on the private sector, and we feel that a better balance would be required. The Finance Minister (Mr. Manness), when he was in Opposition, was calling for about 2.5 percent expenditure cuts. And now what is he doing? He is maintaining funding in most departments.

Now back to the NDP for a moment. When we were in Governments, co-op incorporations were increasing 200 percent, 300 percent, 400 percent in some years when there was no activity, almost no activity, under the Sterling Lyon Government, and that is a fact.

I want to deal with what required. The Finance Minister (Mr. Manness), when he was in Opposition, was calling for about 2.5 percent expenditure cuts. And now what is he doing? He is maintaining funding in most departments.

Now back to the NDP for a moment. When we were in Governments, co-op incorporations were increasing 200 percent, 300 percent, 400 percent in some years when there was no activity, almost no activity, under the Sterling Lyon Government, and that is a fact.

I want to deal with the fact that annual meetings in the private sector, in corporations, are usually very, very staid—very, very conservative-type—I have been around a few affairs—whereas the annual meetings in the co-ops have always been times for family affairs, parties and so on. I remember the Red River Co-op used to be—really, the time of their annual meeting was a great time to bring the family out, to get involved in the affairs of the cooperative. Try doing that—try doing that at the board meetings of the Canadian Commercial Bank. Maybe that is what Sterling was doing at those meetings. I do not know. He obviously was not paying attention; he was not paying attention to what was going on at the Canadian Commercial because the thing went bankrupt.

I mean banks are not supposed to go bankrupt, and here you have one of the titans of industry, the captains of industry, Sterling Lyon, a Premier of the Province of Manitoba, sitting on the board and this thing goes bankrupt, down the drain. And that was indicative of what the economy did under those four years of Sterling Government rule—it went right down the drain. We gave them the Government in 1977 in reasonably good shape and they gave it back to us in 1981 in total shambles. It was an absolute mess that we took over.

I want to go back a few years. Mr. Deputy Speaker, could you tell me how many minutes I have left? I have a few pages here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member has approximately six minutes remaining.

Mr. Maloway: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I do not think I will be able to get my speech finished in six minutes, but I will certainly try, and with the encouragement once again of the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), I am certain he can direct me and make certain that I do finish.

In corporations now, during or before the Schreyer Government, the department of—it was not a department but the Cooperative Development was buried in the Department of Agriculture. In fact, it was the Schreyer Government that first established a department for Cooperative Development. And in corporations, during those Schreyer years—'73, '74, '75, '76 and '77—were approximately 15 incorporations per year. In the Lyon Government, guess how many incorporations there were? Well, a little more than zero. My Leader says zero. In fact, less than 10, a miserable record. One year their incorporations dropped to one incorporation. My Leader obviously remembers that year. That is obviously indelibly etched in his mind because he was able to remember the year that there was one incorporation. In other years, incorporations hovered around five or six. In fact, that drop was isolated to Manitoba in spite of the recession.

In 1983, the NDP Government prioritized the Department of Co-op Development as one of four major economic departments in the Government. No. 1 was Economic Services and Economic Security; No. 2 was the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology; No. 3 was Small Business Development and Tourism; and No. 4 became the Co-op Development Department. That was the first time in history that Co-op Development was given such a high ranking.

This department was started in 1972 and it actually prospered until Lyon came to power. In 1982, incorporations jumped to 30, doubled in one year. In 1983, there were 40 incorporations. You see big improvements whenever an NDP Government gets elected. Last year, we had 60 incorporations. One wonders what the incorporation rate will be next year and the year after with the current Government. My Leader refers to Bennett buggies. That is exactly where this Government is leading us, back to the days of Bennett buggies; that is where they are going.

I would predict that in the next six months, next spring—the economy is already on the skids, it is already starting to slide under this new Government—and in six months, I think I am going to be able to stand here and be able to recite point after point that demonstrates that since this Government took over, the economy has been going down the drain. We have already seen that housing starts have died off. Things are getting more miserable by the week, by the month, by the day almost with this Government in office.

* (1610)

The Liberal Party, we are not sure where they stand on this Bill. As with most Bills before the House and any issue before the House, they are not sure. That is natural. They have not been together that long. The Liberals are having a lot of fun right now because I think they are very nervous because they really do not

know where they stand on this Bill. We are waiting for them, yes.

The Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch), is he part of them or is he not part of them? We want him to stand up and speak on this Bill and all the other Bills in the House to find out what he really thinks about things today. We know what he thought about things yesterday and last week; well, we think he did, but now we are going to be very interested in hearing from him. As soon as you can get him going and get him speaking, we are going to be sitting here with bated breath waiting for him, waiting to listen to his new Liberal pearls of wisdom.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have many, many more pages here to go through and I am beginning to think that I am running out of time. I am certainly down to three minutes. But I will try to sum up with just some general statements about where I think the province is going to go with this Government. This Government is already proving that it is really governing day by day. That is its method of governance. They do not know whether they are going to be here next week. They planned to come into this Session for eight weeks, and eight weeks were up today. We are about as far away from finishing this Session today as we were eight weeks ago. I am sure eight weeks from now, the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) will be sitting back contemplating things, wondering what happened; why are we still here and making further fuzz? Maybe what we will see is this Government will start bringing forward some of its legislative package now that it realizes we are going to be here for a while.

But anyway, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will save the three or four pages that I have left over for the next opportunity I will have on this Bill. Thank you very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): I would like to put a few comments on Bill No. 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act.

The legislation that is before us is the same that was developed by the previous administration. The NDP administration has placed a great deal of priority on this cooperative sector in this province. I might add that the Native communities, the Indian people, have had a cooperative structure in our traditional lifestyles, and many of the economies and our way of life is based on a cooperative movement and a cooperative structure in our societies.

Certainly, in my experience with many of our hunting trips and fishing trips with many of the families, certainly involved in sharing not only with our knowledge but essential needs sometimes. When you are out on a trapline or in a fishing camp, you may run out of sugar or flour or some other item, so we share with the entire group of us travelling in families. Even in our trips into the remote traplines we travel as a group to ensure the safety of our families are protected. Sometimes during our travelling we share in the work, the workload like transporting, portaging over many of the rapids, over land.

I can share the philosophy of sharing on working in a cooperative movement as advanced by the previous New Democratic Party Government. That cooperative structure works well in many other areas in many of the communities now. We have grocery stores, food co-ops. We have just recently established bar co-ops in some of the northern communities. I know in Red Sucker Lake they just started a gas bar there. The price of gas went down drastically. As a matter of fact, over 50 percent of the price of gas went down. We were paying about \$6 for a gallon of gas. When we introduced a gas bar, the price went down to \$3.25 a gallon; so that substantially cut down the price of gas in that community. As a matter of fact, the gas bar provides an opportunity of saving. It is a very essential item in Red Sucker Lake and also in many of the other communities, as in Garden Hill. They have also started a gas bar co-op. That helps the community.

As a matter of fact, the structures of Native Bands are sort of structured in the way that promotes cooperation, promotes the cooperative spirit, the cooperative movement. Certainly, the gas bar that was started in Red Sucker Lake assisted many of the families, the poor families, the elderly people, because what it did was lower the gas price, which is very essential in providing the services to the community. When you are paying six bucks a gallon, and living on welfare or on pension cheques, it does not go very far.

On top of paying six bucks a gallon, you have to buy a quart of oil to mix your gasoline, and a quart of oil costs you maybe \$3 to \$4 a gallon. So when you buy five gallons of gasoline you are spending 30 bucks, and then on top of that, your mixture for gas; so you are paying about \$33 to get your machinery operating, your snowmobile or your boat. On top of that, you need your gasoline, mixed gas to run your snowmobiles, to run your chain saw so that you can get your wood chopped to heat your house. So the gasoline is very essential in those communities.

Reducing the price of gas in those communities has drastically cut the costs of living in those communities because you haul wood from one place to another—it might be five miles away to bring in wood—and then chop it up with the chain saw using gasoline fuel to cut the wood. Also hauling your groceries, transportation, hauling your water, all that energy derived from gasoline is very essential in those communities. What it does is that it lowered the cost of the gasoline rather than paying the enormous costs that were associated previously.

I can see the advantages of the co-ops that are working well in those communities, and I may talk about even the fishing co-ops that are in many of the northern reserves, northern lakes that are utilized by the fishermen. It certainly has helped communities to work together, the fishermen to protect their interests and also bring in the groceries as a group so that the prices of commodities and the support services that they need would be less costly.

I mentioned before the philosophy of the Indian people and their culture, traditionally, of course, is to work together, to share their workload in many of the communities, and this has been adopted in the

development of the communities. As a matter of fact, the development of community cooperations or community enterprises has taken that format, is to get the communities involved, be part of it, and to have an equal say in that institution.

* (1620)

I know in Red Sucker Lake, we had Red Sucker Lake Enterprises, which was basically a co-op, structured in the way that everybody was a shareholder in that store. We managed to compete with the Hudson's Bay, to lower some costs because the Hudson's Bay, in many of the Northern Stores, has a monopoly in many of the communities. In introducing this store, we were able to compete with the Hudson's Bay, but in some cases we were not able to really compete because the volume that the Hudson's Bay has to the entire North, because of the volume of purchase they have, enormous purchase power they have, they were able to lower their prices. Also, the transportation costs by volume that they have, they were able to make deals with the transportation companies, even the airlines.

We were not able to compete in certain areas or certain individual items like milk or the fresh produce, like fresh bread and milk and butter. Those items have to be flown in by plane into the communities, not like the dry goods, the sugar, the flour and those items which can be readily transported during the winter road months, during the winter road season when you have trucks coming into the communities. But those items that were fresh produce, we were not able to compete at all because they had to be flown in every week or so.

We were able to keep the costs down and also we were able to have the people feel part of that. They owned the store and they had a say in the prices and also in being involved in this store. So what the cooperative structure of the co-ops does is that it brings the people together, and they also have an interest in the certain area or areas that they are getting into.

I know that the bands are structured in a way which promotes, like I said before, cooperative movement and cooperative deliveries in terms of our essential services which involve the total bands.

I know that many of the other co-ops are taking place in many of the communities. We have the fishermen co-ops and certainly we have trappers who form groups together who are actually trapping associations but, in a sense, function like a co-op in promoting their interests. Certainly, at this time, the trappers are facing low fur prices, and I am sure they will be addressing many of the needs and some of their interests in the fur industry. Through cooperation and cooperating with each other, they will be able to band together to work together.

I know the Government has provided some assistance to the primary producing activities of our economy, like fishing and trapping, and I hope the Government continues to support those economies and also supports the cooperative movement that is so essential in many of those communities. It is particularly in the northern communities where prices of goods are high and not so readily available as down south here.

I know the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) will be negotiating many programs which will be affecting the North which, in a sense, have helped many of the trappers and the fishermen. Certainly, through the Special ARDA Agreement, we were able to provide some assistance to the fishermen, fishermen's association, fishermen co-ops, to purchase maybe boats, motors, fishing nets, so that they can live off the resources that are available in many of those communities. Also, the trappers were assisted through the Special ARDA in terms of purchasing snowmobiles, traps, snowshoes and those things. I hope the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) would be promoting the assistance of the primary producers. Certainly, as the year is coming up to March 31 in '89, the Northern Development Agreement will be coming to an end. The Special ARDA Agreement will be coming to an end. The Native Economic Development Program, which is a federal development program assisting the Native people, will be coming to an end.

I hope this Government and the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), would be advancing the interests of the northern and the Native people in the North so that they can carry on their activities in the North and also promote the cooperative structure, the cooperative movement that exists in the North.

I know when this NDP Government took over, as mentioned before by the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) and also previously mentioned by the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), that cooperative movement was not a priority with the previous Conservative administration prior to this administration.

The statistics speak for themselves where this Government is going and, certainly, by eliminating or else by putting this Cooperative Department into another department, the Consumer and Cooperative Affairs, it is an indication to our caucus that this Government is not serious in promoting the cooperative movement in this province.

As a matter of fact, during our term, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), who was the Minister of Cooperative Development, did a really good job in promoting the cooperative development in this province. As a matter of fact, statistics show that in some instances during those years, it was a 200 percent or 400 percent increase of the total number of cooperatives in this province.

I believe that this Government has to place some priority in this area where many of the Northern Affairs communities and also the Indian bands have put emphasis on the cooperative structure of delivery from the services in our communities and also some enterprises that are taking place in many of the communities. I know there are community development cooperatives which function as a cooperative movement in many of the communities.

It was brought to my attention some time ago that one of the Native organizations had a course promoting some economic development officers here in Winnipeg where they put on a course for some of the members. One of their plans was that these economic development officers would go back into their regions and the plan

of that particular Native organization was to have regional development corporations.

* (1630)

These people were to be employed as economic development officers in regional development corporations that they were setting up. They had a proposal sent to the federal Government for that particular set-up. The federal Government rejected their proposal saying that they would rather see individual private enterprises being set up rather than setting up this kind of structure. To me, that suggests that the priority of the Conservative Government, at least with the federal Conservatives, suggests to me that the cooperative structure or movement is not a priority with them.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

I hope this Government will provide some services or pay attention or put some priority in this area in terms of assisting the cooperative movement in this province. I just wanted to put a few comments on this Bill. Thank you.

Mr. Storie: There may be an inclination to call it five o'clock so that we can proceed with Private Members' Hour.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it five o'clock?

Mr. Storie: As long as we are sure this Bill will stand in my name.

Mr. Speaker: That Bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Evans). Is that agreed? (Agreed) The hour being 5 p.m.- (Interjection)- It is done by leave. Do we have leave to move Private Members' Hour up to now? I believe it is the will. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

The hour being 5 p.m., the time for Private Members' Hour, by leave.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS RES. NO.14—CANADIAN ENERGY SUPPLIES

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), Resolution No. 14, Canadian Energy Supplies.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): I move, seconded by the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that:

WHEREAS access to secure supplies of energy is essential for Canadians living in a vast northern land with a challenging climate; and

WHEREAS prior to 1985, Canadians, through the National Energy Board, were secure in the knowledge that exports of energy were allowed only when there was a known surplus of 25 years available for domestic use; and

WHEREAS in 1985, under the Western Accord, the requirement for surplus energy was dropped to 15 years and later eliminated by the federal Government; and

WHEREAS the National Energy Board now only monitors sales of energy; and

WHEREAS exports of energy have increased dramatically with natural gas exports increasing by over 30 percent last year alone; and

WHEREAS under the proposed Mulroney trade deal, Canada is giving up its right to regulate the way its energy is developed, used, and sold; and

WHEREAS under the trade deal, the ability of provinces to impose taxes, incentives, and other policy initiatives to foster regional development in the field of energy is outlawed, as is the ability to charge American consumers more than Manitoba consumers; and

WHEREAS according to a report done by the Manitoba Energy Department, if the trade deal had been in effect during the last world energy shortage, Canadians could have paid over \$70 billion more for natural gas, oil, and the electricity they used from 1979 to 1982; and

WHEREAS Canadian consumers will be subject to sudden dramatic increases in energy costs during the next energy crisis unless steps are taken to secure adequate supplies of renewable and non-renewable energy sources for Canadian use.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba go on record as urging the federal Government to re-establish the role of the National Energy Board in ensuring that export sales take into account the needs of Canadian consumers; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly urgently request the federal Government to amend the trade deal so that Canadian sovereignty over energy is restored.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly direct the Clerk to forward a copy of this resolution to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Storie: Mr. Speaker, this Assembly has seen the presentation of a number of Bills and resolutions in this Session, which I think reflects the fact that Members on this side and many Manitobans are concerned about the impact of the Free Trade Agreement on the future of our province and our country. We, on this side of the House, I believe, to a person that this agreement is not in the interests of our country or our province. We have tried to lay before the Legislature and the people of Manitoba the reasons we feel that way.

I would like to indicate that we share the belief that this agreement is seriously flawed, with Canadians from

across this country, from working people in Newfoundland and British Columbia, to lawyers and judges from across this country, who have had time to review the agreement. We believe that this Government has undertaken in a very systematic way to undermine one of our fundamental advantages as a nation when it comes to competing with the world at large.

I would like to think that perhaps the way this agreement came about was simply politically motivated. I cannot for a minute believe that this agreement came about as a result of any systematic rational analysis of the need for this agreement or its implications. I would have to believe that because it seems so obvious to me and is apparent, if you review the facts when it comes to free trade, that the impact is negative. I believe that this agreement came about not as a result of any systematic analysis. It certainly is not going to be passed as a result of any rational discussion, but rather it came about as an ideological position that this federal Government took when it came to matters of the economy and trade. I think that nowhere is the ideology of the federal Government more clearly demonstrated than in the reduction of power, in fact, the elimination for all practical purposes of the role of the National Energy Board in the economic life of our country.

The National Energy Board has a relatively long and proud history in Canada. The National Energy Board, which was created almost four decades ago, was created to provide some measure of protection to Canadian consumers, to Canadians who do not have the advantage of living in a province with abundant secure energy supplies. It was introduced as a means of developing and maintaining a national energy policy, a policy which would provide the groundwork for economic development across the country.

The original mandate of the National Energy Board when it was first introduced back in 1959 was to make sure that the exports of oil and gas and electricity were surplus to Canadian needs. At that time they decided, they being the Government of the Day, that 25 years of reserves were required as a safety net for Canadian energy consumers to be protected; that we should not embark on an energetic extensive program of exporting our non-renewable resources, which gas and oil are, without assuring ourselves that somehow Canadians, particularly in non-producing provinces, were protected.

* (1640)

It seems to me to be a pretty fundamental, simple and necessary policy advancement on the part of a national Government. They also decided that before energy could be exported to any other jurisdiction the export price of that commodity would have to cover a share, a reasonable share of the development costs. And for natural gas, they also put in a specification that required the export price to be related in some way to what consumers in Canada were paying at the time.

When this particular piece of legislation was introduced, the benchmark, if you will, for an export price was based on the consumer price in Toronto. Now

some may object to using that kind of a formulation, but that was a reasonable, at least they believed a reasonable, benchmark for an export price. They also put in what are called "price tests" for exports. Those price tests included an examination of what was the least cost for alternative energy in the market to which the export was being directed.

In other words, if Quebec was exporting hydro to the northeastern part of the United States, a least cost test would be applied to say: is the price that Quebec is receiving for its energy relatively close to the market price that the Eastern Seaboard was charging for other kinds of energy? And the same price test would apply if we were selling to Minneapolis or if we were selling to California.

What has happened, not in the intervening years, not since 1959, not over the terms of the various Governments, but in the last four years is the successive degradation, elimination of the powers of the National Energy Board. It began in 1985 when the federal Government signed the Western Accord and reduced the reserve requirements, the surplus test requirements, from 25 years to 15 years, a signal that the Government intended to eliminate the effective role of the National Energy Board, a signal that this country was no longer going to place as its first priority the protection of Canadian consumers, the protection of Canadian businesses when it came to the use of energy supplies, an energy that I might add is produced in this country.

Subsequent to the Western Accord in 1985, the Government actually eliminated for all intents and purposes the role of the National Energy Board in determining surpluses, and the Free Trade Agreement allocates a simple monitoring function to the National Energy Board. So what we have done in a period of a few short years is relegate what is and could have been a body for the development and the maintenance of a made-in-Canada energy policy to a body which, for all intents and purposes, is useless, which has no real role or function, which no longer has a Canadian national mandate. I am not alone in believing that is a tragedy. I am not alone in believing that is not only a tragedy but is going to have consequences which few people have considered today.

The consequences, I think, are obvious. We need only cast our mind back to the results of the so-called oil crisis of the mid-Seventies. What happened was a group of oil-producing countries in the Middle East decided, obviously much to their advantage, that they were going to control the supply of oil to the western world. As soon as that strategy became evident to the oil-consuming countries, of course we saw prices escalate dramatically. The price of oil went from in the teens to \$40 a barrel in a very short period of time. Of course the countries, the provinces, the people who felt the impact of that change in the relationship to world oil supplies and consumption were the consumers, and consumers particularly in non-oil-producing provinces.

I have said on many occasions, and I have seen no one refute the figures supplied to the Minister of Energy and Mines in his own departmental report which indicates that consumers saved billions of dollars during

the National Energy Program which pegged the price of oil at 75 percent of world price. It is obvious to anyone that if we allow ourselves into a position where we do not pay any attention whatsoever to the reserves that are available to us as consumers, energy reserves, we are going to get ourselves in a position where we have oversold our reserves and where consumers end up paying through the nose for gas that has to be imported or that is being bid upon by other consumers, particularly the United States, in a massive and concerted way.

We have taken away one of the tools that a national Government has to protect consumers, to protect our energy interests and, yes, to protect the very people who this Government and Conservatives across this country claim they represent, the business community, because energy is a fundamental ingredient in any business in Canada. To the extent that we have an energy advantage, to the extent that we can, through an instrument of national policy, ensure that our businesses have energy costs that are lower than average, lower than our competitors, we have an advantage that is a business advantage.

This resolution calls for the federal Government to re-establish the primacy of the National Energy Board when it comes to National energy policy. It calls on the federal Government to acknowledge the fact that we as a country should have some say in the development of our energy resources, in the use of our energy resources to create business opportunities and economic development in our country. We should have some say when it comes to exporting our resource to other purchasers, particularly foreign purchasers, be they the United States or anyone else. So that my comments may not be interpreted as being anti-American, I am simply saying that, in 1959, a Government, and Governments before that, through to 1984, had the foresight to rely on the National Energy Board, to use it as an instrument to protect Canadian interests and that has been abandoned.

I hope that we are not going to see from Members opposite, particularly Members on the Government side, some knee-jerk response to this resolution as an attack on free trade. Certainly, I believe the Free Trade Agreement has negative implications for much of Canadian society and virtually every sector of our economy, but I believe that notwithstanding the Free Trade Agreement, we have an obligation as legislators to stand up, particularly since we are from a consuming province—and certainly not a large non-renewable resource energy producer—to say that we believe Canadians have the right to expect that there will be in effect a national energy policy and we have the right to expect that some instrument—and we believe it should be the National Energy Board—has the right to implement that policy for the benefits of Canadians and the benefits of Manitobans.

I do not think we can make it any clearer than to put a dollar figure on the benefit that Canadians have received over the years in terms of the National Energy Program. It is no accident that the only subsidy that the Americans will tolerate is a taxpayers' subsidy for the exploration and development of our non-renewable

resources, resources which they have in short supply. The Americans say no subsidies for forest products, for agricultural products, for manufactured products, but you Canadian taxpayers can subsidize the exploration and development of oil and gas so that we can have free access to it at competitive prices without any concern for the interference at the federal level through the National Energy Board or any other implement of national energy policy.

I asked Members of this Chamber to give serious consideration to supporting this resolution, supporting it in principle because I believe that Canada has a great deal at stake in protecting itself, protecting its energy resources, protecting consumers when it comes to the pricing of energy and anything that we can do to stir the federal Government into acting in our interest, when it comes to energy, should be done. Thank you.

* (1650)

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): The Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) indicated this was not an attack on free trade; this was not a request by the Members of this House to vote against free trade. However, a number of his "WHEREASes," a number of his clauses deal with free trade.

I would like to say for openers, Mr. Speaker, that the entire resolution, if accepted by this House, would be a record against the Canadian-U.S. Free Trade Agreement. Perhaps too much has been said about the FTA and not about free trade. FTA stands for Free Trade Agreement, not forced trade agreement. There are of course many—always there will be areas that we are not totally happy with. We have never said we were happy with every item that is in the Free Trade Agreement. On balance, however, Manitobans will be better off, and on balance the Free Trade Agreement does not affect the supply of energy to Manitobans and to Canadians.

When you sit in negotiations on any agreement, you do not sit alone. There are others and you have to reach an agreement that is fair to all sides. We believe that in this case it is fair to all sides. We do need an agreement of some sort with the United States. You must remember that we export 85 percent of our exports to the United States, and if they should close their borders to our exports, we would be in dire straits indeed.

If I look at the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the first paragraph is of course all right. Everybody wants to make certain that the energy supply for Canadians is secure. There is no question about that.

Let us deal for a minute with the questions raised by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) about the National Energy Board. We do still have security in supply. As far as security is concerned, any exporter must receive first of all an export licence. In order to receive an export licence, he must show that he has sufficient supplies to export and sufficient supplies for those in Canada who require the energy.

Any applicant seeking an export licence from the NEB must file an export impact assessment which

will allow the board to determine whether the export will impair the security of the domestic users.

As well, if there are complaints about the export licence by the Canadian users, the exporter must either show that there is no cause for the complaint or his licence will be denied. At all times the NEB will continue to protect the public interest in its determination on whether or not to issue export licences. To say that the NEB is in effect toothless is false. The ability to retain the security of supply for Canadian users is still there.

Much has been said over the last several months about the secret report given to our department. I would like to put the record straight that the report was requested by the former Minister of Energy, the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), and was prepared under the direction of the then-Assistant Deputy Minister. There was no methodology used in presenting the report.

You can support almost any position if you take items not within an agreement and draw them to an absurd conclusion and draw from that a scenario. When you leave the hallowed halls of Simon Fraser University, however, and go into the real life, you must deal with real-life issues.— (Interjection)— Yes. I wonder if the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) has something to say or is he just talking.

The \$70 million that had been mentioned in the resolution, that would not have been saved if the trade deal had been in effect, simply is without foundation. We must remember that for any non-renewable resources we have to have a provision or a way in which to find new resources. When we deplete the ones we use, we have to find new ones. If we do not get the price we need for the gas that we sell, if we do not get the sufficient price to develop new resources, we simply will not have new resources to sell in the future.

Canada has an abundant supply of energy. The National Energy Board will continue to make certain that the energy is protected for the security of the Canadian consumer which is not to say that energy should not be exported. We do not live in a box, we cannot box ourselves in, we do not, for example, retain our copper that is mined in the Member for Flin Flon's (Mr. Storie) constituency because it is a non-renewable resource. We ship that out of the country as well. We ship out the zinc that is mined. We ship out the gold. We do not retain any of our renewable resources simply because they are non-renewable. We sell them in the world market and so does every country.

If we were to retain and use only for ourselves the energy that we have in the ground in Canada, we would be a starving Third World country. Without bringing money into the country, we cannot exist. We are an exporting country and we cannot say simply because energy is a non-renewable resource, we should not export. If we have enough energy for our own needs for the future, why should we not export it? We will have enough and nobody has come up with any kind of documentation that proves that we do not have enough. We do have enough. The National Energy Board will continue to ensure that we have sufficient energy for the future.

As far as electricity is concerned, we will be able to continue to use our electricity in any form we wish. There is nothing in the Free Trade Agreement that prohibits us from, for example, subsidizing a manufacturing plant through the use of electricity or through the use of any other subsidy. There is nothing to stop us in the Free Trade Agreement from doing that. There may be countervailing duties imposed by the United States, if we do, but that they can do under the present arrangements of GATT.

* (1700)

So there is nothing new, Mr. Speaker, in what has happened under the Free Trade Agreement. There is nothing new in what has happened with the National Energy Board. The continuation of the two-price system, as the Member for Flin Flon suggests, ignores totally the producing provinces or the producers. They are the ones then who will subsidize the rest of Canada. They are the ones who will suffer. They are the ones who will be unable to develop new oil fields. They will be the ones who will be unable to develop new gas fields, and they will be the ones who will not be able to supply future needs of Canadians.

So without continuing and increasing sales, we will not be able to develop our northern resources as we might with the sales. I would like to go on record, Mr. Speaker, of opposing the resolution as drawn by the Member for Flin Flon.

There is one other item. The Member mentions that we have increased by over 30 percent the exports of natural gas. I have in front of me a schedule of exports by quantity as well as by percentages from 1978 to 1987, the last year of record, and in 1978 we exported 32.2 percent; in 1987 we exported 31.7 percent. In the interim years, we had a low of 25.8 in 1986 and a high of 33.4 in 1979. So the exports have not varied a great deal from year to year if you take it on a 10-year range. They have, of course, varied a little more in the last year because 1986 was a low export year, not that 1987 was a high export year. So again the statement that there was a 30 percent increase in the last year alone is not entirely accurate.

I will let somebody else take it from here and I want to go on record as opposing the Resolution No. 14 as proposed by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak upon this resolution as well. I have to admit that I have great sympathy for the resolution. It has a certain beauty and symmetry all of its own. The development of the "WHEREASes" as they flow from the pen seem to actually develop a case which one almost cannot have any argument with, unless one wishes to take the comments of the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) into consideration, but there are some areas within this development that I wish to clarify and not necessarily take issue with but to put on record comments that perhaps should be taken into consideration as we consider this resolution.

The "WHEREASes," as they develop the argument for the proposed resolution, do state a chronology of

events which lead to the progressive emasculation of the role of the National Energy Board. As the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) mentioned, the initial requirements of the National Energy Board were to stipulate very clearly that there should be a 25-year clear surplus for Canadian consumers before any export deals could be made and this slowly was decreased. Of course, we have to understand why the decrease came in is because the National Energy Board, in its initial role as it initially was envisaged, which was to simply guarantee that there would be adequate supplies of Canadian energy for Canadian consumers, had to respond to policies which were introduced in order to overcome its restrictive role as it was seen by people who wish to propose greater and greater export sales, particularly to the United States.

For instance, if we just simply take a look at not necessarily the chronology, but the events as they occurred from a surplus requirement of 25 years, then to 15 years, we now find that the Ontario Energy Board, which offers a similar kind of role to the National Energy Board only for the Province of Ontario, now feels that a simple three-year surplus or three-year contract is sufficient for small industrial users. This is an argument proposed for the sake of the consumer in that particular province. We are caught, of course, in between the massive consumer market of Ontario and the producing Province of Alberta and probably will have to pay a penalty no matter what happens.

Alberta has its own particular concept because it wishes to propose a situation whereby people cannot or should not be able to find alternative sources of supplies, the displacement concept, simply because they feel that in order to guarantee long-term market stability and to prevent the possibility of rate shocks, they should be able to have their core market be committed to taking long-term supplies of gas. Of course, long-term supplies means that you can write in a price which probably will be considerably higher than the market at any one particular point in time.

In response to some of the restrictive policies of the National Energy Board, the reactive requirement of the national energy policy was introduced at a time when oil prices were skyrocketing and, of course, the Alberta producers wished to have deregulation, freedom of the marketplace, they wished to have the NDP dismantled for a deregulated environment. This is ultimately what happened with respect to the arguments and the policies between Alberta and the consuming provinces. Eventually, the national energy policy, which was to try and prevent the Canadian consumer from being hit too hard in a rising price environment, the deregulation occurred and, of course, at the same time that the deregulation occurred, we have the plummeting of oil prices. We now have a shock of a different kind and the shock actually affects the exporting province. Now, we see them trying to change their own particular concept by trying to have prices now artificially high.

But we have to be careful when we start playing with what we do with boards and with mandates. We have to be careful because we may end up finding ourselves suddenly in a position which we do not wish to find ourselves in. For example, we note that at this moment

in time when there is energy deregulation, we would see with the Free Trade Agreement that energy and exporting is being encouraged and is going to be enhanced, and furthermore, as under the 904 Article, the proportionality clause of the Free Trade Agreement, we may be prevented from voluntarily cutting back on exports.

* (1710)

In the seventh "WHEREAS" of the resolution, we are prevented from discriminatory pricing and the use of subsidies to encourage domestic use. We will find that when push comes to shove, and we are actually in a position where we are no longer happy with what happens, we are going to be faced with two facts: One fact is a pipeline which starts somewhere and ends somewhere; the other fact being a transmission line which starts somewhere and ends somewhere. Transmission lines or pipelines, when they are built, end up having a whole function all of their own. This applies particularly to the Canadian situation with respect to deregulation of oil and gas, when we ask who owns the pipeline. These are not deregulated. Once you have a situation where a pipeline which begins somewhere and ends somewhere, it means you have a fixed location of supply and market. You cannot tap into this to withdraw elsewhere if there is another need in time.

It is the same thing with electricity transmission. Transmission is a natural monopoly, that if you leave it unchecked, allows the owners to exercise monopoly of control and to further its own competitive position regardless of social value or consumer welfare.

At a time of deregulating energy, supply, exports, at a time when we are now suspect of the amounts of surplus, whether we do have sufficient quantities or not, at a time when we find that the Free Trade Agreement may make us a little bit in a weaker position for backing out of arguments, agreements which we may not wish to be in, we find that by the time the export agreements have been fully implemented we may find, because of the transmission line problem or the pipeline problem, we cannot get back that which we thought was ours.

In that respect I fully support the intent of this resolution, which is to re-establish the National Energy Board, provided that in the re-establishment of this National Energy Board we set it up in such a way so that it is completely free of political interference and it can start exercising its mandate. We do not see, for example, what happened with Alberta. When it was creating a mandate for the consumer, Alberta found itself suddenly unable to charge the prices it wanted, and now Alberta has successfully negotiated itself into a deregulated environment we find that the National Energy Board has become, and in the words of the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), simply a monitoring agency unable to actually force its will on any of the exporting provinces or on the consuming provinces. We simply can watch to see what happens.

I would have been much happier with this particular resolution—in fact this resolution would have much

more substance if the previous Government had not decided to lock in the Manitoba position of providing electricity and a 500 megawatt firm power sale to the Northern States Power Group in the United States, because we now have a situation where the recent drought prevents a full recharge of the capacity of the reservoirs for Manitoba Hydro.

We have a situation where the normal capacity of generators, when they are now under a reduced flow, may prevent us from actually fulfilling all the obligations of the firm power sale, and this at a time when we have before us the resolution that the Manitoba Government go on the record as urging the federal Government to re-establish the role of the National Energy Board in ensuring export sales, taking into account the needs of Canadian consumers. The former Government actually went to the same National Energy Board to say, listen, we want to make this sale because we are actually using this for the purpose of generating income.

That demonstrates the danger of having politics in the energy equation, and this resolution, in effect, coming from the same Party that had that particular contract, ends up indicating a difference of opinion or a change of heart or a change of mind. But nevertheless, I am still firmly in agreement of having a body in Canada which firmly takes into account the needs of the consumer and the exporter and creates a climate in which we have a situation where the legislation of the Assemblies of the country would undertake to fulfill the mandates of the energy policy for the country, for the provinces, and then essentially allow the agencies which are empowered to exercise this particular control or exercise the will of the Assemblies be implemented to work without interference. If we want to have the politics out of the equation, it should stay out of the equation for the benefit of the consumer or the producer, but we see that when it comes to energy, politics will enter in one way or the other, as we saw with the Alberta situation and as we saw also with the advancement of the Limestone generating station.

I would, in speaking in support of the resolution, also like to underscore the fact that we need to depoliticize the bodies that we charge with carrying out the mandate of ensuring Canadian energy supplies for Canadians.

Two minutes or not, Mr. Speaker, I shall rest.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I will speak for only a few minutes. I do not know if there have been any agreements made as to speaking order or not.

I usually do not read resolutions sponsored by the MLA for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie). I found in the past they are usually full of extraneous material, to be kind, but there are a couple of comments I would like to make with respect to Resolution No. 14, Canadian Energy Supplies, particularly in one of the "Whereas" sections, specifically this one. It says: "WHEREAS according to a report done by the Manitoba Energy Department, if the trade deal had been in effect during the last world energy shortage, Canadians could have paid over \$70 billion more for natural gas, oil, and the electricity they used from 1979 to 1982."

Let us think about that for a moment, Mr. Speaker. There is probably an element of truth to the statement, but let me say this, as a western Canadian particularly, that is the essence of what Alberta has been saying for years as to what the National Energy Program did to that province and ultimately to western Canada. Eighty billion dollars was denied that province and, to a lesser degree, the indirect effects and benefits to western Canada because of an energy accord that was in place that kept the price to all Canadians at a value which was not the world value.

If one goes to Toronto today and wonders why that economy is overheated, if one wonders why there is building in every quadrant of that city, one in some degree can look back at the National Energy Program where one other region within the land had an opportunity to pull away from the dominance of central Canada. Alberta had that chance, and it had it by the vehicle of its energy supplies. That was denied them because of the National Energy Program in effect in those years. We benefitted as a province to some degree because of that, and I fully recognize that. At least our consumers did, our consumers of gas and oil; but, Mr. Speaker, I claim today that even though our consumers may have benefitted, our economy as a whole today is worse off because of that National Energy Program, because we are a trading province.

* (1720)

Many of our goods go into Alberta and Saskatchewan. I say today that had that National Energy Program not been in place, had industry and financial interest been allowed to develop in Alberta, as would have happened had they been allowed the benefits of another two or three years of major increases in world energy prices, that we in Manitoba would not have been the benefactors indirectly of that.

Some would say that is a long argument, but it is as true and as sound as I am standing here and making it, because we in western Canada are being held back by a number of problems that we have within the nation in my view, certainly not the least of which is this gravitational pull of wealth and decision-making into central Canada.

I wanted to make that statement with respect to one of the preamble clauses. I think I wanted to go on record as finally saying that I am in total opposition to the operative clause, that we go on record as urging the federal Government to re-establish the role of the National Energy Board to ensure that export sales take into account the needs of Canadian consumers. I still believe that those powers to a degree are in place.

But to say, to re-establish a program that is going to be against the resource producers in this land, totally in support of where the large populations are, is to forever and a day confine us to being hewers of wood and drawers of water. Maybe that is what the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) wants. He looks at me aghast, as if he is totally surprised, as if he has never heard the argument before. But tell me how else it is that those of us who are resource-rich are to ever have our fair place in the Canadian context if we are not going

to be allowed to sell those resources at the going world price rate?

The National Energy Program, to me, as it was once constituted, certainly prevented one of our sister cousins as a province from doing just that and from ultimately seeing a shift of the wealth of the nation into one of the regions of which we are part. So on that basis alone, I have to totally disagree with the essence of the remarks and of the resolution brought forward by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): I want to rise to support the resolution from the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) and start my remarks by really being in quite a bit of shock in terms of the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Manness) comments.

I am now starting to understand why this economy is starting to go on a roller coaster down, with the kind of hand we have on this economic tiller in the form of the economic Finance Minister in terms of this province and why we are starting to see the slow effects of Tory economic Government. Tory times indeed are tough times. We are starting to see it under the leadership, or lack thereof, of the Member for Morris (Mr. Manness).

The Member for Morris, the Minister of Finance, states that, as sound as I am standing here today in this House—

An Honourable Member: Take the night off.

Mr. Doer: Yes, I will—thank you, the Member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach), who seconded that Budget that is now trickling down into the Manitoba economy.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris (Mr. Manness) talks about Alberta and Manitoba being in the same position in terms of energy. What a totally ridiculous and uneducated statement to make in this Legislature. We are a net importer of up to 70 percent and 80 percent of oil and gas in terms of this province. We are a net importer of renewable and non-renewable resources. For the Member for Morris to sit there and say we are in sisterhood with the sheiks of Alberta is totally outside the realm of reality. The fact that we are a 70 percent net importer is like many other provinces in this country.

The bottom line is, are we going to have a system that is merely dictated by a free market system with international corporations, many of which are owned and operated out of the United States, international corporations that quite frankly their sovereignty to which is highly in debate? In fact, they are separate sovereignships many of them, these corporations, and that is just the way the international market has gone. Are we going to allow our resources to be dictated by simply sovereign corporations that are international in nature who are looking in the long term in terms of the customers, or do we believe that our non-renewable resources, oil and gas particularly, are owned by all Canadians to the benefit of all of the people in this country?

I believe strongly that the oil and gas supplies and non-renewable resources in this country, a cold country,

a distant country, are owned by the people of Canada. In fact, Mr. Speaker, almost every country in the free world that has non-renewable resources has a national policy with national controls to determine the national destiny.

So you have the choice. You can have sovereign corporations decide where those resources will go, or you can have the people of the country through their elected representatives decide where their resources are going.

The Member for Morris, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), talks about eastern Canada. He should be ashamed to talk about the preference that eastern Canada has received. The present Prime Minister of this country has got a deliberate financial policy that has manifested in benefits to Quebec on a daily basis and an interest rate policy that is preferential treatment to the province of Ontario and indeed to the city of Toronto. And he stands in his place today and talks about western Canada with a federal Government and his cousins in the federal Government in the short-term existence that is still left before the writs are dropped, lectures us in this House in terms of this federal Government.

It is absolutely disgraceful that this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) will talk in terms of central Canada when his First Minister (Mr. Filmon) will not even write the Prime Minister to overrule the Bay Street Michael Wilson, in terms of the central Canadian pro-Toronto interest rate policy that is going to devastate the West. I say this in all seriousness, that high interest rate policy is going to devastate the West. It is going to devastate your community; it is going to devastate the small business community; it is going to devastate homeowners; it is going to devastate people who have mortgages. And these people just sit there like puppets on Mulroney's knee and do not say anything except pass the communique. You hit them over the head with a wet communique, Mr. Speaker, that is what they are going to do, and they give us lectures about central Canada.

* (1730)

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba is a net importer of non-renewable resources. Our gas supplies are on the table right now. Our monopoly gas company is in the process of potentially being taken over. It may make some people rich but it will not secure a long-term supply of gas for Manitoba in terms of our consumers, our residents, our constituents, in terms of the future of this province.- (Interjection)- Yes, we did, and it did not work that well because we should have done something on security of supply of gas. We did something on price, Mr. Speaker, but security of supply was a major issue.- (Interjection)- The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), who gave a \$5 million break to the CPR, many of whose stocks are being held by Torontonians, has the gall to chirp in his seat. It is really very important.

I know that they go to conventions with other Tories from Alberta. I know they like to walk around and think they are just junior Albertans but it is very important, Mr. Speaker, they start acting like Manitobans in terms of the needs of Manitobans.

I believe that every country that has an excess of oil and gas has a national policy. Even the great Conservative guru, Margaret Thatcher, did not give away North Sea oil in the trade agreement with the European Economic Community. She is a lot smarter than the present Prime Minister of Canada, and she is a lot smarter than Members across the way in terms of energy supply for the future in terms of this country. I look forward to continuing this debate at the next opportunity. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday). When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have eight minutes remaining.