

228

ISSN 0542-5492



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

29 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXVIII No. 44 A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 24 APRIL, 1980

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 24 April, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I rose before I saw that the Minister I wanted to address is still not present. Nevertheless, I could direct a question to the Minister of Finance to ask him whether he can inform us what the current interest rate would be on a borrowing by the province, in view of the various changes that have taken place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, the member probably can get his best guidance by looking at either provinces or other institutions who have borrowed in the last couple of weeks or so, and that would perhaps give him a better indication. I think he would find that the last public issue by Canada, by Ontario, was at about 13 percent for terms which varied but would be a medium term period of time.

In the Government of Canada's case, I think it was 13, but with an option at the end of five years for extension. That, perhaps, is about as close as you can get to indicating what the current rate might be.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister. May I also ask him, in view of the fact that there was a recent Ontario Hydro borrowing, I think that's the one he referred to, at 13 and a fraction — it was over 13 percent — what does he consider to be the comparable rate; that is, to what extent would Manitoba differ from an Ontario borrowing at a concurrent period?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is really somewhat hypothetical, inasmuch as the markets are fairly volatile and are moving from a day-to-day basis. So since we're not in the market, there's no point in making that kind of a prediction.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, yes, it's not a supplementary to the question I asked, but it is a question of the Minister of Finance. On April 3rd, the Minister undertook to attempt to provide information dealing with allegations about a certain tax refund

discounter having been investigated for excessive discounts. I asked several questions which the Minister agreed to accept, in lieu of a formal Order for Return, April 3rd, Page 1959 of Hansard. From the way he was reacting to my question, I am guessing he doesn't have an answer with him yet.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll check on that.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Could I have the indulgence of the House to bring to the honourable members' attention, we have 85 students of Grade 9 standing from Isaac Newton School under the direction of Mr. Feren. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here today.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Premier (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House, by leave, to revert to statements for a brief statement, and to table some material which I think members of the House would like to have.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)
The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a short statement to make on the Western Premiers' Conference in Lethbridge, which I will be happy to distribute.

Mr. Speaker, the Western Premiers' Conference in Lethbridge covered a wide range of agenda items, which resulted in a series of communiques which I am pleased to table now in the House. I think it is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that the communiques are tabled in both official languages, with the exception of two communiques which will be made available as soon as they are available in French.

My general observation, Sir, would be that it was a successful meeting, which demonstrated again the growing consensus and solidarity among the governments represented on matters of regional and national concern. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of the House to the communiques on the state of confederation, and the general economic review. It will be readily apparent that the west speaks with a united voice in favour of our fellow citizens from Quebec remaining within confederation. On the general economic scene, Sir, there was similarly a general consensus on the need for all governments to continue their adherence to the economic charter agreed upon by the eleven First Ministers in 1978.

Important topics, such as the grain handling and transportation, the Western Electric Grid, to mention only two, also received careful consideration and renewed support.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that after consideration of the communiqués, members on all sides will find themselves able to support the general proposition set forth in that, thereby lending further strength to the growing unity of position which we, in Western Canada enjoy. The times we face, Mr. Speaker, are certainly fraught with difficulties and new challenges to our Confederation. The decisions and determinations that will have to be made by governments will not often be easy. I have great faith, however, in the common sense, the fairness and the will of our people, and the people of Canada generally, to strengthen our country, rather than to see it break up. I we, as elected representatives of the people of Manitoba, can continue to manifest those qualities and to give leadership, as the Premier certainly attempted to do in Lethbridge, then I am confident, sir, our future will be secure.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I first wish to thank the First Minister for giving us a brief report pertaining to the Western Premiers Conference.

Secondly, I would certainly like, at this opportunity, to associate the opposition with a precise and very clear position on our part that there can be no negotiation pertaining to sovereignty association. The country must be kept united. And that does not mean, of course, Mr. Speaker, that there is not room for constitutional discussions and constitutional reform and we would like, Mr. Speaker, to be very much a part of that process in Manitoba. Constitutional reform proposals are a matter that, I believe, should be as non-partisan as is possible. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we have urged the First Minister to call into being an all party Legislative Committee so that we can develop a consensus, within Manitoba, as to what constitutional reforms ought to be implemented in Canada insofar as Manitobans are concerned.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that type of Legislative Committee review should involve the representations that would be made to it by all Manitobans so that all Manitobans can provide us with their views and their opinions as to that process. And thirdly, Mr. Speaker, Alberta, Saskatchewan, I believe Ontario just recently, have decided upon a period of days in order to discuss the entire issues involving sovereignty association, the constitutional changes. And I would hope that the First Minister still would ensure that we, in this Legislature, have that opportunity to participate in the fullest form of discussion during this session, as they have done in other provinces, so that there is the fullest airing of the different views that must be expressed pertaining to where we had, as Manitobans, within the total Canadian context. And we would urge the First Minister to commit himself to ensuring that there is opportunity for that type of debate during this session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition, I must also commend the First Minister on another change of heart. We have seen a number of changes of heart this last month or two, since those days of '77 and '78, there are suddenly some changes of heart. And in the

communiqué, which the First Minister has just provided us with, Communiqué No. 6, Item No. 2, it reads, and I gather a consensus by the Western Premiers, that action is required to reduce Canada's reliance on foreign capital. Among steps required are a variety of tax measures which influence both the outflow of Canadian savings and the inflow of foreign savings.

Mr. Speaker, this stands in sharp contrast to the speeches by the First Minister in New York, in California over the past year or two, in sharp contrast to the position that has been taken by the First Minister in the past, and we welcome constructive steps throughout Canada in order to ensure less reliance in Canada upon foreign capital.

I would hope, for example, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister would stand more fully in support of the actions by the foreign review agency in Ottawa, rather than as he has done in the past, attacked that agency when it has attempted to restrain the takeover of Canadian companies by American companies. And I would hope the First Minister might lead the way in Manitoba to suggest to Canada that they should, indeed, charge interest in respect to deferred taxes, some 15 billion in deferred taxes. These would be constructive, concrete measures.

So Mr. Speaker, on our part, we welcome the change of heart on the part of the First Minister, and we await the First Minister's efforts to ensure that we will be involved in the type of debate that is so necessary at this crucial time in Canadian history, a debate in this Chamber, a debate among Manitobans as to the Constitution that Manitobans, as Canadians, wish to be part of in the years that lie ahead.

ORAL QUESTIONS (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Minister of Natural Resources. I would ask him if the Garrison Diversion was on the agenda for discussion when Mr. Vance was in Ottawa, I believe it was yesterday or the day before?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I am not party to the agenda for the discussions between the federal government and the federal government of the United States, but I certainly would hope that an issue as important as the Garrison Diversion would have been raised.

MR. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. I would ask him if he had been in touch with the federal government before Mr. Vance's visit to have the Garrison Diversion placed on the agenda?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we have been in touch with the federal government many times over the years and on a continuing basis, to make certain

that the federal government appreciates the position of Manitoba with respect to the Garrison Diversion. The federal government has continued to take a firm stand with respect to that issue that we fully support, and I am certain that same position continues to be held by the federal government and will be put forward on every occasion.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would undertake to get in touch with the federal Minister responsible for the discussions with Mr. Vance to ascertain whether or not this discussion did take place during Mr. Vance's visit?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to make that enquiry, but I wish to make it very clear to the honourable member that the issue has been brought to the attention of our federal government and the United States federal government on many occasions. We continue to have the assurance of the federal government in the United States that they will not violate The Boundary Water Treaty Act; that the recommendations of the International Joint Commission will be adhered to. We have had the opportunity to make that point directly to the Congress and the Senate, as well as to the executive level of the United States government through our federal government. I, personally, have had an opportunity to meet with the Ambassador from the United States to discuss that issue and I know that it is an issue that is well understood at all levels of government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up question on that issue, I would like to ask the Minister if he can indicate to the House what is the most recent communication that his government has had with the federal government with respect to this matter, and I ask this in view of the Minister's rather vague answers to the House in response to my colleague from Ste. Rose.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: I'm not entirely certain what is the most recent communication we have had, Mr. Speaker. I would have to check with my staff to determine that, but we have had contact at the Ministerial level on an ongoing basis several times during the course of time since October 1977.

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Hydro, and it's with respect to the hydro project at Great Falls, Manitoba. Reports I have received from the area indicate that area residents are not being given a fair opportunity to obtain employment on the site. Apparently the contractor or contractors who were working for Manitoba Hydro in this regard are bringing their labour in, and some of it even allegedly

being brought in from out of province and out of country.

I wonder if the Minister can investigate this situation if he is not aware of it and report to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think if the member wishes to obtain detailed information that again, perhaps the correct place to address it would be during the hearings before the Public Utilities Committee. In general terms, I can make enquiries to determine whether there has been an overall policy established and it might be helpful if the member could give me more specific information that I may refer to the Utility for examination.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up question, I would like to ask the Minister to check, if he is not personally aware at this time, whether or not there is any clause in the contracts which the Manitoba Hydro facility signed with the general contractor, or contractors on site, respecting the employment of people from the area or at least people from Manitoba with respect to that operation?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it would be unusual if there was a clause restricting employment to the province of Manitoba. Generally that sort of clause is steered away from. Whether or not there is a clause, though, to try and adapt local employment to a local regional area, I can take that question as notice and make enquiries.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Due to the Minister of Health's statement yesterday that due to a happy set of circumstances he was in a position to shift four school divisions from the services of dental nurses to that of the MDA, and further due to the fact he admitted that he had not canvassed dental nurses as to their availability to serve in those four school divisions, my question to the Minister of Health, has he, since yesterday's revelation, instructed the staff of his department to undertake a thorough canvass of unemployed dental nurses in the province of Manitoba, or those that are not employed in dental nursing, to ascertain their availability to serve in dental nursing in the various school divisions in the province of Manitoba that still operate under the government Dental Nursing Program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): No, Mr. Speaker, not since yesterday, but we have canvassed and monitored the list of dental nurse graduates who are available for employment, and as I said yesterday, the turnover to dentists in those divisions or in any other divisions will require that they hire dental nurses in their practices.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to dental nurses working in government programs. That

which they do in dental offices, under dentists, may be entirely different from that which they were trained for. Can the Minister advise whether he has any intention of attempting to canvass the dental nurses in the province of Manitoba to ascertain whether in the future they will be available for work in school divisions operating under the government program? If he has not since yesterday, does he intend to in the next days and weeks and months to do so?

MR. SHERMAN: I certainly can formulate that intention if, as and when it becomes necessary, Mr. Speaker. At the moment it isn't necessary. We are reviewing the two programs, conclusions will be drawn from those two programs, answers to the questions in the mind of the Honourable Leader of Opposition will be determined at that time.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Minister. Is the Minister at all concerned about the fact that by the time he has completed his reviews and further reviews, that many of those dental nurses will have already left the province of Manitoba and will not be available for further work under their careers within the province?

MR. SHERMAN: I am concerned about that, Mr. Speaker, but I remind the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that they were the ones, when in government, who created the concept, who dangled the carrot, and who were not in any position to compromise a future government as to the direction of childrens dental health services in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I wonder if we are wisely using our question period when there are questions that are being asked and repeated in estimates, which would occur probably in twenty minutes, half an hour's time?
The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Health is in a position to respond to my question of the 10th of April, which I repeated on the 16th of April, relative to the report of deterioration in the quality of milk in plastic bags under fluorescent lights?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I am, and I'm not, Mr. Speaker. That is, the question has been referred to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, who was developing an answer to it. But at the same time, I would just remind the honourable member for Fort Rouge that professional comment has already been carried in the media dispelling any doubts or fears that anyone may have that packaged milk is damaged by fluorescent light.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, my understanding is that the report that was carried in the media refers to Vitamin C content, not to the Riboflavin and Vitamin A content which was also in the original report, and I will continue to await a response from one of the Ministers to this question.

—(Interjection)— Don't hold my breath, the Member for St. Boniface . . .

May I ask another question of another Minister, Mr. Speaker? This also refers to a question that I raised on the 16th of April, addressed to the Honourable Minister of Finance, which he also took as notice. I asked if he could advise what is happening regarding the Winnipeg area airport study and any proposed further development of the Winnipeg International Airport. He took that as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): If I may, Mr. Speaker, I could answer that question. The airport study has been presented, as we all know. At the present time the Manitoba government is encouraging the federal government to go ahead with Phase 1 of the airport study, which would be to extend the two runways that were proposed to being extended, and that in itself, Sir, would take away the noise that is presently over the area close to the airport and would also make a great step to the use of the western side of the airport by airlines in general. The Minister of Transportation and I met with Mr. Pepin. We expressed our concern that this was not being done because we believe it's the first step that should be done and we have also talked with Mr. Bockstael about the matter and he has personally made a tour of the airport, personally made representation for us in Ottawa, and we are awaiting the results of those actions.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the absence of both the Minister for Municipal Affairs and the Attorney-General, the Minister for Urban Affairs, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Honourable First Minister, who no doubt would want to take it as notice because I assume he would not be aware of the background to these questions. I would like to point out to him that there appears to be a contradiction in policy or procedure, which I would invite him to investigate and report on, between the Minister for Municipal Affairs, who suspended two municipally-elected officials because of an allegation of impropriety as compared with the Minister for Urban Affairs, the Attorney-General, who was not prepared to investigate alleged infractions of an elected city of Winnipeg official unless it were to be complained on.

That's one contradiction which I would appreciate his looking into, and the other one is the apparent contradiction by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who suspended two elected municipal officials based on their alleged improper actions, and what I believe he said yesterday and that is that there have been allegations against members of his own staff but he is not suspending them, pending the investigation. I wonder if the Honourable First Minister would agree to accept these questions as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member has properly said, I am not aware of the incidents that he mentions. I'll be happy to take them as notice on behalf of the Ministers in question, but I would suggest to him, merely on the basis of what he has said in phrasing his question, that he of course is first of all dealing with two or three different sets of legislation with respect to municipal officials; one presumably would be The City of Winnipeg Act, the other presumably would be The Municipal Act and/or The Local Government Districts Act, which may or may not have different provisions and I'm forbidden by the rules of the House, Sir, as is the Attorney-General or the Minister of Urban Affairs, from giving legal opinions.

On the second matter, that sounds more like an administrative matter, which I am sure the Attorney-General would be happy to respond to when he gets back. I believe he's in Ottawa.

MR. CHERNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the willingness of the First Minister to accept these as notice. The question was really directed to him because, as he says, there may be some difference in jurisdictional powers, although just to clarify, the Honourable Attorney-General said that he would not investigate unless there was a complaint. So there is that difference that the First Minister mentioned that may be there. The other is; of course, an administrative matter which was that of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, not the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Minister of Health. Has he seen a report by a committee of the Manitoba Medical Association which concludes that there are a great number of therapeutic abortions being performed outside Manitoba and in back alleys that are not medically controlled and that the Manitoba Medical Association as a result, is very concerned about this matter? Has he looked at that report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I received today, at noon today, a report containing some recommendations from the Committee on Therapeutic Abortion of the section of Obstetrics and Gynaecology of the Manitoba Medical Association so that as of now my answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary question to the Minister: Does the Minister concur with the recommendation of the MMA Committee that a private profit-making clinic or hospital should be built to deal with the deficiency in public facilities, or will he ensure that public facilities are sufficient and adequate to provide for or to enable people who are eligible for therapeutic medically-prescribed abortions to have them in Manitoba, without having to resort to going out of the province or to going to the back alley butchershops? Will he insure that the public facilities are adequate to meet their needs?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not subscribe to, nor do my colleagues, nor does this government subscribe to any recommendations that equate to abortion on demand, nor do I think did the previous government of this province. We will make every effort at the Women's Centre of the Health Sciences Centre in the redevelopment program under way now to accommodate the legitimate needs and volumes of Manitoba citizens in the area of therapeutic abortion.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I would like to point out to the Minister that he did not answer the question I asked him regarding . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I point out to the honourable member that there is no obligation on the part of any Minister to answer a question that has been asked of him. The Honourable Member for Transcona with another question.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to rephrase my question because it was obvious from the answer of the Health Minister that he did not understand my question as to whether in fact health facilities were adequate in Manitoba to enable people who require, according to a medical panel, a therapeutic abortion. Does he feel that there are adequate facilities in Manitoba to meet the needs of these people who pass panels which are, in fact, composed of medical people; are the facilities adequate and why, then, are there so many therapeutic abortions taking place outside Manitoba?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the facilities are not adequate at the present time, but the renovations that are under way for interim upgrading of the Women's Centre, plus the long-term redevelopment which will be completed by 1983, will, we believe, provide us with sufficient capability and capacity to meet the legitimate volumes in that area, such as I've suggested.

As to the second part of the honourable member's question, he raises a question with deep social, religious and ethical implications and I'm not either wise enough, nor am I prepared, to comment in question period on that subject.

HON. DON ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Member for Elmwood phrased a question to me as to whether I, as Minister of Transportation, would consider compulsory legislation to require all bicycles in the province to have lighting and I replied that was not part of any legislative proposals that I would put forward; but I did not want to leave the impression with the House, Mr. Speaker, that we are without legislation in The Highway Traffic Act to deal with the lighting of bicycles when they are in use between the hours of dusk and dawn. I would like to refer the Honourable Member for Elmwood to Section 140, of the Highway Traffic Act, Subsections 1, 2 and 3, which is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I thank to the honourable minister for the information.

The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the First Minister. My question relates to the Port of Prince Rupert and the Port of Churchill and, in view of the disturbing information we've been getting through the press in recent weeks, I'm wondering if the First Minister could indicate, and briefly to the members of this House and to the people of Manitoba, as to what took place and what kind of a message that they had conveyed to the federal government in regard to these two important matters.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the interest, at least on this side of the House, in matters of that concern to the basic industry in Manitoba. And it's a concern that I may say, Mr. Speaker, is shared by all four of the elected governments in Western Canada. There is deep concern, as expressed in the communiqué and, as more fervently expressed when Premier Lougheed and Premier Bennett were speaking to this topic only yesterday, about the apparent reneging by the Trudeau Liberal government on the signed agreement to proceed with the installations at Prince Rupert. The communiqué has called upon the federal government to do a very simple, but a very necessary thing, and that is to honour its obligations; to honour its obligations to the people of Canada and particularly to the people of Western Canada with respect to the developments at Prince Rupert, which were entered into in good faith by the consortium with the provinces involved supplying — that is British Columbia, in particular — supplying infrastructure, moneys and so on.

And so I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that again, on all sides of the House, we would find support for the proposition that the fundamental obligations entered into by the government of Canada and by the consortium, just a matter of months ago, will be carried out by the new Trudeau government and that their apparent preoccupation with other events in Canada will permit them to see that there are matters of pressing priority concern for the continuing development of the western economy that must have priority in their consideration at this time.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question and I wonder if the First Minister could give us any information in regard to the dual line running rates going to Churchill?

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, again I would have hoped that there would be interest on all sides of the House about further development of the Port of Churchill. Mr. Speaker, there was unanimous agreement, Mr. Speaker, at the Western Premiers Conference that the attention of the federal government, again, must be redirected to, not only to Rupert, about which I spoke just a moment ago, but about the fundamental importance as well of the Port of Vancouver, of Roberts Bank, of the Port of Churchill, in terms of increased facilities and installations for the Port of Churchill, as well as for upgrading of the rail line, of the Herschel Division, into Churchill, in order that we can maximize the benefit of the Port of Churchill, particularly for grain

shipments from northern Saskatchewan and northern Alberta which are used, as we all know, Mr. Speaker, much more extensively by farmers in those areas than by the farmers of Manitoba.

And so I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would again find support on all sides of the House for that proposition and when the various Ministers are speaking to their Ottawa counterparts, about Churchill, about Roberts Bank, about Rupert, we could feel there would be that kind of unanimity within the House that would indicate that what is good for the west, in that respect, is equally good for Manitoba and that the kind of solidarity the west expresses on this matters to what is very often, Mr. Speaker, a federal government that does not listen. That kind of solidarity would be manifested in this House as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that the First Minister is undertaking to undo some of the damage which was done to Churchill by his colleague, Jack Murta, from Lisgar, a few months ago. Long overdue, we on this side of the House, welcome that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister whether or not — because I know the First Minister would not wish to leave a wrong impression, which some of his colleagues behind him were wishing to leave — would the First Minister wish to confirm that the policy which he is presently pursuing, pertaining to both Churchill and Prince Rupert is consistent, fully consistent, with the position which has been taken by the province of Manitoba, including the position that was taken by the former Premier of this province, Edward Schreyer, in the early '70s and that his present position is not inconsistent, is not novel, and that, in fact, Mr. Speaker, he has solidarity, not only with other western Premiers, but consistency with the position that was taken in previous years, under Ed Schreyer and the former New Democratic Party government in the province of Manitoba.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, as usual, talks in circles. If he is asking me if this government is prepared to stand back because, Mr. Speaker, unlike his party, we don't have to look toward our political bedfellows in Ottawa, the Liberal Party, and hesitate in any criticism of them, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this government, unlike the previous government, unlike the previous government, is not afraid to demand of Ottawa the absolute right for every citizen of Manitoba, regardless of the political stripe of that government. Mr. Speaker, I can't recall too well with respect to the Port of Churchill, what my honourable friends did in terms of improving the grain handling and transportation facilities up there because, Mr. Speaker, there seemed to be a lack of concern on the part of the NDP, manifested even today, about agricultural in Manitoba. They weren't terribly concerned about it. They did, Mr. Speaker, leave a white elephant in Churchill in the form of a 12 million or 14 million development, which the people of Manitoba are now paying for. I merely say, Mr. Speaker, that we would like to see further . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I would hope the honourable members, when they are phrasing their questions, would be willing to accept the answers and allow the person who is speaking the courtesy of having the undivided attention of the House.
The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I conclude merely by saying this, that we wish to see . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. If the Honourable Member for St. Boniface wants the floor, I wish he would indicate it in the normal manner.
The Honourable First Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to know what resolution we are debating at this time during the question period?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, to conclude what I was saying about the Port of Churchill, I would hope that we would see a reawakening in the members of the opposition about concern for the fundamental facilities in the Port of Churchill, namely, the grain handling and transportation depot that we have there and a depot, Mr. Speaker, and a port facility that is capable of transporting other commodities than grain.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends, if they will look beyond their dogma a bit, will realize that in this province now, thanks of the development policies that are going on here, we can now start to consider other commodities, such as potash, which never would have been developed under my honourable friends if they were in office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I noted your request that we phrase our questions to draw appropriate answers. Unfortunately, my question would have sought a simple yes or no, neither of which was answered re the damage done to Churchill by the First Minister's colleague, Jack Murta, not answered, and whether or not the present government in Manitoba was pursuing a consistent policy with that of Ed Schreyer's government in the early 1970s, again not answered.

I would like the First Minister to comment as to whether or not it was not the New Democratic Party Government in Manitoba that established the Port of Churchill Development Board, the Board to which his colleague, the Member for Rock Lake, presently sits; whether it was not the New Democratic Party Government that established that Artic Re-Supply Service in Churchill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I suggest that the honourable member may very well be debating rather than seeking information. — (Interjections)— May I suggest the honourable member may very well be debating rather than seeking information.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in all due respect, because I know you have a difficult task, but I would trust you would agree that your request to myself about not debating would equally apply to the First Minister of this province in answering questions from this side.

Mr. Speaker, in respect to getting into bed with his bedfellows, or our bedfellows as he suggests in Ottawa, I want to ask the First Minister whether or not he is prepared to divorce himself from his bedfellows in Ottawa by taking clear action, consistent with the position which has been taken in Lethbridge about returning to Canada greater Canadian ownership and less reliance upon foreign ownership, to disassociate himself and to speak out against the tardy, lengthy policy on the part of the Trudeau Government, to take ten years to restore to Canadians at least 50 percent of Canadian interest and ownership in Canadian oil resources? Is he prepared to undertake that type of leadership with the present Liberal Government in Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition as usual, reads a half-a-quote or a half-a-paragraph and draws an ideological conclusion from that which has no relationship to the facts whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend will take the time and if he will recall what I said in my, what I thought were really non-controversial opening remarks, if he will take the time to read the communiques — I can only ask for divine intervention that he would understand them — but if he would take the time to read them, Mr. Speaker, he would then find out that what we were talking about in the economic review was this — and I would like to hear during the course of the Budget Speech my honourable friend's comment on these topics — that we have an adverse trade balance in this country, that we have an extremely unacceptable deficit position by the federal government in this country brought about by policies that I am sure my honourable friends would agree with, and that to counteract and to offset the negative effect that those are having on every Canadian, by way of inflation, it is absolutely necessary that the balance of payments question be brought into a greater balance. One of the factors for doing that, of course, Mr. Speaker, would be to encourage greater Canadian investment in all aspects of Canadian industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any party — (Interjections)— Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friends want an answer, I am prepared to give it. If they want to howl like socialist dogs, that is their business.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Quite obviously we are having some difficulty in this particular question period. I think the nature of the questions that a members asks will quite often dictate the nature of the response that is required. If the question does require a lengthy answer, I hope the members have the courtesy to listen to it. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I will try to follow your injunction, which, of course, is absolutely right. I apologize to my honourable friends for the term socialist dogs. I should have said if they wish to howl like dogs, because I hate to discriminate against dogs, I love all dogs. I regret the analogy.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, cannot read into these statements, as he is apparently attempting to do, support for The Foreign Investment Review Act because at least two or three of the Premiers who met in Lethbridge have made it known on previous occasions to the federal government as to what we think of that particular instrumentality. Now what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there should be tax incentives to encourage more Canadian investment in Canadian resource.

So I think my honourable friend, in his quiet moments, if he will read that, will see that he cannot elongate that kind of a statement into the kind of a quasi-endorsement of what I'm sure he agrees, and we agree, Mr. Speaker, is not a satisfactory agency for bringing about the desired result of more Canadian investment in Canadian enterprise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Order please. Order please. I hope all members would give the courtesy to the person who wishes to ask a question.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that in that long discourse by the First Minister, there really was no answer to the question which was presented to him. I would have hoped that you might have provided some comment pertaining to that, Mr. Speaker, because we are interested in knowing, just by what practical means the First Minister is going to undertake a policy thrust which we commend him for, to ensure that there is less reliance upon foreign capital, greater Canadian investment and thrust, and if that be the case, then I believe it was a fair question to pose to the First Minister, as to whether he was prepared to assume leadership in Canada, to make representations to the federal government in respect to a tardy, lacklustre, slow pace of approach on the part of the federal government to restore to Canadians a greater interest in the oil resources in Canada. Ten years to obtain 50 percent, we say is too little, too late, that oil is a basic resource of Canada, and if the First Minister wants to really demonstrate that he is not simply relying upon verbosity in his statement, but wishes to undertake some precise and specific answers to that which he expresses concern about in his communique, then the First Minister surely can indicate whether he is prepared to undertake that sort of leadership on the

part of Manitoba and Manitobans in general with Ottawa.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be fair, and not unkind to say that the four premiers of western Canada meeting in Lethbridge over the last two days were trying to be inspired more by serving the public interest than any quaint ideology. And I would say this, Mr. Speaker, in furtherance of that, that if my honourable friend will read the communique, he will see this, that we asked the federal government, as the provinces themselves have been attempting to do, to stay to the economic charter that was devised and pounded out and agreed to by Mr. Trudeau and the ten premiers in 1978, and all of the precepts of that charter, Mr. Speaker, lowering government deficits, keeping government spending under control, keeping the size of the civil service under control, are all contained in there and they are precepts, Mr. Speaker, which I would be happy to hear my honourable friend stand in his place and say that he agrees with. That's what we were getting at, because we said high interest rates and these other matters were symptoms of the fundamental disease which has been profligate spending by government, primarily, over the past ten years, to which my honourable friends contributed more than their fair share in their eight lacklustre years in office.

So I say to my honourable friend that he had better learn to distinguish between writing a trade balance, that is increasing the amount that Canada can export and the dollars that we can get in for those exports, rather than pursuing any one of his ideological grails, which is really secondary to serving the public interest of the people of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize there is a great desire on the part of all members to carry on with this debate, but the time for question period has expired. Can we proceed with Orders of the Day?

ORDERS OF THE DAY - COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I have some changes for the Public Utilities Committee. I would wish to substitute the Honourable Member for St. George for the Honourable Member for Elmwood; and also the Honourable Member for Selkirk for the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are those changes agreeable to the House? (Agreed)
The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and the Honourable

Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Environment.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris MacGregor (Virden): I call the Committee to order. We are on Resolution No. 38, 5.(a)(1)—pass. The Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. First I will have to inquire as to the condition of the Minister's hand, and say that I hope that it was nothing serious. He indicated yesterday that there had been some problem and at that time I didn't have an opportunity, but just wanted to advise him of our sympathy and hope that it is indeed nothing of a permanent nor serious nature, although I see it is still a bit swollen.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN: Thank you, very much. I'm relieved to find that it's not broken and I should be able to handle a golf club within a couple of weeks.

MR. COWAN: We too are pleased to hear that. I would ask the Minister then, and I believe it would be advisable to begin the discourse on this portion of his estimates in just trying to, in a more general way, feel out the Minister as to his philosophies in this regard, what he believes he brings to this ministry, because he is a new Minister in this particular area, if he can indicate why it was there was a change from where the previous department in which this ministry was housed — not the previous department, but the previous complimentary department to which this was ministry was housed — and what he sees as the function of the Department of the Environment, and how he intends to proceed with that function?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the transfer of this branch of the department to Consumer and Corporate Affairs, it was an effort to redistribute the workload amongst various Cabinet Ministers. As my honourable friend is probably aware, the Minister of Natural Resources is also the chairman of the Treasury Board, which carries with it a very heavy responsibility. I believe the Premier felt that a transfer of the Environmental Branch to my department would relieve the Minister of Natural Resources of what I found out to be a fairly heavy responsibility, and I don't think that the Minister could have handled this department, the Natural Resources Department as well as the somewhat onerous responsibilities of Treasury Board. I suppose the short answer to his question is simply a levelling out of the responsibilities carried by each of the Ministers of the Crown.

Insofar as the answer to the other questions are concerned, my honourable friend asked me what I bring to the department. In response to that question I tell him I bring a very keen interest in the whole question of environmental management and a desire to attempt to implement what I consider to be some

of the problems, that if indeed are not upon us today, problems that most certainly are to develop in the future and are with us, perhaps not to the extent that they pose crisis situations, but to the extent that they will create problems for the future. If he wishes a couple of examples, the question of hazardous waste and sewage disposal is one example. I speak of water quality management, and a more effective way of disposing of sewage, in addition of course to the regular environmental problems that are upon us on a daily basis as a result of changes in technology. My honourable friend is aware of a good many of those; acid rain, the question of lead in the air, and a host of other difficulties that we are faced with on a day-to-day basis.

We are attempting to come to grips with these problems, to eliminate them where they can be eliminated; to mitigate them where they can be mitigated; and in many cases we have to live with a certain amount of them. But to the best extent possible we hope that we can provide for the people of this province an environment that is healthy and clean, and to that end we are dedicated.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister's comments are certainly acceptable to the members on this side, and we can only hope that in the future that he is able to deal with the situation that he has outlined to us. I am fearful that he will not be able to, and that's no reflection on the Minister as a person, or as a Minister, because I believe that he has talents as a Minister of the Crown. I just believe that the Minister is in a somewhat awkward position being a Minister of a Progressive Conservative government, and we will talk about that later.

I also believe that the Minister is in the awkward position of being a Minister in this day and age, when these problems are coming to the forefront so quickly and so furiously, and with such an impact that even a Minister of his talents, no matter which political persuasion they were of, no matter which government they were a part of, would have difficulty in dealing with them on a complete basis and would find themselves, as the Minister has found himself, doing more firefighting on an ad hoc basis than the development of any long-term strategies and plans. I am pleased to hear the Minister brings with this, he says, a very keen interest in the area of environmental management. He brings that with him to the Ministry. And he mentioned a number of specific areas, which I don't believe the list to be all-inclusive, and I don't believe that the Minister indicated it to be all-inclusive, but some of the areas at least captured our attention over the past number of months.

Going back though, before we pursue that area, going back into the Minister's explanation for the transference of this department from the co-relationship with the Department of the Mines — and I have to add, at this point, I don't believe that it was in a proper niche, to use an environmental term, it was in a proper niche there, either, and that was the niche to which our government put it in, and I had some reservations about that. I don't believe that it is in a proper niche now, because I believe there is an inherent conflict of interest that the Minister will find himself captured up in as time goes on, and that

is that the environmental problems that we are facing, by and large, for the most part today, are problems that are caused by the corporate sector. They are caused because, as the Minister said, of new technologies. Well, they are caused in many cases by old technologies, and that is the problem, in that those technologies have not kept pace with the requirements of society as a whole, because one of the reasons that environmental issues have captured such concern in regard to public impressions, is that we are now beginning to demand more by the way of environmental management than we have before.

So while, in fact, the environmental problems are probably the same in intensity that they were a number of years ago outside of a few isolated areas which we will have to talk about, and perhaps even in some instances, less, and one only need look at the quality of air today, as compared to the quality of air in 1950, or even, indeed in 1960, and you will see that there is an appreciable improvement in the quality of air, but the fact is — and that's in certain instances, I wouldn't make that as a blanket statement, but in certain instances, in the cities, for an example, you don't have, in Manitoba — again, I have to be careful of the way I phrase this, Manitoba has never really had the problems, say of London, or of New York city, or Los Angeles. But the fact is, in London and in New York city and in Los Angeles now, you don't have the smog problem that you had a number of years ago. You still have some very major problems, but that is not one of them.

You don't hear about the catastrophic effects of temperature inversions when you did have a high smog problem, where you would have thousands of people that could be negatively impacted to the point of fatality in regard to the effects of those smog inversions. We are through that particular phase, I hope, for the most part in the modern industrial world.

The problems that we face today are more subtle, perhaps not any less dangerous, perhaps not any less important. As a matter of fact, not even perhaps, absolutely not any less important. But they are different problems and they aren't as prominent to the public as those problems were 10 and 20 years ago. So why do we have the public interest to the level that we do today? Well, we do so because the public is, No. 1, more knowledgeable, and No. 2, more demanding.

So the fact is that the problems that we do have today are problems that are created by industrial activity, and that this industrial activity is created by industrialists, and that these industrialists, therefore, have a certain responsibility to ensure that their activity does not impose, in a negative sense, on the general society at large. And so that is where I see the conflict, that the Minister is in a position where he has to, in some respects, encourage that sort of development, and at the other side, he has to place some very stringent controls and confines on the way in which that development would take place. So I would just ask the Minister if he, in a philosophical and general sense, would care to comment as to how he is going to deal with that in his pursuance of proper environmental management for the province?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): The Honourable Minister.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the problems that are outlined by my honourable friend are those that I'm very keenly aware of, and he's quite right when he suggests that perhaps in today's world they appear to be greater today than they were in the past, even though they were with us in the past, and to a large extent, that comes about as a result of an awareness on the part of the public, brought about by more publicity on this subject, more activist groups that have been involved in publicizing them, and the public themselves now are keenly aware of the need to provide an environment that is not dangerous to their health.

But I think that one of the areas in which the public themselves have not fully grasped the significance of, and that is their own role in bringing about the desirable changes that we feel are necessary. I am not sure just what my honourable friend means about a conflict of interest in that industry itself is a large part of the problem. I am very much aware of that, and I have no hesitation in suggesting that they have got to become part of the answer to the problems that they have created. They have to bear a part of the cost of removing the difficulties, along with the public in general. I think it's going to have to be a co-operative effort on the part of, not only the public and the government, but industry as well.

I see some encouraging signs that industry are now recognizing the extent to which they have created the problems and accepting, indeed, their share of that responsibility. I think it's a question now of attempting to harness the combined resources of all sectors in an effort to eliminate the pollution of the atmosphere and our environment and arriving at a mutually satisfactory arrangement in the handling and dealing of these problems.

I, as one example, can see that the question of waste disposal is one that cannot be carried on simply by either industry or government or the public. It, of necessity, requires a combined contribution by all of them in order to successfully overcome this particular problem.

My honourable friend is, I think, as aware as I am of the difficulties in attempting to bring this about, but a start has to be made somewhere and sometime and it is my intention to attempt to bring about that kind of co-operation between industry, the public, government, in order to provide, what I consider to be, a better environment for this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)(1). The Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The Minister said that the public is now demanding an environment that is healthy to itself, an environment in which they can feel comfortable and in which they can bring up their families to enjoy the benefits that living in this type of a society can provide us. So there's two issues at hand. I'd ask the Minister then, in his opinion, is the environment that we have today in the province, and of course we will confine our remarks to the province, if he believes that environment to be a healthy environment in the sense that it is pollution free and that there is very

little contamination of that environment by outside sources.

MR. JORGENSEN: Of course there are exceptions. What my honourable friend means by outside sources, I suppose he means jurisdictions outside the province of Manitoba. My honourable friend himself is not only keenly aware of the problem of acid rain. We contribute to an extent to that, but I think to a larger extent the greatest contributors are sources other than our own jurisdiction. With respect to the question of whether or not I believe we have the kind of environment that we consider ideal, I think it's perhaps far better than a lot of areas of the world and indeed this part of the continent, but nothing remains static, and with new technology, with new industries, we contribute to more problems and it is an effort to attempt to ensure that new developments do not bring with them an increase in the problem that we currently face. Indeed I'm hopeful that, not only can there be a maintenance of present environment, but a reduction in a lot of the areas of pollution that we currently experience.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you. I'm certain the Minister, when he speaks of new technology, does not want to preclude new technologies that are being every day, that are being developed in fact to reduce the effects of pollution on the environment, so that not all new technologies are in fact pollution sources, some of them may well indeed be intended to reduce the effects and also to reduce to pollutions. One need only look to some of the activities that are going up in the mining industry today where new technologies are being brought onstream that are intended — and one has to wait to see whether they actually fulfil that promise or not — but are intended to reduce the negative emissions of the mining industry, the smelters, etc.

The Minister said that nothing remains constant, or that in this case the environment does remain constant, does not maintain the same level of pollution from one period to another. I would ask the Minister, if in his opinion or in his department's opinion, the quality of the environment in Manitoba today is improving, or is the quality of the environment decreasing?

MR. JORGENSEN: I would venture to suggest that there has been an improvement in the quality of the environment. If my honourable friend is going to ask me, which I believe will be his next question, to put my finger on any particular area, I will cite one that I think is going to be an advancement, and that is what I consider to be the new technology with respect to automotive power. There are designs of motors on the market now that are emission free. That to me bodes well for environment, particularly in the more heavily congested areas such as the cities of this province. There may be other areas that just don't come to my mind at the moment, but there is no question that a new technology in smokestack emissions could bring about a considerable impact in environmental quality.

The department has been working very quietly, but nonetheless very effectively, with respect to the question of waste disposal, in arranging with the municipalities of this province, disposal or land-filled

sites that are not as likely to contribute to problems in the future by eliminating the land filling of hazardous waste material.

We are now far more conscious of the whole question of water quality. Indeed there are studies currently going on in the various water sheds in this province to attempt to get a handle on the water quality of those water sheds and to actively encourage the participation of the public in those areas so they have a better understanding of their contribution to lower water qualities, so that they have a better idea of the kind of standards that they would like to see for themselves in those areas and what their contribution to improving their standards convey.

I suppose there are several other areas that I could mention but I think my honourable friend will get some idea of the areas in which we feel we have been moving and in which we have achieved some reasonable degree of success.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, the Minister's last statement does bring forth a thought, and I just have to precede that by saying that this is the second time that the Minister has clairvoyantly determined what my next question will be, and I'd ask him if I'm becoming so typical in my questioning as to allow that to happen, or perhaps he is clairvoyant, because it certainly does put me at a disadvantage if he's going to answer my questions before I ask them, but I do appreciate the information anyway. That's because he has been allowed to phrase a question in which he wants to answer it rather than I am allowed to phrase the question in which I want him to answer it.

At any rate, I would ask him, because it is important, to be very specific in regard to some of these innovations and innovative activities that he's mentioned, because it is one thing to develop new technology, to encourage the development of new technology, to even aid in the development of new technology, but it is another thing altogether to put that technology into place.

Now in dealing with the areas of water quality and the water sheds, the province has a bit of an easier row to hoe because they're dealing with themselves, in other words, they can impose upon themselves in many instances certain requirements, but when they have to impose upon industry, which is a pollution source, either in the watershed or a pollution source in the air stack emissions, or when they have to impose upon the industry the manufacturing level in regards to car manufacturing in specific reference to new engines that are less polluting and new gases that are less polluting, and when they have to impose upon the industrial concerns in regards to making certain that they put in place these new technologies in smoke stack emission control, then they have a far more difficult problem, because they doing it with very little leverage actually and they have to enforce, if they want to enforce properly, and if they want to make a successful job of their attempts to improve the environment, they have to enforce some pretty stringent — and sometimes to the industry some onerous — conditions. So I would ask the Minister if he can be very specific in regards to where they have been able to No. 1, put new technologies into place, that's very important, in that I'm speaking about the

areas that he has talked about, the smoke stack emissions, automotive technology, watershed improvement, landfill sites. Again that's an internal matter, but he still has to negotiate with the municipalities in certain respects in regard to that. Where are these new landfill sites at, what sort of instructions are the municipalities being given in regard to how to proceed with these landfill sites and how to maintain them. Those sorts of details, I believe, are important to our better understanding of where the Minister is taking the public in regard to some very serious environmental hazards.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps if there is a difference in the approach that my honourable friend would take with respect to these problems, and the approach that I feel will be successful in the approach to these problems, it lies in our attitude towards how effective government alone can be, in enunciating new regulations, new laws and matters of that nature. As an example, I draw my friend's attention to the host of regulations and restrictions that are imposed upon the automobile industry in an effort to curb pollution, to very little avail. But when the source of energy became an obvious problem and the public were seized with the problem themselves, they had far greater impact on the industry than all the government regulations in the world. They demanded automobiles that were pollution-free, they demanded automobiles that consumed less fuel, less energy, and as a result the automobile industries today are in deep difficulty because they failed to recognize those signs earlier, in spite of the regulations that were imposed upon them.

So I say to my honourable friend that it is not so much — although that most certainly is a part of the answer to the problem — not so much the question of announcing new regulations on a daily basis as it is working with the people that are generating the pollutants, attempting to reach an understanding with them of the nature of the problem that they are creating, and then finding mutually satisfactory solutions. I think that is of critical importance that if you are to be successful in any effort, that the people who are going to be affected, and that is everyone in this province, understand the reasons why they are being asked to do certain things and why their co-operation is sought in doing certain things.

I come back to the question of the arrangements that we made with the municipalities, and it is not so much an arrangement, it's not so much direction provided, or I shouldn't say direction but so much regulation provided by the government as it is bringing to their attention the nature of the problem and then depending upon their own good judgement and their desire not to contribute to that problem. Perhaps it is a longer route, perhaps it is not as dramatic but in the long run I think it is far more effective because once people understand and are given facts about a certain situation, there's a great deal more likelihood that you will have their whole-hearted co-operation. It's on that basis we hope to be able to bring about what I consider to be, if not the ideal, at least the best we can do in the way of pollution control and an improvement in the environment.

MR. COWAN: We are at a difference, Mr. Chairperson, in philosophy and in also ways which we would seek to implement that philosophy, although we do share some similar goals and I am certain the one goal that we share is that of a clean environment, and there's no doubt about that, and I for one would be the last to question the Minister's desire and his keen interest, as he said, in attempting to bring that about. But on the other hand we do perceive very different methods by which we can arrive at that clean environment and if I can be afforded the luxury of a prophecy — and I know that politicians shouldn't afford themselves that luxury, but I do so only because I am somewhat aware of the historical problem of pollution and the historical methods that have been devised to deal with that — and that is that the Minister's method is not going to work. That's an opinion, that's my opinion and I am certain it is different from the Minister's opinion just by the mere fact that he has put forth his idea of how to go about bringing about this cleaner environment.

But the fact is that in the past this exact methodology has been attempted by different jurisdictions from time to time and has always resulted in a worsening of the conditions rather than a bettering of the conditions. That is because there are many forces at play in the society at large, and many forces in play that will bring to bear pressures that cannot be dealt with strictly by education. And I don't mean to demean the impact of education — and by this I mean public education — I don't mean to suggest that we should not whole-heartedly attempt to educate the public as to the problems we all face and some of the solutions that we perceive as being possible. The fact is I encourage that and I think the Minister should be doing far more with it because I don't believe that enough has been accomplished in that regard. But that alone will not bring about the type of changes we need. For that reason I am somewhat concerned. Regulation is one way, legislation of course being the same way, to impose upon — and let's look at what that regulation does — to impose upon the polluter certain requirements in regards to their operation and how much of the emissions they are allowed to let loose into the air. Because no regulation will bring about an entirely pollution-free operation if it is not technically feasible and therefore most of your regulations are written in such language as to suggest that as far as is reasonably practicable or as far as reasonably technical, or in regard to, I think, the best available technology, is the terminology that is used. The fact is that without those regulations the industry does not have a guideline by which to try to develop their industry. The Minister can say that he is going to sit down and talk with them and try to develop ways and means of co-operating with them, but he's not going to be able to sit down and talk with every polluter, whether it be a private individual or whether it be an industry, because private individuals also pollute. He is not going to be able to sit down and go through the long process of, in a co-operative manner, developing mutually acceptable guidelines unless he is willing to forsake many principles in developing those mutually acceptable guidelines and I don't believe he is.

He is in a difficult bargaining position because the standard argument that has been used against government, when governments have attempted to impose regulations of this nature, is we will leave. We will leave your jurisdiction. We will get ourselves out from under your influence and therefore, don't push us because you will not be pushing us to clean up, you'll be pushing us out. Now the fact is that they very seldom do that. The fact is that they very seldom leave because of regulation legislation, but that is their argument and that is a gamble that the Minister has to take at each meeting, that he is going to run up against that particular counter-argument. So the fact is that when he goes into these meetings, in a co-operative way, to develop co-operative means of cleaning up a certain pollution source, he is at an extreme disadvantage and that does not mean that he cannot work his way out of that disadvantage, it just means that it's a long time-consuming process. So that is why regulations have been developed — to impose guidelines on industry at large and say, if you don't abide by these guidelines then we are going to bring action against you to make you abide by these guidelines, and that action has taken different forms according to different regulations and different legislation. But it is a very necessary part of the process of cleaning up the sources.

The sources, if you look at it from their perspective, are operating on a profit basis and they therefore have to make a profit and they have to make a certain amount of return; and that certain amount of return right now, I might add, is more than it was two or three years ago just because of the increases in the interest rate throughout the country. In other words, if a company has a million dollars invested in their industry and they have a million dollars of capital, which they have to account for, then they're going to want to make more than 17 percent on it because they could, in a much easier fashion, put it in a bank and make that much if not more, whereas a year ago the interest rate was not that high. Now I bring that point in, not as an aside but as an integral part of the argument, because when we get into periods such as we do now — and this is what's making it more difficult for the Minister to negotiate — when we get into periods such as we do now where we see our economy start to falter — and the high interest rates are a symptom of that, a symptom of a faltering economy — when we see that it is not as healthy an economy as it should be, then the companies have added leverage on a Minister like our Minister, who wishes very keenly to see the environment improved but has to also take into consideration the impact of his actions on the whole of the society, and that's the economic as well as the environmental society.

So what the companies are now saying is, look, things are bad all over and we're really ready to move. I mean, maybe we won't even move, maybe we'll just shut it down, and we see that happening in the western industrial world. We see a number of places being shut down, not because they're being forced to clean up but just because the economic conditions are such that they feel it is necessary to protect the interests of their shareholders to place that money in a more effective way, or to put that money more effectively to use to return interest on

their capital, they shut down. And Bob Sass, the director of Occupational Safety and Health for the province of Manitoba, puts it perhaps bluntly but quite succinctly nonetheless when he says, when times get bad the workers eat crap. What he is saying in that regard is when the economic times take a downturn the companies spend less money on improving the workplaces and they have the ability to do so because they always have, hanging over the heads of the workers, the fact that they can close down that operation, and if the workers see one or two other operations close down, they are more predisposed to believe the company when they say they might close down that specific operation. So the workers become less militant.

We see that sort of an effect ripple throughout all of the contract negotiations. You see settlements for lesser money. You see settlements that have in fact sometimes reduced the power of the union. That is the same thing that's happening to the Minister because the Minister is also negotiating with these companies. So when the economy takes a downturn you see the society at large eat crap because they are more willing to allow the abuses of their environment if it means that a job is going to stay around, because jobs then become more valuable. The less jobs you have, the more people you have seeking jobs, the more valuable those jobs become. And if it looks like there is going to be an extreme downturn, then you are going to be faced even more so with that sort of a negotiating stance from the companies. So if the Minister goes in there with just his good will and his keen interest, he is going to find that he is in a position of extreme disadvantage and that is why he has to go in with some regulations backing him up. I would ask the Minister in that regard if any new regulations have been brought forward to complement the appropriate environmental legislation in the province of Manitoba since his government came into power?

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend has asked if there are new regulations that have been brought in. At the moment none came to my mind, new regulations. I want to advise my honourable friend that the environmental assessment and review process has been stepped up in order to attempt to come to grips with the changes that are taking place, in order to attempt to determine what new thrust may be necessary in order to deal with pending problems, or problems that we might be able to foresee.

I don't disagree with my honourable friend that there are regulations that are unnecessary and there are standards that have been set; we are attempting to apply them. We are attempting to apply them with sufficient flexibility as to ensure that what my honourable friend speaks about, the loss of jobs does not come about. But I want to say also to my honourable friend, any difficulty that we may have with industries moving out because of a result of increased regulations, that it's becoming more difficult for industries to use that argument. Because more and more areas are stepping up and increasing their regulations, so that if they use that argument, then it's going to have to be accompanied with some evidence that they are able to go some other place,

and that is not as easy as any attempt to make it appear.

I am advised that there are several areas in which new regulations have been developed: noise, pollution, air . . . —(Interjection)— The objectives would be regulations in several areas such as noise, air and water, and Clean Environment Commission orders on water and sewage. The federal regulations dealing with mining, pulp mill effluence, pesticides, upgrading of existing garbage sewage disposal systems and incinerators; these are the areas in which we have been active in the past.

MR. COWAN: Then perhaps the Minister can expand upon it. There have been regulations that have been developed in regard to noise, pollution, air pollution and water pollution, on a provincial basis.

MR. JORGENSON: No, guidelines and objectives in those areas. That doesn't involve strict regulations. — (Interjection) — As I said, those are the guidelines and objectives that are used by the Clean Environment Commission in setting their standards.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, I couldn't help but overhear, and I couldn't overhear as well as I would have liked to on some of the comments that were going on between the Deputy Minister and the Minister, but I thought I caught one that said, if they are approved by Cabinet. Have these guidelines and objectives that we're talking about now been approved by Cabinet and are actually in effect?

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: Now I'd ask the Minister if he could indicate what the difference is between a regulation and these guidelines and objectives that we're talking about.

MR. JORGENSON: As the honourable member perhaps is aware, a regulation is an order that is passed by Order-in-Council and becomes effective as a regulation. A guideline or objective is precisely what it says; it's a guideline, it's an objective that you attempt to reach. Perhaps the way to describe it as an unofficial standard that the Clean Environment Commission is guided by.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairperson, now I'm a bit concerned, because it looks as if the strategy of the government is not only to move away from regulation, but to impose in the place of regulation as it is moving away from guidelines and objectives, and I, for the life of me just can't see the advantage from what the Minister has told me to date, of a guideline and an objective over a regulation, because what the regulation would do would tend to give you some clout and we're back to talking about our negotiation problems again. And the Minister knows that if he doesn't have any clout when he goes in there, he's in trouble right off the bat. So I would ask the Minister if he can inform us as to why his government is attempting to replace regulation with what appears to be guidelines and objectives.

MR. JORGENSON: That is not necessarily the case, Mr. Chairman. The difficulty with a firm

regulation is that it will have a tendency to work at a disadvantage in certain areas, and I think that it becomes necessary to exercise a certain degree of flexibility while you're working towards an objective. If you feel that it is necessary then to apply it legally then a regulation can be imposed and eventually, a regulation will be adopted. But in order to ensure that hardships are not worked against certain areas as a result of the application of a firm regulation, you apply a guideline so that they have some idea of the objective that you are attempting to reach, and once that objective has been reached, then you have in effect brought about that which you have been seeking.

As an experience that I had while chairman of the Land Use Committee, we found that firm regulations applied equally across the province would have been totally and completely unacceptable in certain areas of the province because of the difference in the circumstances in that particular area, and it would have been quite appropriate in other areas. So by setting out guidelines, you allow for the degree of flexibility that may be necessary in order to ensure that you work towards the objective without imposing hardships in certain areas of the province.

MR. COWAN: I would just ask the Minister to clarify that, Mr. Chairperson, if he means without imposing hardships in certain areas or without imposing hardships on certain individuals, and/or both perhaps, if that's the case.

MR. JORGENSON: There's a possibility that it could be both, but I think essentially it's the community in which the guideline is being applied; the degree to which you can expect them to accept a guideline without there being a reaction by the people in that area, and there are some times that guidelines, no matter how well intentioned they are, if they are not understood or if they're not acceptable, you have difficulty in enforcing. So by working in this fashion, by outlining objectives in the form of guidelines, eventually there is acceptance, and acceptance without creating difficulties.

MR. COWAN: I have to disagree with the Minister on this and I think we're going to get embroiled in a very firm disagreement over this because what I sense and I have not seen one of these guidelines in objective statements, I would appreciate if I could have an opportunity to see all three of them that we're talking about — in specific, the ones dealing with noise and air and water — before speaking too extensively on this subject. But if I understand the Minister correctly, and I believe I do, although I'm not certain without having the guidelines before me, that I grasp the intent of them fully. What they are, are not in fact — well, before I make that statement, let me make certain that I'm not misunderstanding the Minister. We have a guideline, an objective — that's one statement I believe, guidelines and objectives — that are put in place to do what specifically? Let's take a look at the one on noise. What is that guideline and objective intended to accomplish?

MR. JORGENSON: The guidelines, Mr. Chairman, are used in technical assessments and

recommendations, to the Clean Environment Commission. They are used by the Clean Environment Commission in arriving at decisions with respect to water quality objectives, noise, etc., when hearings are held before the commission.

MR. COWAN: So let us follow the process through then if we can, Mr. Chairperson. A polluter, advertently or inadvertently, is brought before the Clean Environment Commission and the Clean Environment Commission is using as its guide, these guidelines and objectives. Is that the proper interpretation? The Minister is nodding in the affirmative.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm advised that the department uses them in their recommendation to the Clean Environment Commission when dealing with orders.

MR. COWAN: Well, I'm experiencing a bit of difficulty with the process now, Mr. Chairperson. We have a polluter, the polluter has been brought before the commission, what is the responsibility of the commission then and how do these guidelines fit in, these guidelines and objectives fit in, with the commission exercising its responsibility?

MR. JORGENSEN: As my honourable friend is probably aware, it's the commission that issues the limits in the issuance of pollutants.

MR. COWAN: And then these guidelines and objectives are used by the commission to determine whether or not they will issue a variance, is that correct?

MR. JORGENSEN: Issue a variance or to, more precisely, establish a limit.

MR. COWAN: What happens in the case of an industry that is exceeding the limits of these guidelines and objectives?

MR. JORGENSEN: As my honourable friend is probably aware that if they are exceeding the orders, there normally is a prosecution against that polluter.

MR. COWAN: I'd ask the Minister how many prosecutions of this nature have taken place in the past year?

MR. JORGENSEN: We will have to get a precise figure for my honourable friend on that, but I'm advised that there is approximately about two months.

MR. COWAN: How are the industries informed or the individuals informed of the contents of a guideline and an objective?

MR. JORGENSEN: Through an order that is issued by the Clean Environment Commission, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COWAN: So they are only informed of the requirements after the fact, in other words, once they

have been in some way or manner directed to the Clean Environment Commission?

MR. JORGENSEN: What my honourable friend says is true, except that we are developing an environmental assessment process and many of the industries that will be affected are coming to us now for pre-clearance, so that they will have some idea of the limits under which they will be operating.

MR. COWAN: How many industries have come to the Minister for pre-clearance in respect to individual numbers and also as a percentage of new industries starting up in the province?

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm advised that there are a number of them, the Manitoba Hydro being a major one, the Canada Safeway with respect to the milk containers, the mining companies, International Nickel, Canadian Bronze, Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company, etc. There are ongoing discussions with these people in an effort to assist them to determine to what extent their guidelines will be levelled.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The places that the Minister has mentioned, some of them at least, and I would think for the most part — and it's a very small list which he gave me, and I think that must be pointed out — are places that come under very strict regulations, either on a federal level or a provincial level as to emissions, as to their operations. Canadian Bronze comes under the latest regulation that Manitoba imposed and that was 140/77 on June 23 of 1977, which was a regulation respecting requirements for the operation of secondary lead smelters. So we find that one is under that particular regulation. I know that there are regulations or legislation that would deal, or at least I would hope that would deal with the mining industry, because I know that they are in some respects one of the industrial sources that needs to be very closely watched and controlled. We know that there are in regards to the pulp and paper mills; in other words, there are a number of regulations that are in place that would not appear to necessitate objectives and guidelines being imposed. So I would ask the Minister if he could direct some comments to what seems to be an overlap or a duplication or, perhaps, even an inconsistency.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, as my honourable friend probably is aware, in some of those industries, there are new processes that are being developed and we hold consultations with them in an attempt to arrive at some definite guidelines with respect to those new processes and how they may affect the environment.

MR. COWAN: Then these companies will be coming forward to the department in respect to new sources of pollution, new types of pollution, or in respect to the same type of pollution. Let's direct our attention to Canadian Bronze, because it's probably a company that the Minister and I are both familiar with and the Minister did mention it, so I don't feel hesitant to discuss it in specific. Are they now developing a new process that would result in a

different sort of pollution than was coming from that plant previously?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, in the main the processes are an effort to reduce pollution.

MR. COWAN: I'd just ask the Minister, I'm not certain that I understood him correctly and I don't want to misinterpret what he said. Did he say that these processes in the main are not being brought forward as a means of reducing pollution?

MR. JORGENSEN: No, on the contrary, they are brought forward as a means of reducing pollution.

MR. COWAN: Okay, I now understand the Minister correctly, but they are brought forward as a means of reducing pollution in respect to very specific regulations that are in place. So, what I want to know is how does the Minister's objective and guidelines fit into this whole process, because that's what we were talking about. In other words, the companies are dealing with regulations and I know why they come forward when they're regulations. They come forward because there are penalties involved with the regulations, some more severe than others, but the fact is that they know very specifically their parameters and their guidelines because they're written into regulation or legislation, and that's why they come forward.

But in the instance of the objectives and guidelines, they are not. As a matter of fact, it's a rather secretive process from what the Minister tells me in comparison to regulations and legislation, because regulations must be printed and legislation must be printed and it must be printed in such a manner as to be accessible to the interested public and, therefore, it is spread far and wide. That is what we would expect to be a positive step but it does not appear as if the objective and guidelines follow that same process. So the question I ask the Minister, which is a question I asked the Minister before, is how many corporations or how many new pollution, possible pollution sources, are coming forward to the department in respect to these guidelines and objectives for clarification on that?

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend was asking what new processes were being developed. In the case of mining companies, I am sure he is aware that they are working with our department on means of converting sulphur dioxide to acid. That process in itself may create other problems that they want to discuss with us and so we are attempting to understand the new process and to offer them guidelines as to how to contain problems that may arise as a result of this and I'm not sure what those problems might be. But it's a process of substituting dispersion with containment. Maybe my honourable friend, who comes from a mining area, may be more aware of those problems than I am. But that's essentially what I said what we're discussing with these people various guidelines and they're coming to us in order to discuss this. This is one example of the kind of discussions that we are having.

MR. COWAN: We talk about the — the reason I smile, I didn't mean to be rude, but when he mentioned containment versus dispersion, it brings to mind the two philosophies of dealing with an environmental contaminate. One is to dilute and disperse and the other is to be capture and contain, and we'll talk about that in some length at another point. But that is the reason that I, at that point, did take particular notice. The fact is, and we could discuss this for a long time I'm certain and I don't want to. I want to try to move through these estimates as quickly as is possible, although there is going to be extended discussion on certain subjects which I feel is necessary, I feel responsibility to pursue. But the fact is, that in this particular instance I think we've gone about as far as we can go in defining the difference that the Minister and I and others, both on his side and my side, share in regards to how you deal with point pollution sources in specific, and that is that the Minister seems to have put into place, and I can only believe that it is part of a strategy, because I don't believe the Minister would put into place a process which is not in keeping with his entire thrust, his entire strategy in how to deal with pollution, so he has put in as a tactical manoeuvre, guidelines and objectives, and has seemed over the past number of years to ignore regulation.

He talked about regulation, and he uses some key words when he talks about regulation. One is, he spoke several times to firm regulations, and that's exactly what regulations are, they're very specific and they're very firm. That does not mean that they cannot be written in such a way as to take into account the differences between communities and the difference between pollution sources. That shouldn't be interpreted as being a failing of regulations, regulations can be written very specifically for a certain area or they can be written very specifically so as to allow for variances, yet still impose a specific guideline and objective. And they do it in this manner: they set out those goals that the company should work towards, and they do it in a negative sense; they say if you do exceed these goals, then there are certain penalties that will be placed upon you for your excessive pollution. By doing so, they point out very clearly, they provide a road map for industrial concerns as to exactly what limits they will have to operate under, and they are very specific and they are widespread. Anyone can come in and ask the Minister for a copy of the regulation, the regulation must be printed in the Gazette; the legislation is a very public document and goes through a fair degree of debate in the House, and that would tend to publicize the details in the intent of the legislation.

The Minister says that these firm regulations have a tendency to work at a disadvantage in certain areas. Well I am telling the Minister, and the Minister is very aware, that if they believe in regulation, and the regulatory process that they can develop regulations that will take into account the possibility of that disadvantage being worked and to make allowances for it. But he says that the reason he has rejected regulations and accepted objectives and guidelines, is he believes that he has to be able to exercise a certain flexibility in working towards an objective. Well certainly one does have to exercise a certain

amount of flexibility, and no one would suggest that the Minister shouldn't do that, but the fact is that you can also write that flexibility into your regulations.

Now I will take an area that I am most familiar with and talk about it in some very specific terms, and that's the Occupational Safety and Health Act in the United States, which imposed upon workplaces some very stringent environmental, in this sense internal, controls as to how much pollution they would allow to exist within a workplace. The argument of industry at every juncture, and that was at the very extensive public hearings that were held and also in the courts after the legislation had been proclaimed and put in effect, was that they can't do it, it's impossible to achieve that sort of technology. And what the Operational Safety and Health Administration said, well then we would give you a timetable, by such and such a date you will have to achieve this technology, but such and such a date you will have to achieve the next technology; you can do so before, but you will have had to by a certain date. And the industry knew, and I think that was in many respects doing a service for the industry, because there was no fuzziness, there was no haziness about what was anticipated of them. It was very specific, they would have to do something by a certain time; if not, then they might as well shut it down. And they were probably stricter than most would be; they were very firm about that.

The fact is, that in every instance, the majority of the industries were able to accomplish those regulations, given that timetable, even though they argued that they could not do so in the beginning, and were quoted publicly as saying, We were quite surprised about how easy it was to do that — we just never tried to do it before. And if the Minister put himself in a position of trying to negotiate with those companies without any leverage, they in all good faith would have told the Minister that they couldn't do it. They would have been honest unto the Minister and honest unto themselves, but the fact is that when put in the position of having to do it, they did do it, and that is where regulation can be of great benefit to the Minister because it gives him that power to go in there and to negotiate.

You are going to create hardship if you want to achieve a certain environmental standard, a level; if you want to ensure that emissions are of such a specific nature, and you post a level at which you want those emissions to be by a certain date. If you say they have to be that way in six months, or if you say they have to be that way in six years, you are going to impose a hardship on the company that has to achieve that. You're either going to spread it out over a longer period, or contain it in a shorter period, but the fact is they're still going to have to reach the permissible level, sooner or later. It is up to the person developing the regulations, and Cabinet approving the regulations, to ensure that they balance the hardship that is going to be created for a pollution source, a polluter, with the hardships that are going to be created by the society and the citizens of that society if that pollution is allowed to continue any longer than it should be. The Minister I am certain will agree that there is pollution that is occurring today that should not be allowed to continue. That's just a symptom of our society.

So the fact is he needs these firm regulations, he needs specific legislation to deal with these sort of problems. What he is attempting to provide us with is unfirm objectives and guidelines; objectives and guidelines that don't enjoy the publicity that regulations and legislation do; objectives and guidelines that are unofficial standards instead of official standards. In other words he's moving away — or I would sense him to be moving away from what he tells us to be his goal, and that is a cleaner environment. I don't believe he will accomplish it by this. I believe these objectives and guidelines, when compared to regulations and legislation, are licence to pollute. I believe they are a licence to pollute. That what he is telling the industry is, sure we have a problem with the environment, but I'm on your side to the extent that I don't want to see any hardship created and therefore I'm going to be very flexible.

Well that's a weak bargaining position, and if he doesn't realize he's in some very high profile and some very intensive bargaining by now, he hasn't come in contact with the industry to any great extent, because that's what's going to happen. I think that they have admitted it in the sense that after the MacGregor incident we see the Minister standing up and saying that we are going to have to have some ways of dealing with this, we are going to have to talk about legislation, amendments to the Act and regulations. We see the Minister responsible for the Emergency Measure Organization coming to his senses also and saying, we're going to have to develop a better system because the system isn't there. That's not the Minister's fault — well, not fully the Minister's fault, because he's only been in this portfolio for a short period of time. But the fact is that if he pursues these objectives and guidelines over regulations and legislation, it is going to be the Minister's responsibility.

And he has admitted that this co-operative trend is not working in the sense of the MacGregor incident. The Minister of Labour admitted it in Canadian Bronze. I remember talking, and talking and talking and telling the Minister, there is a problem at Canadian Bronze. First there was denial, then there was acceptance of the fact there was a problem, and then the Minister said, Don't worry about it, because we're going to develop co-operative means of dealing with that problem. That's exactly what the Minister tried to do, I'll give him credit. He sat down with the company, and he said, You are polluting your workers and you've got to stop, and the company said Okay I'll stop. But the company didn't stop, and what the Minister finally had to do was shut the company down. I give him credit for doing it, although had he attacked it from a different way, he might have been able to avoid that hardship on the workers. But the fact is, in the end, after all his talk about co-operation, let's sit down and bargain this out and let's be friends, the fact is that he had to do a very nasty thing at Canadian Bronze, he had to shut it down because it wasn't working the other way. Thank goodness there was in place legislation that enabled him to be able to shut it down, because that was his leverage, and he finally had to use it. What the Minister is saying now, that he doesn't want that sort of leverage. He wants to be able to go in and the same thing that the Minister of Labour said, deal with this in a co-operative way and try

through his good office and through his ability to convince, to deal with the problem. I believe the Minister does have a good office, and I believe the Minister at times can be very convincing, but it's not going to work out. He has every instance to back that up, that in the long run, whether it's Canadian Bronze or whether it's MacGregor, or whether it's a spill here in the city where the reporting mechanisms seem to have been breached by someone in regards to the methanol spill, that in the long run they need the regulation, they need the legislation to back up their very convincing arguments, and if they don't have it they are at an extreme disadvantage.

So I can only call upon the Minister to reject this concept of being - how does one reject flexibility; I don't want you to reject flexibility - I want the Minister to reject, that the only way he can deal with this matter is by being extremely flexible. He can deal with it much better through firm regulations, and he does a disservice to the corporations and to the polluters if he believes that by being flexible he is going to benefit them. —(Interjection)— The Member from The Pas says, He can speak softly, only he has a big stick, and that's probably true, the bigger the stick, the softer you can speak. There is a certain amount of truth to that philosophy, that if he wants to go in there and bargain then he'd better go in there with some clout, and he can do that if he's got the regulations, otherwise he is either going to be run over by the companies and the polluters and the individuals, because it is individuals that pollute also, or he's going to end up in the long run by being unfair to them by placing them in a co-operative stance and then having to close down their operations.

So I would hope they would go about the task now of developing some very firm regulations that will apply to pollution sources, that will be a matter of the public record as the objectives and the guidelines do not seem to have been, or at least will be publicly distributed so that everyone knows the guidelines. Because that's what regulations are - guidelines with clout — everyone knows the guidelines under which they have to operate, and I believe the sooner he gives some official standing to his unofficial guidelines and objectives the better off he will be. I have a selfish interest, the better off he is the better we all are, because pollution is a problem. I don't believe that we are dealing with it adequately now, and I don't believe that it's getting better; I believe that in certain instances we have reached in a graph, a downturn, where we have been able to drop the environmental damage for a while, but it is now starting to go the other way. We need only look to some of the subjects which the Minister mentioned, acid rain etc., to determine that is in fact the case.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I have just one brief comment. I appreciate my honourable friend's comments; I always listen very carefully to his suggestions. It doesn't necessarily mean that I follow them all, but I am pleased to have the benefit of his views. I think that one impression that was left was that, and I wouldn't want this session to close with that impression on the records, to the effect that we are backing away from regulations, that is not the case. I don't know of any single instance where we

have reduced the regulation. When I speak of guidelines, and perhaps it's a question of technique, guidelines and objectives, in many cases it is perhaps a difference in the manner in which my honourable friend would approach a subject as opposed to the way I would want to approach it. He says that we can implement regulations with flexibility in the regulations. One other way is to set the guidelines as an objective, as a prelude, towards arriving at a regulation that can be applicable, one that will be effective and may be better and in my view it perhaps is a better way; that by the application of the guideline for a period of time, you then have a better idea of how effective a regulation that you can bring in, or what legislation that may be necessary. I think in the final analysis you can reach the same objective. I'll keep in mind his suggestion that our method may be a failure and I'll give him credit if that happens to be the case.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. It is credit I'd rather not take. But the fact is that I do believe very strongly that that method is a failure or will result in a failure just from the historical sense. I'd ask the Minister then, when an objective becomes a regulation. Because he says that the end result of these objectives is that they become regulations and that the objective is just a trial and error method of learning how to cope with the industry and allowing industry to learn how to cope with the government.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, the guidelines, in many cases, will help for us to determine whether or not a certain regulation is enforceable. I think we weaken the regulation or the law if we attempt to pass laws or regulations that are indeed unenforceable. So it gives us that, if I may say, learning experience towards the development of a regulation that we feel can become a guideline.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Chair for Private Members' Hour and may return at 8:00 o'clock.

SUPPLY — HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (St. Vital): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 61 of the main estimates, Department of Health, Clause 3. Community Health Directorate, Item (g) Dental Services, Item (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday, we had a brief period dealing with this subject, but it was very illuminating, because in spite of the fact that we all believed we knew the philosophy of the Conservative government and its relationship to the manner of delivery of service, such as the dental plan for children, it became most obvious yesterday, when the Minister of Health, reiterating his conviction that it is best to have the Manitoba Dental Association run the program, went further, and spoke of, and I think he used the words, a happy circumstance, or in any event, about the happiness he had in noting that three school

divisions had lost the use of their dental nurses, and as a result he was able to turn these three school districts over to the dental association and what he had to say was that the dental nurses that were trained, that could be available, would then be turned over to the dentists for them to — exploit is the word given to me, this is a word that did occur to me — for them to exploit. Because, Mr. Chairman, I think it is amply evident that the dentists do not in their view of the delivery of the dental service consider the dental nurse to have the opportunity to do the job for which that dental nurse is trained but rather would be used by the dentist in some less skilled way. I think the Minister said yesterday that there was a possibility that they would be encouraged to become dental hygienists; I think he said that, I didn't quite catch the manner in which he made the statement.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time, and some of the members opposite, especially the First Minister, is well aware of the fact that historically the dentists were doing all the work in the mouth dealing with dental problems and gradually started to employ parodontal professionals, to do additional work which the dentist found he could have done by a less skilled person to do in such a way as to save the time of the dentist and enable the dentist to make better use of his time and, of course, obtain greater economic returns for that and that is perfectly legitimate.

The dentists, as we were told, and I mention the First Minister because he and I, along with, I believe it was eight other members of the Legislature back in the middle Sixties, were part of a committee of the Legislature which was investigating the field of denturists, later known as dental mechanics. And we learned then, from the dental professions across western Canada, including Ontario, that the dentists used to have a back room boy who used to work on the fabrication of the dentures which a dentist would apply and then we were told that because the work of that back room boy produced a great deal of unpleasant odor because they were working with rubber and hot rubber doesn't smell very good, and the dentist found it paid him to have this work done outside of his premises, so that no longer was the dental technician working right under the discipline of the dentist himself but was working outside.

Nevertheless, we know that as of today, we have dental technicians, we have dental hygienists, we have dental nurses, we have dental assistants, we have dental mechanics; all of whom contribute to the care of the mouth of Manitobans. But the effort has always been on the part of the dental profession to retain control over all the work that is being done related to the care of teeth, and the present government and the . . . well, I think it was unanimous report of the committee that I referred to of the middle and late Sixties, I guess it was, the majority of whom were Conservatives, recognizing that dental mechanics could indeed work independently of dentists, not under their control and work directly with patients and work in the mouths of patients and I think the legislation itself was passed during the NDP government regime early in its years of service but nevertheless it was as a result of a study conducted by a legislative committee appointed under the Conservative regime.

In this case that we are dealing with, this Dental Program, based on history, based in relation to, I think it's Australia, based on what is known in Saskatchewan which brought in the program much earlier than Manitoba did, it was felt that the best way to deliver the service is in the schools where the children are present, the cost could be reduced and although a dentist would have the responsibility of deciding what work had to be done, that there were people who could be trained to do a specific job of working with children, with the teeth of children, putting in fillings, doing preventative care of dental caries, and able to do it at a cost much less to the community in that the training cost of the dental nurses, as they came to be called, was much less than that of a dentist. And we know, Mr. Chairman, how costly it is to train professionals especially in the health field. And if a professional can be taught to do a job as well as another professional at a much less cost, then that should be advantageous; it just makes sense.

But the dentists fought that, Mr. Chairman, because they were losing control, and control is not only control as to decisions of treatment, control also is economic control because the way the dentists had it, would have it, and now do have it, is that they would do the charging and they would be using these other skills, these lesser skills, and paying the people who provide the skills, at a price which was negotiated by the dentist. The dentist would have economic control as well as control of the treatment. Well the plan that was introduced a few years ago and which the Conservatives are bent on destroying — and I made that phrase clear and dragged it out a little to make it clear — I believe that the Conservatives are bent on destroying that plan, was a plan which required participation by the dentists. Not only did the work have to be prescribed by a dentist but certain parts of the work could only be done by dentists. But the dental profession fought it vigorously, and I understand in their own economic interest they were right so to do, and I suppose they believe that since no one else can do work as well as they can or under their supervision, they expressed concerns on behalf of the standard of care and quality of service being given, and they say, well, we will supervise it.

But, Mr. Chairman, the dental mechanics have been allowed to work independently of dentists and work directly with patients for a number of years and you don't hear — at least I haven't heard and I don't believe that the Minister of Health will have heard complaints about the standards of service that are being delivered by dental mechanics. There may be some concerns and I have concerns. I'm really surprised that we haven't heard about complaints but apparently they're doing an adequate job.

Mr. Chairman, if one reviews what was said last year and I note, I've glanced at some of Hansard on last year's debate, I note that the Member for St. Boniface referred to April 2, 1979 as being a year which will be long remembered . . . oh, he said, I quote, page 1828: We are ruining a program, and mark my words, Mr. Chairman, and remember this date, April 2, 1979, when you read Hansard, and I say that in five or ten years if this program is there, it is going to very costly when all the dental nurses are chased out. That's what he said a year and a couple

of weeks ago. And then, of course, the Minister of Health, at the same occasion, then started to quote, and as is not unusual, misquote, and he said on page 1834, appearing to be quoting the Member for St. Boniface, he says, now the Honourable Member for St. Boniface accuses us of killing the program. He says; Mark my words, you will remember April 2, 1979, it will rank with May 8, 1945. I couldn't see any reference to May 8, 1945 in the Member for St. Boniface's speech, but maybe the Minister of Health heard it. And of course, the Member for St. Boniface said, I didn't say that; those are your words, but the Minister of Health, in his enthusiastic flow of words continues, according to Hansard, It will rank with December 7, 1941. You know what date that is, Mr. Chairman; the attack on Pearl Harbour. It will rank with Dieppe. This is going to go down in history as the day that you will rue, that we will remember on April 2, 1979. He stood in the Legislature to pronounce that this program was effectively destroyed by the present government. And the Member for St. Boniface —(Interjection)— well, you know, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health said it was a pretty good speech. It was — the kindest word I could use, that it was a deliberate distortion of what was said by the Member for St. Boniface; as a matter of fact, it wasn't true, Mr. Chairman. I read Hansard; I saw what the Member for St. Boniface said. It was the Minister of Health who started comparing it with Dieppe and started comparing it with the attack on Pearl Harbour, by the Japanese — those were his words, and he now commends himself by saying, that was a good speech. Mr. Chairman, I hope he is ashamed of his own self-aggrandizement, as of today. You see, Mr. Chairman, now that I read it back to him, he still likes what he said. And I'm reminded to mention to him that it was, when he was on this side of the House that he talked about Jack Boots — the sound of Jack Boots reverberating in the halls — that was a good speech too, but it was a disgrace, Mr. Chairman. I didn't want to be distracted; I wanted to keep on with this reference that he had, that the program was effectively destroyed by the present government. Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Boniface said, when he talked about April 2, 1979, he said, I say in five or ten years, if this program is there, it's going to be very costly when all the dental nurses are chased out. Five or ten years, Mr. Chairman; it's a year now and the Minister has admitted that happily, his word, happily, the circumstance has arisen in, I gather, three school districts where he was able to turn the program over to the dental association. Why was he able to do it, Mr. Chairman? Because he effectively destroyed the education that would have made possible more dental nurses who would be able to do a job at a lesser expense and I believe more effectively, and he's happy about that. He admits that it is contrary to his philosophy to permit it, but then he says and, Mr. Chairman, I think you heard him yesterday. Did you not shrink on his behalf to hear him say, and the reason we are not doing it immediately is because it is my duty — I'm quoting but not verbatim — to convince the members opposite and to prove to their constituents, and the Minister said to prove to his own constituents that, indeed, the dentists can run this program more effectively and as economically. Mr.

Chairman, he doesn't have the slightest intent to do other than what we forecast he would do and what he admits he wants to do and what his actions show he is determined to do.

We told him last year, we told him two years ago, that his actions were deliberate and they were intended to destroy the program. What troubles me is that rather than say, yes, we believe in what we're doing, so we're doing it; he is calling on expertise, he's calling on studies and he has now filed with us a study this last week which somebody wants to — (Interjection)— I didn't hear. Oh, the Minister for Natural Resources has a contribution. I didn't hear what he had to say. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, now that I know he wants to say something and I'm listening, he is silent. I suppose he ought to have been before he started to talk. — (Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, it so happens, I didn't criticize the Minister for talking from his seat. I didn't hear him, so I waited to have him repeat himself. Does he want to repeat himself now? I will not object.

MR. RANSOM: I said, you don't like to deal with the facts.

MR. CHERNIACK: You see, Mr. Chairman, he said I don't like to deal with the facts. The facts are what I read to the Minister for Natural Resources and I have to tell him that the facts that were completely false that I read were the statements made by the Minister of Health last year. So there you are. Now there was a report filed, an interim report. The report makes certain recommendations. —(Interjection)— Pardon?

MR. RANSOM: We sought expertise; you said it's bad.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, he sought expertise, but one has to deal with what the expertise says, and the expertise makes recommendations. What are the recommendations, Mr. Chairman? That the committee's cost efficiency report revised interim findings on accessibility be received. That's a great recommendation and that was followed. Why, even we on this side agreed that it should be followed; it was received. What's the next thing? The committee's proposed clinical survey to determine the relative effects of the two programs as revealed by dental health status of the children be approved and funded. Have you approved it yet, Mr. Minister? Have you funded it yet, Mr. Minister? That's the recommendation of this committee. I know this Minister cannot respond at this stage; maybe he will do so after I open the floor for other comments. The third recommendation — the Minister meet with the Chairman of the Review Committee and review the committee's mandate and timetable. Was that done? I imagine it was done. Does that then mean that you happily convert three programs, transfer them from three school divisions to the Dental Association happily, Mr. Chairman? Is that the justification? I should tell the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources who's so interested, there are no other recommendations in this report. No, those three are the ones I read.

It states further, Mr. Chairman, the committee is hearing presentations of selected briefs and will be reporting to the Minister on both a written and verbal presentations in the near future. That's why I call an interim report, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I have questions I'd like to ask of the Minister and I have to add to what I said before I asked the questions. What was read into the record that same April 2, 1979, a day which will live long, because it was on that day that the Member for St. Boniface predicted the death of that program; didn't compare it with anything, but it didn't have to be compared with any other day. In itself it stands as a day when he made that prediction saying, five or ten years from now and within this one year, in this one year we're already seeing the trend. But the Minister at that time read a memorandum which was distributed and headed Personal and Confidential, which was not signed at the time but bore a Brandon telephone number, and which subsequently I think was acknowledged generally and publicly to be an authentic memorandum sent to all dentists, marked Personal and Confidential. I will not read it all because it is on record on that April 2nd, but what is reported here is that the government has a pool of money for a dental program and part of this pool was going to be turned over to the Dental Association. And he says, the involvement in these 16 school divisions which he hoped to convince the Minister to turn over to them will depend on two things, utilization and cost. Well, he says in his memorandum, cost we can readily determine but utilization is a bit of a problem. Now I quote: This is basically the reason for this Confidential Memo and it is to urge all regional coordinators to do all you possibly can to get utilization as high as we can. There's a directive to his membership. Get utilization as high as we can. In about six weeks the Minister will have to face the Legislature for his budget estimates presentation, so to help the MDA get the further 16 school divisions we would like him to be able to relate high utilization and reasonable costs. Now, and I'm still quoting — oh, it's not now, it's how, I think — If these are not favourable then our further involvement in the expansion of our program will be stopped. There's a threat. He says, The extremely important reasons for having these two areas favourable and ultimately expanding our program into the 16 school divisions are first to stop this government from hiring the 38 dental nurses graduating from Waskada in June, the first thing and they succeeded, Mr. Chairman. They succeeded in having that bursary program stopped — and that's the word — first to stop this government from hiring the 38 dental nurses. The dentists stopped the government from hiring the 38 dental nurses, that's what I say. And second, to get them to finally and firmly decide in favour of our program, so they will have to, in fact, terminate employment of the dental nurses in the 16 school divisions we will go into. Hear that, Mr. Chairman. Now the Minister as I recall it, said, no, no, we're going to tell them. They've got to hire these nurses. After all, they were trained. Of course, we're not going to help any more to be trained but those that were trained, we're going to get them to hire them. Now the letter goes on — I'm skipping — So do all you can to get our utilization up so the Minister can

present favourably to the House and to the media and the public, this is what it all depends on. Mr. Chairman, in the light of that letter — and we didn't need the letter to understand — and, Mr. Chairman, I have tried not to be critical, openly critical of the dentists for fighting to retain control and retain economic control of the program. I fault them as professionals for trying as strenuously as they're doing, because I think that as professionals they should want to make sure that the care of the teeth is extended to all Manitobans and that it is possible to reduce the amount of work that they will have to do in the future. I think that every professional should be striving that the service that that professional has to offer becomes less and less needed because of greater preventative care in all fields that professionals are involved.

But I can understand the fear of the dentists, although I don't agree with it. So some of us — and I was one of them — said that the manner in which this study — whose interim report we have — the manner in which it will be conducted will be strongly indicative of the effectiveness of the program and the comparison of it. Now we have charts given — they're not clear to me and I really haven't studied them as carefully as I would like to, given the short time that was available for that — but, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that they are comparing oranges and apples; that they are comparing a cost to government of carrying on this program; that that cost is known but that the cost to the dentist of the program is not known; what they know is what they have paid to the dentists; but I don't think that these tables show what it costs the dentists to produce the program.

For example, Mr. Chairman, we know that the government program hired people, paid salaries. We know that they used supplies. We know that they used transportation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And that all of these are known. But when you pay the dentists per capita as I believe was paid — and, Mr. Chairman, that's one of my first questions to the Minister — was it a per capita arrangement for the Dental Association? And if so, what was done to ensure that the government, in order to get a proper grasp on this, what was done by the government or by the survey team to determine what did it cost the dentist to produce it? And therefore, what was the subsidy, if any, by the Dental Association to the cost of the program? Because, Mr. Chairman, we all know how monopolies operate. As long as there is no monopoly there's got to be some control, be it the Public Utility Board, be it the government, be it the ownership of the operation. When there is a monopoly you have to make sure how costs are distributed, and if there is a subsidy in order to create a monopoly, then that subsidy will disappear and, Mr. Chairman, should disappear. I don't ask any professional to work for nothing. I don't see why any professional cannot claim a return commensurate with the service he offers.

So I'm asking the Minister, is it true that the program continued on the basis of a flat-rated annual fee-per-

patient as compared with fee-for-service or salaries? And wasn't it for patient-eligible rather than patient-treated? And can the Minister tell us what comparison has he got, which I didn't see in the charts, to indicate the number of attendances per treated child by the two forms of service, that is, the Dental Association and the government plan? The number of treatments, the number of attendances per treated child.

Another question, were the dentists working on a fee-for-service basis paid by the Dental Association, or did they contract out a contracted deal by the hour or by the day or the half-day to the Dental Association? Who paid the dentists' travel expenses? Who paid the mileage fee of the dentist? What about the nature of the attendances? What did the MDA program, the dental program, do to carry on instruction in care of teeth, which I'm sure the dental nurses were expected to do? These are questions which I would hope the Minister will have available to answer so that we can properly evaluate the effectiveness or the objectivity of the report that was distributed to us. There are many unanswered questions in the report as I read it and there will be more. But as you indicated, Mr. Chairman, I'm running out of time. I want to give the Minister an opportunity to respond to questions because there are more in my mind and they will possibly develop as the Minister tells us those answers which will elucidate and clarify the validity of the program because, Mr. Chairman, I am not in any way, not in any way, challenging the committee itself. I don't know of whom it consists. I don't for a moment question their integrity. But I do question the extent to which they did a complete and proper evaluation of the two programs, and since it's not evident, I want to know.

I believe what they have done was to divide a number of costs by a number of eligible patients and by a number of treated patients, and I think with the figures they came up with which the Minister quickly announced to the public, before he even gave us the benefit of reading the report, was a study to show that there was a differential in costs and that the MDA program compares very favourably to the government-run program. What is shown here are certain figures showing quite a comparable price. But that's all it shows. I want the Minister to tell us, what is there that justifies his transference of three school divisions, before the program has been completed, to the Dental Association? And what is there that he has done to get behind this report to find out what is the true impact of costs on the deliverers of the service, that is the dentists in the one case, the government's costs in the other? Because the cost to government of both programs is of no interest at all unless the cost to the deliverer of the services is developed. As I say, one of the most important questions is what, if any, was the subsidy by the dental profession to the dental program itself? If we don't know that, Mr. Chairman, then it's like any lost leader, you never know what it truly costs a retailer to deliver a product unless that retailer can give his hidden costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to have heard the Minister answer what I think were very sound criticisms made by the Member for St. Johns. But if the Member for Rock Lake is going to interrupt the debate, I would prefer to continue to deal with some of the points that the Member for St. Johns has made and which have occurred to me, myself. Therefore, if the Minister chooses to answer, I will sit down. But I note that the Minister is not accepting the invitation and therefore, we are not going to get an answer from the Minister but we are going to get some self-serving remarks from the Member for . . .

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

MR. EINARSON: I would think, Mr. Chairman, if a member on the government side wishes to get up and make some comments in the interval, having listened to members of the opposition, that I thought that was in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster on the point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the member has not raised a point of order. He's merely explained himself and I say that it is certainly in order for the member to get up. I didn't say it was a breach of the rules for the Member for Rock Lake to get up. I said, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Rock Lake is getting up in order to buffet, what I think, are remarks made by the Member for St. Johns which should be answered by the Minister. And if we are going to have the Member for Rock Lake get up, perhaps he will get up following my remarks and we won't have achieved anything. But I tell the Member for Rock Lake and I tell the Minister, that I am prepared to have him get up after the Minister gets up, if the Minister chooses now to answer. If the Minister chooses not now to answer, the Chairman has recognized me and I'm going to continue with my remarks. —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously the Minister would prefer to hear from me rather than to answer the Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on a point of order.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I'm under any obligation, nor was the Honourable Member for Inkster when he was a member of the Treasury Benches, to respond to every statement. We are here examining my estimates. I will deal with the challenges put to me. I don't think I have to respond one by one. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Are we discussing the point of order? I would recognize you on the point of order, otherwise I should make some ruling on the . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, there has been no point of order raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member got up on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Oh, I thought he just got up to explain himself, which he did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would not recognize him unless it was at a point of order because you had the floor.

MR. GREEN: You never know what a member gets up to say until he says it. We have heard what the Minister has said. The Minister has properly said to the House, that he doesn't have to answer; that he doesn't have to answer one by one; that he can wait until he hears from other members and that he can wait until he hears from the Member for Rock Lake. If that is the point of order, I'd say the Minister is perfectly correct. I didn't know it was a point of order. I thought that the Minister was merely indicating in the face of what I had said that he's not going to deal with the Member for St. Johns' remarks. —(Interjection)— I'm going to lose my time answering these questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake on the point of order.

MR. EINARSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I rose on the point of order and I would just probably like to clarify things. I had no objections when the chairman recognized the Member for Inkster; that was not my point at all. I will change my position then, Mr. Chairman, and forget about the point of order if the Member for Inkster has some questions to ask of the Minister. I thought when he rose he was going to ask some questions of the Minister, but he did not. He was chastizing my colleague, the Minister of Health, for not answering questions of the Member for St. Johns and maybe others. Now that's the reason, Mr. Chairman, I rose on the point of order. Now if the Member for Inkster has some comments to make, some questions to ask, he is at liberty to go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake does not have a point of order. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, let the record show — that I'm rising because the Member for Rock Lake rose — in Hansard — to the Member for St. Johns' remarks. I did not believe that the Member for Rock Lake could answer the Member for St. Johns' remarks; I believe that they should be answered by the Minister. If the Member for Rock Lake is intent on speaking, then you have recognized me and I intend to speak. I am prepared to yield the floor to the Minister of Health, who obviously said he doesn't want it, and that is a summary of what has occurred and it has just cost me about ten minutes at least for what I intended to say.
Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on a point of privilege.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of privilege, I think that after this misunderstanding has been clarified that we suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the time of the

Member for Inkster start as of now, because he hasn't had a chance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface does not have a point of privilege.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's a privilege of this House; it sure is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a request; it's not a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface on the same point of privilege.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like you to reflect on my request. I am asking, through you, because I can't talk directly if I don't talk through you, to the committee, as a privilege of a member who has been deprived of valuable time, if the committee would rule — and we're masters of our own rules — if we could agree, and I heard the Minister say agree, that the time of the Member for Inkster should start now, that he would be deprived of these precious minutes. Somebody on that side said agree. If it's not a point of privilege of the House, where else can I say it. It'll be too late if I get up after him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable members, I've been committee chairman for a fair amount of time now, and I can recall a remark where I did bring the member to order after the allocated time of thirty minutes had expired. I was reminded at that point, that if there was anything more to be said that they would say it anyway, whether it was at that speaking order or at the next. So I don't think that we are really limiting debate to any member, because if they want to talk, they will have the opportunity of speaking after the thirty minutes has expired, at the next point, where they do have an opportunity to talk. But we do have a request from the House that the honourable member's time commence at this point rather than at 3:30 when he first got up and was recognized.
Do we have agreement? (Agreed). The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the members for their indulgence, and I particularly want to thank the Member for St. Boniface, who used up another few minutes which I might have lost had it not been for the indulgence of all of the honourable members. —(Interjection)— My friend from Seven Oaks says I should make a five-minute speech. I don't believe I'm going to take thirty minutes, Mr. Chairman, but I do want to register some concern with the fact that it has been suggested that the Minister of Health and what he is doing, comes as a shock to the people of the province and to some of the members on this side. Because the Member for St. Boniface, and indeed the Member for St. Johns both indicated that last year — what was it, Pearl Harbour Day or D-Day, or April Fool's Day, or the day after April Fool's Day — the Minister indicated that the writing was on the wall, and the Member for St. Boniface indicated that the writing was on the wall, and all of these reports, Mr. Chairman, are surplusage, and indeed the recommendations of the report do not in any way justify what the Minister has done.

Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that this was April 2nd, we're talking about April Fool's Day. I do not regard the Minister of Health as a fool, Mr. Chairman, I do not regard him as a fool, and therefore he must be a saboteur. Because if he was not a saboteur, then the notion that a study of this kind would represent an objective analysis as to the costs as between what was being done through the program before the Manitoba Dental Association was asked to experiment and the Dental Association experiment, as being a proper analysis as to the costs as between the two programs, the only person who would come to that conclusion is a fool. And I know the Minister is not a fool, therefore, what the Member for St. Boniface said last year, is perfectly right.

The Minister is sabotaging the program, plain and simple, and he is doing so for ideological reasons, Mr. Chairman, not in the interests of the delivery of health to the people of the province of Manitoba. Now let's analyse that, Mr. Chairman, because it's a pretty serious charge, but I believe it can be documented.

In any other area of endeavour, let us assume that someone suggested that they wanted to do the same thing. Let us assume that the Minister suggested that there is a program now being conducted by the doctors and that he is going to ask a group of people who say that they can do it cheaper, to come in and conduct an experimental program to do it cheaper. Would he not know in advance that it's going to be done cheaper by this new group? If there was a group of people who said that the teaching profession is now charging too much money, we can do it cheaper, let us come in and give us an experimental station and we will do it cheaper, would anybody but a fool say that they wouldn't come in and do it cheaper? If they were determined, as is stated very frankly, in their own documentation, that they've got to come in with good figures, that they've got to have heavy utilization, that they've got to be able to show the Minister that they are doing it cheaper and that is their intent and purpose, and that they are determined to undercut the people who are not doing the work, is there anybody but a fool who would think that the report would say anything else?

Now, Mr. Chairman, in spite of that, in spite of the fact that the Dental Association who said that they were determined to get rid of these people, who said that we should be very careful, to work very hard, make sure that we get a good utilization, make sure that our charges are such — and I say that is implied — as to be able to indicate that we are going to do it cheaper, is there anybody, Mr. Chairman, except a fool, who would have expected that they would even come in as comparable as they came in. Because, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister knows, is that the program as constituted before this experiment, was fully controlled by the province of Manitoba, that the nurses were working on a government program — which the government has ultimate control over — that they will continue to have control over that program, whereas once the government loses control of that program and it goes into the hands of the Manitoba Dental Association, what is he left with? What is he left with after the dental nurses go and the MDA comes in

and says, yes, we've been doing it at this figure for the first couple of loss-leading years, but now we want to get paid.

What has the Minister got? He's got, Mr. Chairman, the fee-for-service medicine. He's got the same position as he has for fee-for-service medicine, whereby we have been trying to convince, and he has been trying to sabotage the notion that there has to be an alternative form of health delivery in the province of Manitoba so that the Minister, when he is trying to deal with the MMA with regard to their fees, knows that there is a counter-balancing at least position which the medical profession is faced with.

But the first thing the Minister did when he came into the department last year, was to say that he is going to undo the health clinics, and there was quite a scene in the province of Manitoba last year on that account, and the health units at the present time and even at the best, at the optimum operation under the New Democratic Party administration, hadn't developed to the stage where they really deserved the label of there being available an alternative form of health delivery system.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, they were the opening. And with regard to the delivery of dental care and to dental nurses, it was more than the opening. It was the ground floor for the delivery of a service which most dentists in the province of Manitoba previous to the implementation of the program said couldn't be handled because there weren't enough people to handle it. And what was introduced into this province, and something that is regarded very progressively, is a method of getting more dental care, particularly to young people in the province of Manitoba without taxing, Mr. Chairman, the capacity of our dentists to deal with it. And now the Minister has decided, because I don't regard him as fool, has decided that he is going to sabotage that program, and I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that any of us in this House should be surprised at that.

That's the only complaint that I have with some members; the notion that if we could only get to this Minister and convince him of the wrongdoing, of the bad direction that he is taking, if we could only cajole him or persuade him or intimidate him, if you will, that he will change his mind. The reason that he is doing this is not because of any report, not because of any committee, not because of any analysis, not because of any fact, but because he is determined that he is going to sabotage the system of public dental services in the province of Manitoba provided through the agency of the public, because ideologically he says it has to be provided by private dentists. That's the reason, Mr. Chairman, and is there any sort of mystery about that? Hasn't that been the entire direction of this government, Mr. Chairman, in every area? Hasn't it been the direction of the Minister of Education that he doesn't care what happens in the public school system, he doesn't care how many teachers are let go, because he is prepared to have the public school system act as a garbage can and buttress the private system?

Hasn't it been the case with regard to the Minister of Agriculture, who says that he is not going to have any public land available in the province of Manitoba for people who want to rent them, that if you want to rent land in the province of Manitoba, you're going to have to rent it from a private landlord.

Hasn't it been the position of the Minister of Mines, who says that we are dependent and will remain dependent upon the private mining industry of the province of Manitoba and we are ideologically opposed to the public having control of this area.

Mr. Chairman, I notice you are looking somewhat askance at me, because of the fact that I have gone into other fields, but I do so, Mr. Chairman, I do so because the Minister is merely one cog in a larger wheel of rolling over and destroying any control or otherwise participation by the public in its own affairs in the favour of having the public subject to private people who are not under their control, and this is merely one part of it. And I, Mr. Chairman, believe that is perfectly in order, perfectly in order, and I say so because this is one area, Mr. Chairman, where the evidence that this is sabotage, is so clear as to escape anybody's attention but that of a complete fool.

The report that has been presented indicates that the public does it as well, at worst, the evidence is that the public does it as well. And if the public does it as well and the public remains in control, then why have the public get out of it and put it in the hands of people who are given a lost leader's opportunity of showing that they could do it better and then losing that control. What other reason, Mr. Chairman, but a complete ideological direction to do what they can, to take away from the public the initiative that has been exercised in this area. Mr. Chairman, the Minister can, of course, do to me what he did to the Member for St. Johns, and what he can do to the Member for St. Boniface, and no doubt the Member for Rock Lake, they get up and deal with the question in the way in which he wants to, but it's not something which comes about by accident, which comes about by analysis, it comes about, Mr. Chairman, in the law — and I cite the Criminal Law, we say malice aforethought. Now I know the Minister doesn't believe that he is doing malice, he thinks that what he is doing is for the good of the province, that's his direction. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that he doesn't rely, nor is he really pretending to rely on any evidence to support that position. The three recommendations which were read out in the report do not suggest that the Manitoba Dental Association have this program turned over to them. What he is doing, Mr. Chairman, he is doing to pursue the direction of the Conservative party in every area which they have touched and the slight deviations or pretended deviations, Mr. Chairman, are not deviations at all. They are either camouflage, such as occurred with the mining program which is not, Mr. Chairman, a public participation in a new venture, not at all, it is a giveaway of 75 percent of known reserves for a pittance — known reserves given away to a private interest on the basis that we could participate 25 percent in our own property. Any mining company that did that, Mr. Chairman, if the directors of a mining company did that they would be first of all removed by their directors and then prosecuted for converting the property of the mining company to somebody else.

But this is the direction, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is proceeding in, this is the direction that we can expect him to proceed in and, Mr. Chairman, any notion that we on this side can dissuade him from that direction, I think is very optimistic. I'll wait

to see whether that will happen with a great deal of scepticism but I think it would be optimistic indeed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to honourable members Opposite that I'm not rising here this afternoon to defend my colleague, the Minister of Health, who was sort of criticised by the Member for Inkster when he was chastising him for not standing up and immediately responding to some of the comments — and probably some in form of questioning — by the Member for St. Johns, the Member for Seven Oaks and the Member for St. Boniface. I've just finished listening to the Member for Inkster — and I'm going to try to keep to the text, Mr. Chairman — but when the Member for Inkster embodies his ideology and gets out in the field of agriculture, when he tries to tell the people of Manitoba that a young farmer had no opportunity of leasing land, that is Crown Lands, other than under a socialistic government, I want to tell him that he is totally wrong, that ever since Day One when this country was formed, the young farmer, or anybody who wanted to rent land, he could rent it from a private owner and he has also been able to rent land from the Crown, or from the people of the province of Manitoba. We've always had that opportunity under our system of government and that still prevails today and as far as I can gather, Mr. Chairman, I think it will still continue. So the Member for Inkster, and his ideology in that respect, I think he is barking up the wrong tree.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I heard the Member for St. Johns speak this afternoon and he did his level best to try to tell the people of Manitoba that we on this side of the House as the government of Manitoba of the present day are trying to destroy our dental services to the children and to the people of the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I also listened yesterday to the Member for Seven Oaks who stood up and he said to the Minister of Health, why don't you come out clear-cut or why didn't you do that from Day One, the day that you took office, and tell the people of Manitoba that you are going to wipe out everything that the former government had done in the way of providing an opportunity for young people, whether boys or girls, to enter into what they established as Wascana School of Learning in Regina and destroy that completely and form your own policies and get on with what you believe in. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the honourable gentlemen that I feel as a member of this government we have a little more compassion than that. We understand, and we have honoured some of the things that you as a former government had done; we felt it our obligation to. We feel that we have that sense of responsibility, where a group of young people had gone through for two years, trained, and we felt there was some obligation to fit them in if at all possible, to jobs here in Manitoba, when they finished their course and came back into this province. That's one point, Mr. Chairman. And I chastise the Member for St. Johns pretty strongly on this point by accusing us of trying to deliberately scuttle and destroy the whole program because of what we're doing. It isn't as

simple as all that, Mr. Chairman. It isn't that clear-cut.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to members that as a rural member, I recognize and I agree with honourable members that we've had a shortage of dental services in rural Manitoba particularly. You haven't had that problem to quite the extent, say, in the city of Winnipeg as we've had in rural Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I happen to represent one of these constituencies that do not have the sharing of this experiment where we had dental services out serving the schools in my constituency. And it's over a year ago I met with the Tiger Hill School Division Board one evening, they were concerned about this, such as you might be as well, and they discussed the matter with me. And through the discussion that evening, Mr. Chairman, I should like to inform honourable members, having toyed this thing back and forth, they indicated to me that our local dentist was very upset about this whole matter, and they said they could have got into the plan but they did listen to their dentist. And having listened to him I said, well, what was the outcome of this discussion? And the point they informed me on, and I think to me, Mr. Chairman, and I say to honourable members opposite, is that I was given to understand that the previous government, the NDP party, under the auspices of the Member for St. Boniface, who was then the Minister of Health for a period of time, did not consult at any time, in any way, shape or form with the Dental Association when they embarked on this program.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this — (Interjection)—

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The member can make that statement, and I believe he was told that, but the member was a member of this House a few years ago when this was said and I filed a pile of documents of exchange in correspondence this thick, saying how many times I'd met with them, for over years, and delayed the program and they brought in an organizer from Ontario, and I talked and talked with them as I have never refused a meeting with them and there was a committee working with them. They were consulted in every possible fashion, way more than any consultation on any subject that was done. And I'm ready to bet anything that this was not done to the same extent as I did on that by any members of the present Cabinet, on any subject, because there was more correspondence and discussions and meetings, even with people that they brought in from Ontario, with the President, personal meetings, private meetings, official meetings, exchange of letters and then a committee that they dealt with constantly, so that is definitely false.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows on the same Point of Order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, no it is a matter of privilege, Mr. Chairman, because here we've just seen an example of a case where an honourable member was presented with certain information,

which was within his possession, within his knowledge, and it was up to him, and he could have corrected the thinking of the members of Tiger Hill's Board who felt that there was no consultation between our government, the government of the day and the Dental Association. But the honourable member knew there was consultation because he had evidence given of it and he remained silent; so by remaining silent, Mr. Chairman, he misled the people of Manitoba, or at least a group of the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Member for Rock Lake care to continue?

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Member for St. Boniface rose on a point of personal privilege. By your silence, Sir, I presume that the Member for St. Boniface had no point of personal privilege, the Member for Burrows had no point of privilege, and you know, Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentlemen want a battle of ideology.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I will rule on the points of privilege, I think that a member has the right to make any statements that he attributes to himself as personal statements, and if they don't agree with the thinking of other members, I don't think that really does give them a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: My point of privilege, Sir was not solely because I did not agree with him. There was an incorrect statement — and I'm not accusing the member, and I made it quite clear, of misrepresenting — but I certainly have a right and a privilege to correct immediately a false statement that is made in this House that is going on the record, and this is what I did and this is why I rose on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Honourable members, we will accept that. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, to continue my discussion on this particular matter which, Mr. Chairman, is a very very important one, and when the Member for St. Boniface says he has a list of correspondence, I don't know how much, between himself and the Dental Association, that could well be, Mr. Chairman. He could have had a good deal of correspondence with the dentists of the province of Manitoba. But you know, Mr. Chairman, there's a big difference when the Minister is embarking on a new program, which is going to be a policy of the government of the day and is going to affect the people, such as is the case of dental services to our children and to adults of the province of Manitoba. I'm given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that sure, maybe the Member for St. Boniface, who was then the Minister of Health, talked to the dentists, I'm not saying that. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to say if he did, it was a one-way street. Mr. Chairman, it was a one-way street. The dentists could present all the proposals they liked and they could present their case in total, what the situation was as they saw it in regards to providing dental services in the province of Manitoba, both urban and rural. But I would

suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the past NDP government were bent, such as they have done in so many other areas, in the years they were in power, that they were not concerned how the dentists felt about their own profession. In the same way the Member for St. Boniface, he was continually in confrontation with the medical doctors of this province. And, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this basically was the problem that was begun by the previous administration. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned, and we were concerned when we took office in 1977, when we learned of what the situation was all about. I, for instance, am a member of this House. I'm not one who can pass judgement on whether a dentist is doing the right thing or the doctor's doing the right thing. I think that should be left up to the professional people who are providing that service to the people of this province. I'm given to understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is satisfied after a certain period of time to lapse, while the review committee that the Minister had established, to look into providing dental services to our children and to adults of Manitoba.

One thing I fully recognize, as I'm sure that honourable members opposite recognize, that there is a shortage of dentists throughout the province of Manitoba, particularly in the rural areas. And right now I'm given to understand that the Minister is urging upon the dentists — and I believe he's getting that kind of co-operation — of the dentists to work with the dental nurses to bring them into their fold and to give them the opportunity to serve under them and give better service in the way of dental programs to the children of Manitoba and to the adults of this province.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Seven Oaks yesterday, from what I could gather of his comments, pretty well his total speech, was telling the Minister — and condemning him, really, that's the impression I gathered — for carrying on the kind of program that they had in mind. But what we were wanting to do, and the difference between the NDP and the Conservative Party, Mr. Chairman, is this, that we don't believe in taking complete control of the province of Manitoba, and that is the difference, Mr. Chairman. We believe that the dentists, through their Association, have a responsibility — and I hope that my colleague, the Minister of Health is doing that very thing — impressing upon the dentists of this province that they do have a responsibility and hopefully that we're going to get more dentists out into rural Manitoba; and hopefully that we will have the opportunity to allow them, through their association, to find employment for young people who want to become dental nurses and other forms of occupations within the dental profession, in order that we can have a better service and provide a better coverage for people from all parts of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, listening to four members opposite there, I don't blame the Minister of Health for not really getting up and answering each one individually. Because as far as I was concerned in listening to what they had to say, it was pure ideology, was condemning us for what we're trying to do and condemning us for not thinking exactly the way they do. Well, Mr. Chairman, fortunately we do have our ideas of establishing the kind of policies and what we

think is best for the people of Manitoba. We don't believe that dentists, doctors, lawyers even — I don't know why it is lawyers aren't brought into this whole thing, I don't know why they didn't do it when they were government — (Interjection)— No, I'm talking about professions, I'm talking about ideology, about different professions. The thing is that rather than create a confrontation with everybody in this province, rather than working with them and trying to work together to solve the problems that we are faced with, and I'm hoping and I am sure from what we have so far, that the ultimate results of the review committee and hopefully the co-operation that I hope we're going to get and I know we're going to get from the Dental Association and the dentists that are practising in this province, we're going to see a better dental service, for not only in the cities but also in the rural parts, in the northern areas of Manitoba.

And I want to commend the Minister of Health for the patience that he's been able to provide and also the criticisms that he's been able to withhold and withstand against, that in the final analysis when we have a program that we can work out in co-operation with the dentists of the province of Manitoba, that we're going to have a program that we'll be proud of.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I was going to wait but after the remarks of the last member I feel that I should get up as soon as possible to refute some of the things that were said. Maybe I should start by talking about this because this has been something that I should know by now. They like that. They want to keep on misrepresenting. They're talking about a confrontation with doctors and with dentists and it will go on forever.

I say there has been no confrontation. And the member is saying, well, maybe you did talk to them. At first he said that I hadn't even consulted them or talked to the dentists at all. I have a letter here written by them that says, Over the past few years representatives of the MDA have been negotiating with the Minister of Health and his representatives on the development of a Dental Health Care Plan for children. That was in 1976 and it didn't end there. Now the member said that it was a one-way street. Well, I think that you could say the same thing, that maybe they were embarking on a one-way street also if there is a confrontation. Now, let me explain and I want to take the time to explain because the member should know the facts.

The situation was that we wanted to bring in a dental plan that not too many provinces had, one that was very successful in Saskatchewan. The Minister that was there before me and his staff travelled to Saskatchewan and they were impressed with the service that was given in Saskatchewan. I don't think there's anything wrong with that. I think this is our duty to bring in these plans. If we hadn't brought in this plan we wouldn't be talking about it, there wouldn't be a line here, because you wouldn't have a plan right now. You can bet your last buck on that, Mr. Chairman.

Now the situation was that we also studied other plans where the medical profession ran the plan and they were not successful. They were not successful. It wasn't going. They had to change. In fact when we were doing this study the people of the province of Quebec, who had such a plan asked to come in. They wanted to meet and they met with representatives of the profession but not only Manitoba, because the Manitoba group brought in the federal group and brought in some consultant hired by them, very impressive, very capable people, and we had some good meetings. I can't say any more than that. I knew the then president quite well, the President of the Dental Association when I became Minister, asked me if I was going to negotiate with them, if it was a *fait accompli*, and I said no. And I said, but if you don't believe that tell me now, don't waste your time. I'll listen to you. I said, anything that I can do, I'll co-operate as much as possible but there are certain things that we must have. I said, if you don't believe me, tell me now. And he says, I know you, I believe you; that was the thing.

Now, in one other conversation he did ask me, could we bring in a suggestion? Could we bring in a plan to prove to you that we can do it? I said, absolutely, absolutely, bring this plan and I'll do everything possible so you'll be able to go ahead. But you're taking so long; there is no way that we're going to stop on this other plan. We're committed to it. It was a campaign. It was a promise in the election. It was a commitment that we made. We were already running late because it took longer than we thought. The negotiating also prolonged this and we went from there. Now I never saw that plan. They never did bring in a plan. It was only after we had introduced the plan that Turtle Mountain - after it was too late - we had budgeted for it, the dentists had not given me a plan and it was then that Turtle Mountain decided that they didn't want any part of our plan, they wanted to start their own. And I say that that was refused. There is no doubt that that was refused. That was never considered and then they said, we don't want to go in it, we want our own plan.

Now, as far as the professional people, I have a dentist. My friends have a dentist. I have a doctor. I have as much respect for my dentist, for the ability of my dentist, than you have — as much. I don't know your dentist. I don't know your doctor. I'm not saying mine is better. I say that I respect them. But we have a responsibility. When I took over — and the same as the Minister now or anybody except the position of Minister of Health and especially in the days when health and social development and the other things went with it — you know that it's a responsibility. We are embarking, we have left the centuries ago where everybody was concerned and worried about his own health. We felt that this is something in a progressive country such as ours that you should have at least the minimum, there should be a minimum, there's different programs, but there's a minimum of care that has to be guaranteed to the people — and I don't think that you disagree with that — and therefore, that it was our responsibility, it was the public that would deliver that.

Now you have seen that all over except in the United States, and I'll say that you and I will live — unless we should die of a heart attack quite fast, I've got to cover that, that's always possible — but I think that we will live to see a plan in the United States. It is ruining some of the people in the United States. For example, I can say that I was in Hawaii with my daughter, her husband, my wife and one of my grandsons.

My daughter happens to be a nurse and my grandson developed infection in the ear. She knew exactly what it was. She needed some drugs. She couldn't because that was prescription drugs. She had only one way of doing it. We went to the hospital. She told the doctor what she thought it was. He looked at the child for a minute or two and he says, yes, that's it. Here's a prescription. She had to pay for the drug. She had to pay, which the doctor told him was the very minimum because he realized he hadn't done very much, it was 55.00 for that child for something, and that is nothing compared to some of the things that are done if somebody should fall sick in the United States on a holiday. I think the member will agree with me, I'm sure that he's heard about that.

So, all right. You're trying to deliver a certain service and the taxpayers are paying for that. We are not experts. We've never said that we were experts in the field of medicine. Administration is something else. I think we now as much administration as the medical profession. I don't think they're necessarily expert in that and we might disagree with them on certain types of administration out to give the service. But the member is not naive enough so therefore he should not try to make a false impression that we know better than the doctors or the dentists when it comes to give the service. At no time did we make that statement. It would be ridiculous. It would be asinine.

Now there is another thing that everybody in this field will say and repeat as often as possible, that it is a concern because of the high cost of taking care of providing these services for our people. So it is the duty of the people that are elected, that is us as MLAs, to try and find a way to give as good service as is possible, but try to get it as reasonable as possible. Anybody will pay lip service, anybody, that you need more paramedical. There's a lot of things that you do, the dentist with the pay that he gets now, the fees that he gets, hasn't got the time and we cannot afford a dentist trying to act in a preventive way, to give advice and to give counsel on that when it could be done just as easily and maybe better, because it is a limited field, by a nurse. That is a very important part of the program. I'm talking about how to brush their teeth and so on. I'm not talking about explaining what is wrong with the teeth, they have to have an X-ray. That's not something that you really have to tell the public except to satisfy their curiosity. But to show them how to protect their teeth. That's Number One in education and prevention.

Now, a program was started where there were people trained for a very limited area, to do certain things, always with the supervision of a dentist, and that program has worked very well. I haven't criticized the dentists and in all fairness nobody on that side has criticized the work of the dental nurses.

Now Saskatchewan brought dentists — not dental nurses — they brought in and they said, we want you to examine, to look at the work done. And they themselves, and I read it and it's on the record, they themselves looked at in every case, the work done by the nurse was as good — not in every case but a bigger percentage — was as good or even better than the one performing in the dentist's office, and that was confirmed. And there wasn't a single layman, they were all dentists, the most knowledgeable, not necessarily the best, some of the most knowledgeable people at the university, and not NDP provinces either; from Toronto, from Alberta and from some of these places.

So therefore, as I say, nobody questioned the work of the nurse; nobody questioned the work of the doctor. We are looking to provide a service and to do it as reasonably as possible. Now there was no intention, and it was a fear that they felt this would hurt the dentists. There was no way. We were relying that most of the work was going to be done by these dental nurses. The member states himself that there was a shortage of dentists, and that was one of the reasons that was done, because of the shortage of dentists. We tried to entice, we even had grants for dentists to go in rural areas and in the north; this was done, and we relied on young dentists that were just setting up a practice that would help him to go into a rural area because he would do much of that work if he wasn't that busy. If he was busy, he didn't want any part of it, that's his choice. And there are other dentists who wanted to be semi-retired. We relied on them; this is the way it's done in Saskatchewan. So this is not something that would hurt the dentist at all, if anything, because the people would be aware of the importance of taking care of your teeth; if anything, he would have more work because the people would be aware. How many people do you know who have never been to a dentist or just go when it hurts so much they want a tooth yanked. So therefore that would not hurt the dentist.

The member said that it was a one-way track; it wasn't. We've talked, we've listened to them, but I did tell him, the first day I said, but as we go along, we can't respond forever; there will be some give-ins that you will have to accept, because that's the program and rightly or wrongly we're charged with providing services and this is what we want to do. We were very very interested in the utilization. It made good sense, that if you brought the service to the schools, and my dream was when I was the Minister, to bring many more of these services to the schools to test the hearing, this is done to test the teeth, the eyes, and all these things, I think it is a good place to start. It would be great if we had some kind of a little clinic or a room that could be used where you would do that in the schools.

I don't think you can improve on utilization, except for people who don't want any part of a plan for some reason or other, that are afraid of dentists, or the parents don't want to go to a dentist. Now the experiments that were done in countries that had this program had a very very very high utilization; that was No. 1. No. 2, we wanted to recognize the paramedical, the new group of people that were going to do limited things, and that was the dental nurses. And the facts and the

investigations that I told you about, that I mentioned today and that I quoted in fact from that study in the House last year and the year before, convinced us that they could do that work. The dentists then worry about that too much. They had said at one time that they did not accept the dental nurses, but when I brought that, I said that's a give-in, that's the No. 1 start, and we are not going to discuss this any more. I'll agree, I'll admit that this was said, if you don't recognize it, and they told me that could be changed. There were a lot of people gone; that's no problem. That's what I was told about recognizing the dental nurses.

And the No. 2 was not fee-for-service, excuse me, not a flat sum, and we said, well, all right, we can have a fee-for-service and we will not direct anybody to any special dentist on any special referrals. They had the right to come in and charge the fees. But in the initial care that the dentists would supervise the first, I think that was supposed to be on a retainer, on a certain amount, and we wanted a fair retainer. Now that's the situation. —(Interjection)— If you want to call that confrontation, I can't stop you. If you want to talk about confrontation with the medical profession, and he's the one that introduced that, Mr. Chairman, so I think I have a right to answer that, if you want to say that I met privately, my first mistake when I was Minister of Health, that I met privately at the request of the chairman or the president of the MMA to try to arrive at something, which was a mistake; it should have been done at the Commission where there could have been a higher appeal, then there was only the First Minister. And I can say that the requests that I had in that year, and you know that it was a very generous request; some of them bragged what they would do, that it was going to be a rehearsal when we negotiated a contract for professionals, for doctors, that we had working in the department, and do you know that there was an increase of over 40 percent in some certain areas. You know that I had trouble with some of my colleagues in Cabinet because of that, so it was a very generous thing.

Now the first confrontation started then. It was supposed to be a start because you were going to get that socialist government and there was going to be a war. They weren't satisfied with the way it had been settled before. And do you know what the point was? When we did, and it was misrepresented until I asked to go, by the way, I asked to go in the lion's den. I requested to go at the annual meeting of the MMA, and if you think I wasn't shaking, you're crazy. And I finally was given this chance. I asked if they would question me, I wasn't allowed, this was not allowed, I just made my statement very clearly — I don't know what else I could have done. And then when we started, as I said, the first time, the first chance that I had to negotiate with the MMA as the Minister of Health, the question was that they wanted an increase of, it came to about 40 percent or 42 percent. You didn't give him that; they didn't call it a confrontation. You didn't give him that. I told them very candidly, maybe out of turn, maybe I shouldn't have said that because I had to get the approval, I had tested the Cabinet and I said that the most I could do, I revealed everything, I put everything on the table which probably was a mistake, I said that I could probably go on 13 percent.

This wasn't done immediately and then controls were brought in. I had nothing to do with that. The federal government brought controls. The province, our leader, always being accused of just favouring the unions and so on, excepted the controls. Many of the members did not agree; some of them said so quite openly, with the First Minister on that. The unions and these people did not like that, many of them, but nevertheless we did it but he said there won't be any exceptions. So the federal government said that the maximum that any professional can get was 2,500 for the same work as the year before. They could work more but for the same pay.

That was done and there was a certain amount of money besides that provided, because that's when we started talking about maintaining the office and so on; that was granted. The big battle, the big battle was on 2,500, because they wanted to do that collectively. At the time the federal government had not ruled on that. We were given to understand that it was for every individual. That was the control that you were going to have on the individual. The medical profession wanted to have that as a group, in other words, that we get the equivalent of so many doctors multiplied by 2,500 and that would be divided, and some would get maybe 5,000 or 6,000, the other maybe a few hundred dollars. And the commitment was made, not necessarily by me alone but by me as a member of Cabinet of course, I accepted the responsibility, but I had to carry the ball. There was nothing else I could do. That was done and the medical profession objected to that.

The following year, we did recognize that if that — we didn't know how long, one year wouldn't hurt it, but if this was done, and their main concern was not the money — their main concern was that the government eventually would control the fees, it would be practically on salary. We recognized that. The following year, because the controls remained for more than a year, that was changed. That was the big confrontation. And I forgot something. I said that the confrontation started at the meeting when we were negotiating and the MMA had been — I think it's ridiculous — but the MMA became the bargaining agents, the union, for the doctors working for us. And you know what they wanted, you know what the big fight was all about — contracting out. Many, many of the doctors themselves did not know what was meant by their leaders, by their executive, when they talked about contracting out. They thought, and I was accused of preventing them from opting out. Well, contracting out, no contracting out — and I hope that the member is listening because I think he should understand, he should get all these facts — contracting out meant that the government, if they had to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30. I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return to the Chair at 8:00 o'clock this evening.
Committee rise.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are now in Private Members' Hour. The first item of business on

Thursdays is Public Bills. We have one bill, Bill No 14, An Act to Amend the Law Society Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. (Stand)

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING — PRIVATE BILLS

BILL NO. 24 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MANITOBA CLUB ACT, 1931

MR. SPEAKER: The next item is Private Bills, Bill No. 24, An Act to Amend the Manitoba Club Act, 1931, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must tell you that when I see something involving the Manitoba Club, I just feel I want to participate in debate involving them. The Member for River Heights — I wonder, is he a member of the Manitoba Club? No, he's not, Mr. Speaker. I wouldn't fault him if he was, but it appears that he is not.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Club apparently was incorporated by an Act in 1875, May 14th; we're not quite there, May 14th, yet. But it sets out that an association of persons have existed since 1874 in Winnipeg under the name of the Manitoba Club and thereupon gives it a charter, and the important thing always with a charter is that there is the protection that no member shall be liable for any of the debts of the corporation.

In 1931 a new Act was brought in which revised, revamped, and updated the charter of the Manitoba Club, and it has proven to be the most prestigious club in Winnipeg from the standpoint of social and economic contribution to the province as has been alleged by people who apparently think they know what powers operate within the community of Winnipeg to manage that things happen.

We have been told in the years gone by that decisions were made in the Manitoba Club that affected ultimately the decisions made in legislatures, maybe city councils at City Hall, etc., and I believe it was true — I don't really believe it's true any more. But I remember my first direct involvement in relation to the Manitoba Club was when I was a member of this council of the city of Winnipeg, which was I think 1958, 1959, or thereabouts, when I found that the city was paying the membership fees, the dues, on behalf of three employees of the city of Winnipeg, the Finance Director, the Director of Works, and I think the Director of Hydro. Mr. Speaker, by that time I was fully aware of the fact that the Manitoba Club maintained discriminatory practices based on various criteria related to what they considered unattractive membership and, being a Jew, I was always aware of the fact that the Manitoba Club did not have membership of any Jews and did not have membership of many other people who, in the eyes and minds of the esteemed members of the

Manitoba Club, were not acceptable to them socially or for whatever reason. Women were never even allowed on the premises at that time, much less be members.

Mr. Speaker, I made it a point then to object to city, to tax moneys, moneys paid by the taxpayer of Winnipeg, to be used to recognize the validity and the value and to create a sense of respectability to the Manitoba Club, which I believe was not deserving because of discriminatory practices, and I objected that the city should it think it worthwhile to spend tax moneys to have three of its senior employees be paid for to be members of that club. The argument given to me was that since the powers that be in the economic life of Winnipeg and, therefore, of Manitoba were centred in the Manitoba Club, that it was important that the city's top officials should be able to rub elbows with the other powermakers, the powerbrokers, at the Manitoba Club. And I objected violently and, as I recall it, out of 18 members of the City Council, only one did not support my proposal that it be eliminated; that those three membership dues should be eliminated from the budget. I felt it was a justifiable thing; I said then and I say now, that any group of people, private people, who want to practise discriminatory practices in their social life have a right to do so. I frown on it, I deplore it, but I recognize that if they have biases, discriminatory ideas, prejudices, that's their problem more than that of society's. But I did object to tax moneys being used for it and two interesting things developed after that, Mr. Speaker.

I got a phone call from a judge of Manitoba, a Jew, who said that he was the first judge appointed in Manitoba who was not automatically invited to become a member of the Manitoba Club. And, concurrently, I had a call from a person whom I don't think I ought to identify, but I would say that he was the first Jewish president of one of the largest companies in a recognized industry in Manitoba. If pressed, I can give enough of a description so that he would be identifiable, and I don't want to do that, who told me that his corporation owned a share, owned a membership in the Manitoba Club which was always the prerogative of the president to use, but that in his case he was not allowed to be the person to use that membership and, indeed, it was the secretary of the corporation that was given that opportunity. And they thanked me, both of them, one the judge and one the president, for raising that issue because they felt, and they were right, that in their roles it was not their function to make a public issue of it. I remember, I believe it was the Tribune that supported the position I took editorially.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a Metro councillor shortly after that we had the same kind of debate and Metro council rejected payments for dues from tax moneys. Then, Mr. Speaker, when I became a member of the Legislature, Edward Schreyer put in an Order for Return asking for any payments made by the government for any member of government in any social fraternal club and, sure enough, when the Order for Return came, the then Finance Minister was having I think it was 400 paid on his behalf to be a member of the Manitoba Club. And Schreyer stood on this side of the House and he said that although he did not want to hurt the feelings of that particular member, he objected that tax moneys should be

used to obtain a form of recognition of a club with discriminatory practices by paying for a Minister of the Crown. He moved, or was about to move, a deletion of the estimates of millions of dollars from that department by 400.00.

Mr. Speaker, Duff Roblin, sitting opposite, stood up immediately and said, I was not aware that this was being done. I'm not quoting him verbatim, of course, he said, I personally object violently to the practices of that club. I cannot, of course, support an amendment to reduce the estimates of the province because it would be a non-confidence vote, but, he said, I would tell the Member for Brokenhead, Ed Schreyer, that if he will withdraw the motion I promise him that in no future years of Conservative governments would he have the need to bring such a motion because it would be eliminated.

Gil Molgat, then the Leader of the Liberal Party, stood up and said, I, too, have refused to join that club because of their practices and I endorse what was said by the Premier, and Schreyer then withdrew that motion. I was, for one, pleased to see that reaction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why do I raise that? Because I believe that the discriminatory practices of that club are not necessarily fully cured. I do know they now have some Jews as members of the club. I believe they have, I don't know how many, I don't really care, but I believe that it is still engrained within that club to maintain discriminatory practices. That is proven by the fact that one of the members on this side asked the member who introduced this current bill whether women were members of the club and the answer was, no, they are not members and they're not allowed to members of the club, although apparently there is some part of the building where they are allowed to — there are none that are members of this club. I am now quoting, It is a mens' club; there are women that are permitted into the club and they do have a specific dining area for women alone — alone — and, of course, many of the other areas of the club are for mixed company but there are no women members. It's a mens' club, but I am informed by the person present in this Chamber, who is most interested in the use, in the facilities being offered to both men and women that there is a facility in the Manitoba Club.

MRS. WESTBURY: I think it's a ladies' dining area, but I don't . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Called the ladies' dining area. Well, that's confirmed, Mr. Speaker. But I did ask about, when that question arose, I asked about Human Rights' compliance by the club and the member who introduced the bill said that there would be persons present. The reason I asked that, Mr. Speaker, is that I do believe that if a private club does not get public support for its operations, it has a right to do as it likes. But we, the onlookers, have a right to express our opinions about them and the way they operate. If, in this case, they chose to come to the Legislature to continue and expand on their operations they lay themselves open to being discussed. I believe they could have come and got a charter under the company's Act as a non-profit organization and could have avoided this, but I guess they want whatever prestige goes with this. And,

therefore, I have a right to express my sentiments about the way they operate.

I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, by mentioning that — just a sample, I don't know how many are really available — of legislation that has passed through this Chamber. In 1970, the Club de Golf St. Malo has inserted in it Section 16 which reads, passed in 1970, No person shall be denied membership in the club because of race, colour, nationality, ancestry, place of origin or creed. The Transcona Country Club, 1972, has Section 17 in it which reads: No person shall be denied membership in the club because of race, colour, nationality, ancestry, place of origin or creed. There is one descriptive title that is not in these two that I read but I find that in 1976, the Carman Golf Club was incorporated and Section 17 reads: No person shall be denied membership in the club because of race, colour, nationality, ancestry, sex, place of origin or creed. And I believe that the addition of the word sex in the latter case is probably because of a change that transpired in the Human Rights' legislation, but it's not important how it came in. The fact is it is there. I'm saying this because I would like to think that the Manitoba Club will think that justice, fair play, ethics, should be seen to be observed, not only be claimed to be observed. I predict, Mr. Speaker, that when they come before the committee they will say, whatever was passed is gone but we do not discriminate now. Maybe we would want to ask some questions about, exploring a little further, the extent to which they do or not.

But it would be awfully interesting if they precluded these questions by asking that there be an amendment at the committee level along the lines such as the Carman Golf Club which says: No person shall be denied membership in the club because of race, colour, nationality, ancestry, sex, place of origin or creed. Mr. Speaker, other than as a citizen of Manitoba, it is really of no concern to me what the Manitoba Club does or does not do. I think it should be a concern that people should operate in their private ways as openly as they are required to do as employers or in connection with other public associations. I think it would be good for declarations to be made time and again repeating the fact that discriminatory practices, such as we know have existed, are no longer acceptable in society. That's the reason that I took the trouble and the time of this Legislature to speak as I did. I think it's important, repeating again, that they have every right, to my mind, to do as they please unless they come along and ask for a reduction in taxation or for any other benefits, or if they ask that the memberships be paid out of tax moneys for civil servants. —(Interjection)—

I'm informed, Mr. Speaker, and I was just informed and I hope that my information is reliable that last year, in 1978-79, memberships were paid for the heads of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, the Manitoba Telephone System, and the Manitoba Hydro. Mr. Speaker, those are not tax moneys but they are Crown corporations with a monopoly to serve in the way they do. They belong to the people of Manitoba and everything I said up to now is made even more important by the fact that I am able to make this statement which I really wasn't sure about, Mr. Speaker. You know, I start to wonder; I wonder how many other government employees or, may I

ask, is not possible that what happened in 1966 or whatever could be happening again? Are there fees being paid now on behalf of any people in government, either elected positions or otherwise, and I don't know that it's so, that maybe again supporting and recognizing by that support, the continuance of clubs such as the Manitoba Club whose discriminatory practices were well known and were never denied when they were challenged. Now, as I say, it may be that since I heard some few years ago that they invited some Jewish members, I would imagine that maybe other people with other descriptions relating to their race, colour, nationality, ancestry, place of origin or creed are now acceptable regardless of what transpired before that. I don't know if that's the case. I do know they discriminate against women, but apparently they do have facilities which women can use, and therefore one wonders why they should continue to discriminate against women. But again, I grant them the right to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I've clearly taken up the time in order to make a public statement the way I feel about discriminatory practices of that nature. This is not the YMCA, and I do believe the YMCA has women members now. I think there are certain areas where women may not be entirely welcome, but nevertheless I believe that all the services, programs etc. are available that way. But this is a club, a Manitoba Club, which does not of course set out its purposes but which is given the right to meet, to have members and to enact by-laws which in themselves may or may not be used to be discriminatory. I understand that never did they have a by-law, at least they always said that they'd never had a by-law which discriminated, but their practices showed clearly the way they did. I hope they will now come and say, we have mended our ways, we are pure as the driven snow, we will even consider the inclusion of women as potential members, and I hope they will voluntarily say they would like to have included in this bill before us a section which reads, and I will read it again in concluding, as does the Carman Golf Club section which says No person shall be denied membership of the club because of race, colour, nationality, ancestry, sex, place of origin, or creed. I hope they do, and if they do, it will be a change and a further development in the history of the Manitoba Club and indeed therefore in the history of Winnipeg and of Manitoba as it develops into the 80s.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to take very long to say what I have to say, but I must make this statement. I will not support any resolution in any way, which by implication reflects support of an institution known for its discriminatory practices.

They say that some Jewish people are now acceptable as members of this particular club. I would suspect there may be other races and nationalities which are not acceptable. We have been told by the person introducing this bill that women are not allowed to be members. I don't know why women would want to be members, but that is really not the point.

One of my proudest memberships, Mr. Speaker, is membership in the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews. I happen to be a regional and national executive member of that organization, which opposes discrimination in any form, and I feel that if I did not now speak out on this particular bill, I would be denying the *raison d'être* of that organization, the very principles in which I and very many others so strongly believe. I will not support, in any way, an organization such as The Manitoba Club, which has a tradition of discrimination. Whether that is now washed over a little bit by allowing some people in, I don't think reflects a lack of discrimination, I think that reflects a realization that people expect changes, and so allowing some people in as if it is a quota of Jews now, and perhaps other races as well, doesn't really answer any challenges on the matter of discrimination.

Until and unless they display their goodwill toward all minorities by incorporating in their by-laws, in their constitution, a declaration such as has been read out by the Honourable Member for St. Johns in reference to the Carman Club which even includes lack of discrimination against women, or by sex . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to be permitted to make, what may be a correction. I've just been informed that my information regarding the three organizations mentioned, the three Crown Corporations, may not be correct; it may be that it refers to the Carlton Club, and even then I'm not sure enough. As I said earlier, I'm absolutely sure I was quoting what I was told. I want to take the precaution of saying I was informed, but I'm really not sure, and I'm now told there is some doubt about the statement as it may apply to one or other of the Crown Corporations.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear any nay votes.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear any nay vote.

MR. GREEN: That's right, you didn't call the question.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion please say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: All those opposed please say nay.

MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. We'll now proceed with private resolutions.
Resolution No. 23 - the Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Transcona,

WHEREAS the economy of the province of Manitoba is currently in a depressed state;

WHEREAS the citizens of our province are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that oil and gas are rapidly depleting and are extremely costly resources; AND WHEREAS alternative energy sources will be required in the near future to prevent shortage of energy;

AND WHEREAS alternative energy industries, based on solar and biomass can prevent such energy shortages while stimulating our economy in that such alternative energy sources are extremely labour intensive;

AND WHEREAS that industries should be encouraged to manufacture and experiment with sunny Manitoba;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED — and Mr. Speaker, I'm asking that a correction be made in the first resolved that would read as follows: THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the provincial government

consider the elimination of all provincial taxes on solar and wood heating equipment;

THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that legislation protecting the rights of our citizens to solar access be established immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreeable with the House to consider that minor change in the wording?

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this resolution is three-fold. First of all, it is to encourage innovation in the search for alternative energy, alternatives to the non-renewables which we are rapidly running out of. The second purpose is to boost the economy of this province. A third is to protect the rights of those individuals who do use solar energy in order that they will be encouraged to do so.

The first purpose, that of encouraging innovation, is one that I believe is extremely important. The objective of conserving the non-renewables here as elsewhere is something that all of us should be concerned with. In yesterday's Tribune there was a headline Vicious Struggle for Oil Supplies Forecast. It was a clear indication that we are running out of oil and gas throughout the world and we'd better start thinking about alternatives and we had better start turning our minds toward alternatives. It has been about one lifetime since we started in any major way to exploit our oil and gas.

I recently had occasion to speak with an elderly farmer, who told me that he could remember the first car that came into the district. He could remember the first combine that used gasoline or diesel fuel, and the first truck, and during his lifetime we have come practically full circle. We started off with major exploitation and we are now in a position where we are running out of it, and when you consider that lifetime as opposed to the entire course of human history it must be admitted that we have been very wasteful. We have not been considerate of future generations. The demise of oil and gas and coal and alternatives have been talked about for a century. In

1870 Jules Verne in the Mysterious Island stated, I believe that water will one day be employed as fuel, that hydrogen and oxygen which constituted, used singly or together will furnish an inexhaustible source of heat and light of an intensity of which coal is not capable. Now I don't know whether that will ever happen. The Member for Churchill, who I believe wishes to speak after I've finished, may be able to tell us whether that will happen. But I do know that we already have prototype hydrogen-powered buses, we have prototype hydrogen-powered planes and we have houses which are being operated on hydrogen, so there is a possibility that is a source for future energy.

Many of our private citizens are beginning to look at, examine and experiment with solar energy for their residences, for their greenhouses, for their swimming pools, and in fact the public of this province has spent some money on experimentation with solar energy on this very building in which we sit. I am not exactly sure as to how that experiment is going. But there has been a commitment by the public to research. The Manitoba government, this current government has negotiated with Ottawa an agreement which will provide assistance to those experimenting with alternative energy. I'm not sure as to the exact nature of that agreement. I am somewhat concerned that probably it's going to be a giveaway, a grant type of situation. However, there are movements coming along in that direction.

People throughout our province are going back to using renewable wood to heat their houses. It was only twenty or thirty years ago that people practically throughout this province were using coal and wood. We converted to gas and oil. We converted to non-renewables, we're heading back to renewables. And I recognize that there are problems involved with wood heat; I recognize that there are problems in terms of pollution; and as a former fire fighter I recall very well the difficulties involved with chimney fires in the good old days when we still had some wood heating even in the city of St. Boniface. So that is an area that is not necessarily one without any problems whatsoever. Nevertheless, it's an area that the people are looking at and the government should do everything possible to encourage this for the sake of saving our non-renewables. But it should also encourage this for the sake of our economy. Our economy, I think everyone here would agree, is in pretty bad shape. Housing starts are down; they're down across the nation, but they're especially down in Manitoba. Bankruptcies are on the increase. There are businesses closing. We're losing population; we're losing our kids. And one of the things that's climbing in this province and in this country is interest rates which is certainly an impact on our business community and our farmers. This particular type of industry would be both socially useful and a real asset, a real asset to our economy, and I would like to remind members of some of the benefits involved in our economy. We should remember that every time we don't send a dollar to Alberta for oil and gas and keep it in Manitoba, that has a tremendous positive impact on our province; and we should remember that every time we get a dollar in here from outside because of our technology, that has a tremendous impact on our economy. — (Interjection)— Yes, the Member for Transcona

mentions peat moss and that's certainly an area where we should be doing more experimentation.

So the removal of this particular tax is one which I would submit is not a matter that would cost the Provincial Treasury, but rather in the long run would provide us with more funds from the employment of individuals in this province on this type of an industry.

There are other methods of encouraging this industry and I would encourage the government to consider other methods. I would hope however, that one method that they don't use is give-aways, is grants. The province of Quebec recently established a company, the Socié de Nouvelier, with a 50 million budget, to promote renewable energy and it is expecting additional funding and I would like to quote from the April edition of Canadian Renewable Energy News, page 1: A long awaited commitment to renewables from the Quebec government has taken the form of a holding company set up by the province with a 50 million budget to promote renewable energy. And funding from other sources, particularly the federal government, could make as much as 300 million available to alternative energy sources in Quebec over the next few years. Members of Quebec's solar industry are enthusiastic about it. I think it's going to have a very good impact in the Quebec province because Nouvelier has the mandate to look into renewable energy that excludes, and this is important, oil, gas, electricity, coal, and also nuclear, says Michael Sicotte, vice-president of PetroSun Company of Montreal. What is left really is solar, wind, tidal, and biomass, and they've got a mandate of 50 million in initial capital which, if you consider it, is approximately half of what the Canadian government under the PUSH program is putting up. We've been following it very closely and it looks very very promising.

There's another quote from a fellow by the name of Nick Nicholson, a solar designer in Aires Cliff, Quebec. He says: Essentially my feeling is to support this kind of government effort because it funds people involved with renewable energy to work on a practical basis. I very definitely support the idea of government assistance in the form of low interest loans for venture capital where it's merited.

Nicholson says he prefers loans rather than a grant system, like the federal purchase and use of solar heat program which can cripple the industry by holding it back from being competitive. If it isn't, it should be phased out. He suggests a factor that has retarded the industry is that a lot of initiative was not acted on except with government grants and consequently many of the installations weren't competitive. And I believe that is a point that the government should take into consideration when they are looking at encouraging industry. The grant system is not one that is to the benefit of the people and as people in the industry say, it's not of benefit to the industry.

So there are other ways of encouraging experimentation with alternative energy and I urge this government to implement this resolution in tandem with the resolution authorizing the lending out of funds rather than the giving away of funds to a few people, that is the Enterprise Manitoba resolution.

Again, the renewable energy industry can supply a great many jobs. They can be research jobs, skilled jobs, good jobs for our kids to stay in the province. I suggest that any loss in revenue will very quickly be made up from additional revenues flowing from income taxes which will be paid by the people working in the industry. And again, the money which would otherwise have left our province to purchase gas and oil and other alternative fuels will remain and be used in this province. And hopefully, we will be able to set up an industry which will be competitive on the continent.

I notice in today's paper, Page 2 of the Winnipeg Free Press, there's a headline Solar Energy Spokesman Says Canada Falling Behind, Dr. James Bolt, national chairman of the Social Energy Society of Canada is quoted as saying that one of the main incentives to the public would be a government offer of tax incentives. These kinds of incentives are already in place federally. I have here an R&D update for the month of April, federal contracts announced, and there are some 29 of these contracts announced during that month, two of them to Manitoba companies, 31,935 to James MacLaren Limited of Winnipeg, to determine renewable resources information needs in Manitoba; 460,972 to W.L. Wardrop and Associates Limited of Winnipeg, Manitoba, to monitor solar heating systems in multi-unit residential buildings and commercial hot water systems. That apparently is for Phase One. So there is something happening federally.

As well, if we are going to become involved in alternative sources of energy and if we are going to encourage people, for instance, to use solar energy on their homes and on their business buildings, then we must ensure that those peoples' access to the sun for the purpose of operating their building, their access must be protected. In fact, any such building should be encouraged in this province and I would suggest that it is somewhat amazing and a rational fact of our life that in this day and age, as we are coming to the end of our non-renewable resources, we are still building buildings, we are still building houses and offices, that are being built in defiance of the environment rather than in co-operation with it. We're not saying to our people, we encourage you in some positive way to build your houses so that you have the southern exposure, so that you don't waste energy in other ways, so that you use the sun; we're not saying that in any of our laws and this type of solar access prototype legislation would demonstrate to the public of this province that we're interested, that in fact the legislators of this province are concerned with the proposition, that something has to be done to get into alternative supplies. And so the purpose of such prototype, solar protective legislation, would be twofold; in fact, it's first purpose, obviously, would be to protect those who put solar collectors, or what have you, on their buildings, to ensure that their neighbour doesn't grow some giant tree and stop the access of the sun to their building, and to ensure that their neighbour is not allowed to build a skyscraper or some other structure which in some way will interfere with the sun beaming down its energy on the particular home using a sensible form of energy, a form that we should be encouraging people to use.

Now the second purpose of that type of legislation, or consideration of that legislation, would be just simply publicity from this Chamber to demonstrate to people out there that in fact we are concerned and we're prepared to move and we're prepared to give encouragement in any way possible to those who are prepared to innovate with solar energy. And therefore I would ask your support in order to encourage the government to view ways and means and especially the proposal to eliminate the sales tax, to view ways and means of encouraging, seeking for alternative energy sources, as well as to improve our economy.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. GARY FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to have a resolution of this nature introduced in the Legislature to bring attention to the great opportunities that exist in the field of alternate energy, renewable energy sources. I compliment the Member for Rossmere for bringing this forward and allowing us to speak on it.

The Department of Energy indeed has many initiatives and many things under consideration in this area and this only serves to bring attention to the opportunities that exist.

I would like a little clarification if I may, Mr. Speaker, on the preamble to the resolution. I'm not quite sure in the last statement of the preamble which says, Whereas that industry should be encouraged to manufacture an experiment with sunny Manitoba, should that be within sunny Manitoba? Am I reading that correctly?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it would be extremely difficult for the solar energy industry to be experimenting with sunny Manitoba in Saskatchewan.

MR. FILMON: Yes, I certainly wouldn't want somebody experimenting with sunny Manitoba. I'd rather have them experimenting within sunny Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and so we'll proceed on that assumption.

I think the experiments with sunny Manitoba were done during the previous years of administration. Those were experiments which unfortunately failed and I hope that the experiments that happened within sunny Manitoba are far more productive in future.

Mr. Speaker, without proceeding directly to the resolution, I would certainly like to spend a little bit of time concerning the obvious inaccuracies that have been presented in the preamble regarding the views of the members opposite on the current state of the economy in Manitoba. The facts certainly appear to contradict the premises that are contained within the resolution and I'd like the opportunity to bring forward the correction of these facts to the attention of the members opposite. Certainly, I don't think there is any great weight of evidence to indicate that the economy of Manitoba is currently in

a depressed state. The truth, of course, is that our economy is healthy and we are doing very well compared with other province in this country, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, the Conference Board of Canada, that great institution often referred to by members opposite, came forward with its provincial forecast predicting that growth in Manitoba for 1980 will 1.8 percent, the highest growth in the country, after Alberta and Saskatchewan. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, with the exception of Saskatchewan, Manitoba is the only other province expected to show an accelerated growth rate in 1980 over that achieved in 1979. Despite the record-high national interest rates and current uncertainties in capital markets, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba's manufacturing sector is continuing to play a leading role in the recovery of the Manitoba economy.

According to the latest estimates by Statistics Canada, again, that source of information so widely quoted by members opposite, they currently are reporting that investment in Manitoba manufacturing is expected to increase 27.7 percent in 1980. This follows a 24.6 percent increase in 1979 for a two-year growth rate of more than 50 percent. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that's a very positive sign of the strength of our economy reinforced by the fine record achieved in manufacturing shipments which were up 20.2 percent to almost four billion in 1979. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, I'll be pleased to submit to a question at the end of my presentation for the Member for Elmwood. Indications are that this growth will continue and in January, 1980, manufacturing shipments were up by 20.9 percent over the previous year. A very positive trend, Mr. Speaker.

The employment picture in Manitoba is equally as bright. After an increase of 11,000 jobs in 1978 there was a further increase of 13,000 jobs or a 3 percent growth rate in 1979. Mr. Speaker, I might point out for the benefit of members opposite that those were not part-time, make-work, band-aid type jobs that were created by the government purse, but rather the vast majority of all those jobs were created in a private sector and are permanent long-lasting jobs that will continue to contribute to the growth of our province. These figures, Mr. Speaker, on our increase in job creation were well above the province's average annual increase of 1.9 percent from 1966 to 1979, well above those figures that honourable members opposite should be very familiar with.

The manufacturing sector has been particularly strong. Average employment in 1978 was 59,000 which increased to 63,000 for 1979. During the first quarter of 1980, the average has 66,000 people employed in the manufacturing sector. Employment in the private sector has significantly increased during the past two years, Mr. Speaker, and the public sector employment has declined. This is a sharp reversal of trends that were seen between 1975 and 1977. The employment growth has been heavily concentrated in full-time as opposed to the part-time positions that are a direct contradiction of the myth that the opposition is trying to propagate. Manitoba's unemployment decreased significantly last year to 5.5 percent from 6.5 percent in 1978. This rate of unemployment was the province's lowest since 1976, well below the national average of 7.5

percent last year. The Conference Board of Canada has predicted that Manitoba's unemployment rate in 1980 will average the same as in 1979, that is, 5.4 percent, well below the current national rate of 7.4 percent. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. MacEachen's mini-budget estimates — or was it a ninny budget I'm not sure — indicated that the federal government is predicting a national average of 8 percent unemployment in 1980 — 8 percent and we're projected for 5.4 percent. In other words, an increase in the national unemployment level, but in Manitoba, no increase predicted.

In contravention to what has been mentioned by the Member for Rossmere, Mr. Speaker, all of the industries of Statistics Canada recently are showing upward trends and positive trends for our province. The only possible exceptions are in the house-building and construction industries and those will come, Mr. Speaker, I assure you. The climate that we are presenting as a government for growth in stimulation of the economy will ensure that even those, the only two that are currently slightly lagging, are going to come around very quickly. Why, Mr. Speaker? Very simply, because our Progressive Conservative government has taken action and will continue to take action to build the economy of Manitoba and work on the solutions to the problems we're now facing. And of course, Mr. Speaker, energy is one of those. As a net importer of fossil fuels, we obviously have a direct interest in questions related to supply and price of oil and natural gas.

We recognize that a joint provincial-federal energy strategy is necessary, and the sooner the better. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, we've outlined a comprehensive new policy for such a strategy. The principal features of the strategy include support for a goal of energy self-sufficiency by 1990 and sooner, if possible; recognition of the importance of hydro development; a planned and prudent development that includes the western power grid. —(Interjection)— The western power grid, Mr. Speaker. We're all aware of the significant progress that's been made in regard to this matter. Self-sufficiency pricing for oil to encourage increased domestic production, decreased reliance on imports. Special cushioning programs, such as tax credits for northern residents and senior citizens to help offset the negative effects of our oil prices. Consideration of a new pricing system for natural gas reflecting our favourable supply situation, rather than keeping the prices of natural gas rising in lock-step with the prices of oil. A major new set of federal-provincial conservation programs, including measures for better use of available energy forms. I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that progress has been made towards this end in the form of a federal-provincial agreement on energy, jointly funded for research and development projects, for the conservation and renewable alternate energy sources. We intend to participate in this, Mr. Speaker, and have signed our part of the agreement and are just awaiting Mr. Lalonde's signature.

Mr. Speaker, this government has shown by its previous actions that it is interested, particularly, in conservation. In the 1978 budget, our administration expanded the application of sales tax exemption for insulation material to cover all purchasers, not just non-commercial residential purchases, as had been

arbitrarily limited under previous legislation. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that energy conservation and the intelligent use of our energy resources is desirable in all sectors of the economy, and not just limited to individuals, but available to all corporations because energy conservation is important no matter who or how is achieving it.

Furthermore, tax exemptions were extended to thermal insulation materials consisting of triple-glazed windows, triple-glazed doors, weatherstripping, caulking materials, wood used as firewood for domestic heating and cooking. It should also be noted that there is a system in place to eliminate property tax increases, Mr. Speaker, when they arise from the installation of equipment which makes the utilization of solar energy for home heating purposes possible. The field of legislation relating to solar energy is a new one. There are many aspects which must be investigated before legislation can be enacted, Mr. Speaker. There is no solar legislation anywhere in Canada that gives the right-of-light concept legislative effect. However, some other provinces and American states have been looking at this and it's a very complex issue, Mr.

Speaker, for it involves the rights of municipalities within the provincial system and the rights of provinces within the federal system because the gist of right-to-light legislation involves building restriction budget control legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The hour being 5:30, when this subject matter next comes up, the honourable member will have eight minutes remaining.

The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the House do now adjourn and continue in Committee of Supply at 8:00 p.m.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 tomorrow morning, (Friday), but will resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 p.m. (tonight)