



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 74 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 25 MAY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 25 May, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Radisson, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to table the Forty-Fourth Annual Report of the Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Fund for the year ending December 31, 1982.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 students of Grade 11 standing from the Sisler High School. They are under the direction of Mr. Brown and Miss Thompson. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

There are 30 students of Grade 11 standing from the Joseph Wolinsky Collegiate under the direction of Miss Connor. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Brandon-Souris by-election

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. In view of the good news for Canada that emanated out of southwest Manitoba last evening; in

view of the resounding repudiation that was administered to the Trudeau Liberal Government and to the Pawley New Democratic Party Government in that election; will this Government of Manitoba now begin to get the message and start to change its financial, its economic, its social and its administrative policies to accord with what the people of Manitoba want, number one, or failing that, will it stand aside, call an election so that a government of common sense can be restored to this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there is no need to change policies. This government is providing policies and programs in relationship to its responsibility and of Manitobans, in the expectation of Manitobans. The Leader of the Opposition may wish to delight himself all that he wishes and beat his breast about the results in Brandon-Souris. The outcome is no surprise to the Leader of the Opposition that the Liberal Party would have dropped from second position to third position in Brandon-Souris, and for the New Democratic Party to move from third position to second position in Brandon-Souris.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I should add and I trust a little bit more, that in jest, if the same trend took place throughout Canada, the Liberal Party would end up being the third party in Canada.

A MEMBER: You're the third party in the country, Howard.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister, arriving out of his response, thereby giving corroboration to my statement that his government needs to change course financially because it doesn't understand figures, does the First Minister and his party take solace from the fact that it ran second in Brandon-Souris last night, but lost 5 percent of the popular vote in so doing? Does it take solace in that fact that it's now reduced to about 20 percent of the support in Brandon-Souris Constituency, whereas in the last federal election it had 25 percent?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, not at all. Insofar as the results are concerned in Brandon-Souris, they don't particularly come as a surprise to anyone that's been following the Gallup polls across Canada. Probably because the Conservative Party is leaderless these days, probably because it has no leader federally, it may very well be that the Conservative Party is enjoying some uplift. I think after June 10, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party may be in some deep trouble. The only people that are going to rescue the Conservative Party in Canada after June 10th when they elect their new leader will be the Liberal Government in Ottawa,

that has been doing a pretty inept job of managing the affairs of Canadians.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to make any suggestion that would cause unrest amongst the First Minister and his doughty band of followers. Given his concern about the leadership of the National Conservative Party, would he not agree that if the fortunes of the National Conservative Party have improved without a leader, would there not be room for that kind of consideration in his own party before it plummets out of sight in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that reminds me of a quotation by Mark Twain. When Mark Twain read an obituary of his death when he remarked, "It seems to me that reports of my death are extremely premature." I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition might want to await the results of the next federal election.

I do want to undertake a serious message at this time. New Democrats are patient and will continue to attempt their job of communicating with Manitobans and with Canadians; that the back-and-forth routine from left foot to back foot, right foot to left foot and back again; that from the Liberal Party to the Conservative Party, to one party that continues to support the high interest rate, tight money kind of policies at the federal level that we've had, resulting in its defeat - Clark; the re-election of a Liberal Government which continued those same kind of policies. Mr. Speaker, the choice between tweedledee and tweedledum at the federal level is pretty well an irrelevant matter. I hope at some point, Mr. Speaker, Canadians - I believe that point will be arriving - will decisively indicate that they want a change from tweedledee and tweedledum, and from a left leg and a right leg, but want a real positive alternative in dealing with the problems of Canadian affairs.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a further query to the First Minister.

In view of the fact that he was reported as making a speech to the Ukrainian Professional Business Federation on Saturday, the effect of which, Sir, was to sing the song "Happy Days are Here Again," would he now confess, Sir, that the results in Brandon-Souris are one example, one augury of those happy days; and No. 2, would he now begin to understand that the policies which lead him to say happy days are here again are the very ones that he, and his party, said would not work in Canada without the Conservatives or anybody else defending them. Is he now taking the same position, Mr. Speaker, that all socialists tend to take, that you can spend, spend, spend, spend you way out of problems, and that interest rates won't reflect that kind of profligate government because, if he does, then Manitoba is in even worse shape, I suggest to him, than it is?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, you would be thinking that we were talking about a by-election in Winnipeg, North Centre, Winnipeg North, that it's one Conservative. It seems to me that honourable members across the way, Conservative members, are grasping

at some straw. Here is Brandon-Souris, a constituency represented by the Conservative Party of Canada for some 31 years, the former member winning percentage majorities of anywhere from 50 percent to 60 percent.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with the context of the Leader of the Opposition's question, pertaining to the economic situation, as same affects Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, there are positive factors insofar as the Manitoba economic climate are concerned. Manitoba, comparatively speaking to other parts of Canada, is making headway again, Mr. Speaker. There are numerous such factors that Conservative members across the way might be interested in analyzing and digesting, and I am sure it will cause them some pleasure to know that there is some degree of improvement. But, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend, and I am rather surprised that the Leader of the Opposition is interpreting those remarks to indicate that Liberal Party policies in Ottawa have now succeeded.

Mr. Speaker, what the Leader of the Opposition indeed has done, unwittingly, is acknowledge freely and openly in this Chamber that Conservative policies are Liberal policies; and Liberal policies are Conservative policies, although there are 2 million unemployed in Canada as a whole.

Unemployment Rate

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would the First Minister then mind synthesizing and reducing to a common denominator that all of us in this House, and all of the people of Manitoba can understand, but particularly the 52,000 unemployed people in Manitoba today, when he tries to buffalo the people of Manitoba and give us the bogus hope that under his government things are going to get any better at all?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I know that the Leader of the Opposition wants to spread his cloud of doom and gloom throughout the province; I know that the Leader of the Opposition wants to continue thinking in negative terms rather than positive terms, in respect to those hard-working Manitobans that have combined together to turn around the economic affairs of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the statistics demonstrate for themselves, Manitoba has moved from the third lowest unemployment rate in the country to the second lowest unemployment rate. Manitoba has the second best retention rate insofar as job retention in Canada of all provinces, bested only by the Province of Saskatchewan and insofar as population growth, Mr. Speaker, for the first time - well, the best record in some 10 years by way of population growth.

Mr. Speaker, this is — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is, and we have indicated . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is cold consolation insofar as the 52,000 Manitobans are concerned that

are unemployed. We acknowledge that, Mr. Speaker, and that is why there is a need for a change insofar as the slipping back and forth of tweedledee and tweedledum insofar as the policies that have influenced Federal Governments over the last 10 years in Canada.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, because of the First Minister's fixation with the terms tweedledee and tweedledum, trying to suggest that an NDP Government in Canada would really help things, would he not agree that moving from tweedledum to tweedle-dumber really wouldn't help any of the unemployed in Canada?

A MEMBER: That's why you're trying to get rid of Joe Clark.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I didn't know the Leader of the Opposition was seeking the leadership of the Conservative Party. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for making the announcement in this Chamber.

Manitoba-manufactured products - sale of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. I wonder if the Minister can confirm that shipments of Manitoba-manufactured products are down 6.6 percent this year and manufacturing investment predicted by Statistics Canada is to be down 39.5 percent this year. I wonder if the Minister of Economic Development can tell us what kind of happy days those are in the Province of Manitoba and when those happy days are going to be here again when there was manufacturing investment in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I can of course confirm those statistics and they're certainly not ones from which we take comfort. Right across the country the manufacturing industries are only operating at 60 percent of their capacity. The recession that has, not only hit Canada, but the entire world, has had a tremendous impact on people's ability to purchase manufactured goods, and it's only going to be with the return to better liquidity and increased trade in the global level that our manufacturing industry is going to be able to move up.

There's also a change in the type of manufacturing that's going to be able to survive in Canada and in the United States with the shift of a great deal of that sector of the economy to developing countries, and it's with that in mind that we've taken on the initiatives of putting in increased assistance to people to convert to the better technologies, to train people so they are ready for the new emerging industries, and to start moving on things like Venture Capital and Buy Manitoba so that, in fact, we can build the newer type of industry that is going to provide the jobs of the future.

Western Power Grid

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's refreshing to have a Minister stand up in this House and give the facts as they are. The Minister admitted that the statistics are down and they are correct; that's more than the First Minister has ever done.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism is the report that was released in Edmonton regarding the Western Power Grid stated, "The Western Power Grid would have significantly boosted investment and job creation in Manitoba." Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could tell us what she is doing to impress upon the rest of her caucus, the Minister of Energy, the First Minister, to do something to replace that investment that we would have had in Manitoba which would have helped create other investment.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it's very tempting to think that the existence of a hydro-electric project would provide the kind of jobs and long-term sounder economic structure that we in this province desire. It would, Mr. Speaker, no doubt have given a temporary impetus to jobs in the province and, in fact, when we entered into negotiations with the Western provinces, we were very willing to come to a mutually satisfactory agreement; but not, Mr. Speaker, at any price, because you have to look at the agreements that we enter into and sales development of our hydro-electricity for the long-run. It wouldn't be much of an achievement to get a short-term sale, Mr. Speaker, and to suffer long-term disadvantage when we might find, 20 years down the road, that the very terms we had agreed to were putting us at a disadvantage.

Mr. Speaker, it's important, if we're going to build a sound economy here, that we also have a sense of our own needs and our own long-term needs. The areas in which the jobs of the future are going to occur are going to be increasingly in the higher technology manufacturing areas and in the emerging service-sector industries. Along with that, improving the productivity of our basic primary sector and improving the capacity of our Crown corporations not only to function well within the province, but to export their services and their materials, I think is a general, sound approach that the Province of Manitoba is adopting at this very difficult economic time.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my last question to the Minister is this: It's very surprising that the Minister would suggest that the Power Grid would not be long-term jobs, when the report that was issued states emphatically that there would be 50,200 man years of work in Manitoba if the Power Grid were gone ahead with, and \$1.17 billion of investment would be in the Province of Manitoba, or income would be available to the Province of Manitoba. Is the Minister really saying to this House that expansion of our great Hydro heritage in this province is not long-term jobs which are desirable for the Province of Manitoba's benefit?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous impact in the job side and the general impetus to the economy, under the construction phase of a hydro-electric installation, but in the longer run

there has to be an adequate market for that power, and there has to be some attention paid to the long-term energy interests of Manitoba. There are short-term gains that when projected over a longer period do not necessarily bring a fair proportion of benefit to the province. It was that kind of calculation that led us to adopt the range of options within which it made sense for Manitoba to enter into that kind of agreement.

As the members opposite keep pointing out to members on this side, when you borrow to invest in a hydro-electric development in a Capital investment, it is not all impetus to the economy, there is a cost. Mr. Speaker, to go into a Capital investment prematurely is as foolish as not to go into it when the analysis is appropriate.

Grain shutdown - West coast

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government has backed away from their responsibility in intervening or appointment of a commissioner to settle the grain handlers dispute at Vancouver and Prince Rupert, has the Minister of Agriculture on behalf of the some 30,000 farmers in Manitoba who depend on an efficient grain transportation and handling system that is working day by day to generate the revenues in extremely difficult times, has the Minister of Agriculture communicated to the Federal Government telling him, on behalf of the farmers, that we cannot tolerate a grain shutdown at the west coast again, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the honourable member that in light of the prices that farmers are facing on the international market of grain, we would be very concerned that there would be a shutdown in any dispute, in the handling of grain.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I am advised, negotiations are continuing. The reports are that bargaining is going on and we are hopeful that the two parties will reach an agreement. The reports that we do have is that on one side, there will be no strike as reported in the media on behalf of the union, however, that's not to say that there may be a lockout on the other. Hopefully the two parties will get together and resolve the issue, so that grain movement can continue.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture has not communicated with the Federal Government, and in view of the fact that the Federal Government have backed out of their responsibility of intervening with a commission or an arbitrator, why, Mr. Speaker, is this Minister standing here today trying to baffle the farm community, when in fact he has done nothing to resolve and help encourage the Federal Government to resolve grain handling disputes?

Will he now after our urging, Mr. Speaker, communicate to the Federal Government that the

economy of Western Canada, the farm community, cannot withstand a grain shutdown and will he take action to request that the dispute be resolved immediately?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I could tell the honourable member that, first of all, I don't want to cause a dispute that is not there. There is bargaining going on. I've indicated that we would be very concerned if there would be a stoppage, Mr. Speaker. I am in Ottawa tomorrow and I intend to, amongst other matters, raise this matter with the Federal Minister of Agriculture so that the message can be taken to his counterparts.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is now confirming that he has done absolutely nothing to encourage the movement of grain which is badly needed for the western prairie grain economy. Will the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, immediately contact the farmers' co-ops, the United Grain Growers, the Pools, to see if they are satisfied with the current situation? Can he confirm, Mr. Speaker, that one of the officials of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool said it was dropped on them like a bombshell, that this in fact was happening and the Federal Government were not working to resolve it? Is not part of that bombshell and would he not confirm that he's part of that bombshell that has been dropped on the farmers, and is in fact discouraging them, Mr. Speaker, from the New Democratic Party helping to resolve what has been a long traditional problem and that is, labour disputes in the grain transportation issue?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that in Canada the disputes in the grains industry have not been — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, obviously the member has all the answers. We on this side, would want to see everything possible done to prevent any disputes, which means, Mr. Speaker, in the free and open collective bargaining system that two parties sit down and work out their disagreements. Mr. Speaker, I can go by the — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the members don't want an answer to the question because they keep piping up.

Mr. Speaker, I intend, as I've indicated, to raise personally that issue in Ottawa tomorrow when I am there. I believe that the responsibility in the national sense lies with the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. We from the Province of Manitoba will do what we can in order to deal with the situation, although it is out of our hands. We certainly will make our views known.

Main Street Manitoba Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if the Minister can advise the House today, whether or not he has been able to get Cabinet approval for the latest application from the Town of Swan River under the Main Street Manitoba Program.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to make a formal announcement tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: But it's always been my policy to give facts when questions have been posed to me. I can advise the honourable member that we have approved, in principle, two major projects, one for Swan River and one for Flin Flon.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. ADAM: I will be making, as I said just a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, I will be making formal announcements tomorrow and issuing a press release on the definition of the two programs. I've already phoned in advance, to the Mayors just to let them know. We will also be making announcements in Swan River and Flin Flon tomorrow as well.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I thank the Minister for his answer. He indicated that he has approved, in principle, the application from the Town of Swan River. What other requirements would be required from the town in order for them to proceed with their project?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I announced, just to the first question, that I would be making a formal announcement tomorrow but, while I am on my feet, I want to congratulate the Municipalities of Swan River and Flin Flon, and the business people who have co-operated together to come up with what I think are two very fine projects.

Winterkill - Alfalfa

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Based on the many calls that his department has received and the many calls that myself and my colleagues have received on the severe winterkill of alfalfa in the Province of Manitoba, could the Minister indicate whether his department is surveying the farmers to see exactly how dramatic is the situation regarding the winterkill of alfalfa?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the department did anticipate that there might be some winterkill and that inspections should be going on. There is no doubt that our staff are receiving calls and are surveying farmers

independently to see that there is ample supplies of seed available within the province, and there is, because seed prices and quantity of grass seed have been low in the last year, and to make sure that there is ample seed available for the reseeding of such fields. To indicate whether a specific survey is being undertaken; no, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is an all out survey to survey the winterkill, but certainly, from the discussion that staff have had in the field, it has varied from area to area, but that was anticipated with the rains and the wetness and the freezing of the wetness last fall and through the winter.

Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Due to the fact that grass seeds that would be planted this Spring, but not obviously the development time to give any hay crop at all, and based on my information that I believe there are thousands of acres that have been ploughed down of winterkilled alfalfa, is the Minister prepared to establish an emergency program to ensure feed supplies for the beef and dairy herds of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that Manitoba Crop Insurance has begun setting, on a federal-provincial basis, setting into motion an insurance program to deal with hay supplies and they're proceeding on a limited basis in that way. Once the extent of the losses are known we will be in a better position to deal with the question. The honourable member should be aware that, in terms of the Support Program under Manitoba Plan for Beef, there is a cost calculation dealing with feed supplies and feed supplies would be covered as part of the stability in price for beef that farmers are receiving under that program.

Studded tires - removal date

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. At the present time the regulations governing The Highway Traffic Act require that studded tires be removed from all motor vehicles by April 30th; in view of the fact that there were a number of snowstorms earlier this month, particularly in the northern part of the province; and in view of the fact that such snowstorms are normal occurrences in the early part of May, I was wondering if the Minister would consider changing the date requirement for the removal of such studded tires?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem that the member poses, of course, is one that there is no simple solution to, in that people travel from north to south and south to north and, therefore, it is awkward to have a date that is suitable for all climate regions within the province. I have to assume that the date that we have is the most adequate date, and obviously must

be a compromise date. Perhaps the member is arguing for a northern consideration. I don't know how that would be implemented, given the fact that people move in both directions on a year-round basis.

MR. S. ASHTON: Well, in view of the fact that there is a distinct difference between the climate of the northern part of the province and the southern part, particularly at this time of the year, as evidenced by the fact that it was 20 degrees in Winnipeg last week and -1 in Thompson. I was wondering if the Minister might, perhaps, consider making such an allowance for the northern part of the province where the use of studded tires would be greatly appreciated for at least the first two weeks of May.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I know that the member is asking a question most sincerely. I do raise the problem with enforcement. How would we know whether those vehicles are travelling south of the 53rd, if you like, at any given period during the period of exemption for the North. I don't know whether that is an enforceable suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

Release of non-violent offenders

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, my question is to the Honourable First Minister. In light of the news report that the Solicitor General Robert Kaplan recently asked the Parole Board to release more non-violent offenders to cut prison costs and reduce overcrowding, can the Minister inform the House if persons jailed for rape are being released under this policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a question, of course, that involves federal jurisdiction and would be more appropriately asked within the federal jurisdiction.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well, Mr. Speaker, since the people being released will be on Manitoba streets and would involve Manitobans, I would like to ask the Minister then if he would assure the women of Manitoba and their families that he or the Attorney-General will make representation to the Solicitor General to make sure that rapists are not released under this early release program, that rape is an act of violence.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly if there is any legitimate concern, it will be brought to the attention of the Solicitor General by the Attorney-General.

Again, I emphasize to the honourable member that this is a federal matter, a matter which appropriately falls within the jurisdiction of the Solicitor General of Canada, and questions really should be raised in this respect in the Federal House. If there is a particular problem, then the Attorney-General certainly would not be hesitant if there are matters of concern to Manitobans in bringing those matters to the attention of the Solicitor General.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, again to the First Minister. Although this may be a federal matter, this

affects all women and it certainly affects the women in Manitoba. My question is, will they bring this to the attention of the Solicitor General and make sure that this policy is being followed, that rape is an act of violence, that they will not be released in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it is quite clear that the period of questions is to get some information and you're not requested to ask information about another government. There is a means to do exactly what the honourable member wants to do, it's to bring a private member's resolution and then that could be debated in the House, but not during the question period, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain to the same point.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Health should be aware, of course, that the enforcement of the Criminal Code is in the hands of the province, that the Provincial Government expresses concern about many items that fall within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government such as the Crow rate question, they're prepared to hold legislative hearings. In this case, the First Minister is not prepared to take some action, some relatively simple action being requested to protect the women of Manitoba from a program which might place them in jeopardy.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I guess because of the noise across the way which is quite persistent, in fact, it makes it quite difficult for us on this side to sometimes hear the questions from honourable members across the way. The House Leader of the Conservative Party did not hear me make my reference to the fact that I will discuss this matter with the Attorney-General, and since a concern has been raised, to invite the Attorney-General to advise me as to whether or not the matter ought to be raised with the Solicitor General of Canada.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health raised a point of order and I was speaking to the point of order.

Children's Aid Society - board members

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services and I would ask him whether the services of his office are being extended to the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg or whether there has been any request from CAS Winnipeg for the services of his office to help the society deal with and cope with the current situation relative to Native membership within its ranks on its board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I can advise the honourable member and members of the House that I had a very excellent meeting with the incoming president-appoint and the outgoing president, Mr. Vopnfjord, some days ago to discuss some of the concerns that we share mutually and I can also advise him my staff has worked very, very closely and are continuing to work very, very closely with key officers of the CAS Board of Directors, CAS Winnipeg, and we are very cognizant of some of the problems that are facing the child and family delivery service in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's information but perhaps I can be a little more blunt in my question and ask him whether, in fact, the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg is in the process of being destroyed by elements who are determined to discredit it, to vacate it, to leave it looking bloodied and battered in the eyes of the community and therefore reduce its legitimacy as an agency for child caring.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows, as I do, the various problems that we've had, not just the past year but for some years. There are various problems in the delivery system that have been present not only in Winnipeg, I might say, but in other areas of the province. It is our hope and intention and I'm hoping that within not too many days, maybe a week or so, that we will be able to bring forward a plan of co-operation with the Children's Aid Society, with Indian organizations and with other organizations to evolve into a system that may be acceptable and may prove to be, I think, acceptable certainly to people who are now delivering the service and, indeed, acceptable to those people who are now critical of the existing organization.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with the children who are in the care of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg at the present time and their status, and whether the Minister's office is intervening to ensure that they're receiving the kind of attention and compassion and the care that they deserve or whether they're just being left to twist slowly in the wind - to use a phrase that's been used in equally ugly situations in the past, not necessarily related to the Children's Aid Society - but are the children being looked after or are they suffering through this trauma that the Society is going through at the present time at the hands of a number of people who are perhaps unhappy with it, while many other people may be quite happy with it?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would trust that there are no children who are being hurt by the process. The staff are in place, the organization is in place and, as the member knows from his past experience as Minister, if there are any particular problems or special problems, those are dealt with by the Child Welfare Directorate. We do have a very excellent Child Welfare Directorate and they are very much on top of the situation with regard to Winnipeg or, indeed, with regard to any child and family service agency in the Province of Manitoba. Nothing has been drawn to my attention of any extraordinary fashion in the last week or two.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: I have some committee changes, Mr. Speaker. The Standing Committee on Agriculture, the Member for Burrows will replace the Member for The Pas. Economic Development, the Member for Osborne, the substitute will be the Member for Burrows for one day; and the Member for Elmwood will be substituting for the Member for Thompson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Acting Government House Leader. Order please.

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Member for Riel changed a member on the committee for one day. It's my understanding that when you make a committee change, you make a membership change and that stands until it's changed back again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain is correct.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, would you please call No. 55?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 55 - THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 55, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell has 37 minutes remaining.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I spoke very briefly on this bill some few days ago and expressed certain concerns and anxieties about the legislation coming in at this time, when the province is in a deficit position and certainly in no position to go out and borrow money to pass these kinds of changes to The Legislative Assembly Act, Mr. Speaker, because after all, the burden for the costs that are involved in this bill are to be borne by the taxpayers of this province.

I don't see any great haste as a member that's been here for some years in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, for these kinds of changes at this time. In fact, I have never yet in my years in the Legislature, had my constituents or organizations coming to my desk or to my home and ask me to set up an office, of all things. I seem to be able to handle it quite well; I'm here Monday to Friday and I go home on the weekends and we get along quite well, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing that I raised the other day, Mr. Speaker, I said I believe that, as the Member for Virden has said, let's put this thing on the election platform for the next election and let the people decide. Let the

people decide if we need to spend these kinds of dollars and the NDP can put it on their programs that they're for these kind of changes, and we will put it on our election programs and say we don't feel that it's timely to have this kind of change, especially when the province is in a deficit position and has to borrow the money to implement these changes.

So I offer that alternative to the Attorney-General or I offer him the chance to come out and talk to the people in my constituency to see if they feel these changes are needed, and I don't think they are, Mr. Speaker. I think we've got a lot more jobs we can do in this province rather than bring this kind of legislation before the people at this time. We, first of all, should maybe deal with the 52,000 people who are unemployed and spend some bucks there and put some of those people to work, rather than bringing in this kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Attorney-General has really gone out and polled the people in this province as to what they think about this kind of legislation. Or does he understand how popular politicians are in this country today? I suspect that the politicians across this country today, on the popularity scale, are about the lowest of the low and the reasons are many. I don't have to stand here this afternoon and espouse the reasons, but this type of legislation, coming before the people at this time, in deep recession of this province, and asking for the taxpayers to put up more money to prop us guys up and give us constituency offices so we can have flashing lights out in front of our offices and big signs to get elected, I think is called for, untimely, and it doesn't deserve the attention of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Attorney-General very quietly if he'd put this Bill No. 55 on the shelf until the deficit position of the province has improved or until at least we can pay our bills, and then the Government of the Day maybe can take a look and ask the people, maybe we do deserve these changes. But, Mr. Speaker, I can't, for the life of me, see any reason or need. Do you mean to tell me we have to crank out this kind of garbage, propaganda, at the expense of the taxpayers as a result of this legislation? Absolute garbage.

"A Clear Choice for Manitobans", policies of the New Democratic Party, where they made all these promises and pledged almost everything under the sun. Here's the First Minister's picture and his signature; it's absolutely worthless and yet to charge that back through this legislation, to the people of this province, Mr. Speaker. Or some of the other stuff, Mr. Speaker. Here's one that came out the other day from the NDP propaganda machine, now where they're out collecting money and it's a strange thing, this pledge for money, "Great People in the Future." It's printed, or it's mailed out of Scarborough, Ontario. Now why would their plea for money - I thought they were all Manitobans, these members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that were sitting across and out pledging or asking for the people of this province. It's got NDP, Broadway Avenue, Winnipeg up here but it was postal stamp is Scarborough, Ontario.

Are we to ask the taxpayers of this province to crank out more and more of that kind of shady, uncalled-for pleas for money? Why was it printed in Scarborough or why was it mailed in Scarborough? Have we got no post offices in Winnipeg or across rural Manitoba? But there it is, Scarborough, Ontario. Is that fair to ask the

taxpayers, the people of this province, to help a political party go out and collect money using that kind of stuff, Mr. Speaker? I suspect not.

Mr. Speaker, we look at other things in this bill here, the matter of trips and I don't know if anybody's made more trips back and forth from my constituency to this Legislature than myself. I don't think the Member for Swan River has, because he hasn't been here as long as I have. Has the Attorney-General had any pleas from me Mr. Speaker, that I feel I shouldn't pay a few trips from out of my own pocket? Has the Attorney-General heard any quarrels from me what an honour it is to sit in this House and be able to have to spend some of my own dollars to represent the people of Roblin-Russell Constituency? No, Mr. Speaker, that's not what I'm here for. It's an honour and it's a privilege and one of the greatest things in life to be elected, to come here, and sit in this place and be part and parcel of the law-making process in this province. But for us to come back and milk the public on every issue - now we have offices, signs, secretaries, the whole caboodle. Mr. Speaker, I'm not buying it. I'm not buying it and I don't think the people in Roblin-Russell Constituency would buy it. I would ask the Attorney-General to come and accompany me and I'll cross my constituency with him and make him acquainted with most of the people I can, and I know nearly all of them, and ask him what they think of about it. I think the members opposite know the answer they'll get. I'm certain the Member for Lac du Bonnet knows the answer they'll get. They'll say, look, McKenzie, you and the Attorney-General go back to the Legislature and look after the province. Don't come out here begging us for more money for offices and more pencils and more trips and more dollars out of our pockets. That's what they'll say and I don't think there's a member in this House that will disagree with me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. ANSTETT: I'll disagree with you.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, the Member for Springfield says he will disagree. That's his luxury. I will take the Member for Springfield through my constituency and take this bill with him and see what they'll tell him. They'll tell him the same thing that they are telling me and they will tell him or the Attorney-General, go back to the Legislature and look after the unemployed people in this province; look after the economy in this province; look after the deficit of this province and get this ship back on the rails again where it used to be, rather than bringing this kind of garbage in at this particular time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't want any retroactive legislation such as this crossing my desk when this province is in deficit position such as it is in today. I'm violently opposed to it; I will not support it; and I think it's absolutely untimely for this government, facing all the problems they're facing today, and their lack of dollars, their lack of initiative, their lack of programs to bring this in for us to go back and say to the taxpayers, give those politicians more money; give them more signs; give them more pencils; give them more mileage for their cars; put more bucks in their jobs they're doing a good time. Mr. Speaker, we are not doing a good job in this province; this government's not doing a good job in this province. I would suggest

to the Attorney-General that he put this legislation back on the shelf until the province can afford this, and then maybe we should take a look at it. I think it's untimely; I think it's uncalled for and I hope that the Attorney-General, before it gets to third reading, that he will pull this bill and set it aside till another time, till the province and the people can afford it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Would you permit a question?

MR. W. McKENZIE: Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Member for Roblin-Russell. The Member for Roblin-Russell suggested that no changes should be made with respect to member's services while there's a deficit on the provincial books. I'm wondering if he can confirm for me that the salaries of Cabinet Ministers and MLAs were dramatically increased in 1980, under the administration of which he was a member, while there was a deficit on the province's books?

MR. W. McKENZIE: That was a commission that was set up, Mr. Speaker, to examine. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can check. I can tell the honourable member if he wants further, the province wasn't in a deficit position in those days as it is today, where it's \$579 million, Mr. Speaker. There was a committee set up to study the matter at that time. I have no quarrels with that committee; the House adopted it and I'll live by it.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Will the Member for Roblin-Russell then confirm that the report of the whole commission, to which he referred, was tabled in this House; was changed into legislation in the form of amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act; and that he voted for those amendments and those increases when he was a member of the previous government?

MR. W. McKENZIE: The vote of the House on that occasion was unanimous, as I recall it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to this bill I must say that I'm somewhat disappointed that I have to follow the previous speaker. I found his remarks to be rambling and rather ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, and I, therefore, won't be commenting on those.

I will, however, attempt to comment on some of the comments made by the Member for Virden previously, and some of the general comments one, I'm sure, we'll hear from members opposite about this particular bill.

First of all, to refute a number of the basic arguments as I see them which the members opposite have been putting up in regard to this bill. One of the arguments thus far, Mr. Speaker, is that it is a bill that benefits members in terms of their own particular situation

personally. Some members have described it as a greed bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not true; it is not true at all. If one looks at what the bill does, Mr. Speaker, one will find that it certainly does improve the ability of members of this House to service their constituents; there is no doubt about that.

In terms of the impact on the situation of the individual member, Mr. Speaker, it will mean actually that individual member will have less take-home pay. One of the changes, Mr. Speaker, which requires that future expenditures under the constituency allowance provision be made accountable, rather than the present system where they are merely added to the member's paycheque. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that an argument could be made that members opposite are the ones who are being greedy; they don't want to lose that constituency allowance on their paycheque, Mr. Speaker.

I could go further and say that they're really concerned about the loss of that because they're not spending it in their constituencies, Mr. Speaker; that they are pocketing that money and that it is, in effect, take-home pay. I could suggest that, Mr. Speaker, but I would think that would be somewhat lower than the level of debate that one would expect in this House. However, in suggesting one potential argument against what those members opposite are saying, I would hope that they would reconsider their statements about this being somehow a matter of personal gain to members of this House, because clearly that is not the case, Mr. Speaker; it is clearly not the case.

It is similarly not the case, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will result in a huge increase in cost to the province. A number of these measures, Mr. Speaker, will not necessarily result in a major increase, they may not result in any increase whatsoever. I just referred a minute ago to the constituency allowance. At the present time a \$1,500 constituency allowance is paid to all members; it is not an accountable constituency allowance. The change in the bill would make that an accountable \$2,500 allowance. Now I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that before members suggest that there is going to be a cost increase from this change, that they look at the situation of members in this House.

I would suggest that a significant number of members will not spend the entire \$2,500.00. I will go further, Mr. Speaker, I will suggest that many members will not even spend the \$1,500, which they are presently receiving, in their constituencies. Any dollar spent less than \$1,500 by a member is going to be a saving which will balance out the additional expenditure for those members who do spend that money, Mr. Speaker. If one looks at the basic reason for the bill I think that's only fair. If a member is pocketing that money right now, I'm not going to criticize that member because that is the way the system is set up, however, he or she is clearly not using that money for servicing his or her constituency, and that is the purpose of that allowance. By making it accountable it allows for it. It also allows for the fact that there are different levels of services, different levels of expenditures for those services in different constituencies, Mr. Speaker, and this is a point that I will get to later. That's one particular item. Members opposite I'm sure will say well there are other items which will definitely result in an increase in expenditures; the travel allowance for example.

Are we really to accept that as being a consistent argument from those members opposite, Mr. Speaker? Are they really saying that they are concerned about the cost of this overall bill, that they are against any and all cost increases? No, Mr. Speaker, they're not saying that; they're quite happy getting up and saying, well, we think there should be more secretarial services. A number of members have, in this House, on the record said that, and others have supported that proposal, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, one of the impacts of this bill is it would do just that, it would increase the number of secretaries from three to four for the caucus of the members opposite. Is that not an expenditure? Is that not a cost increase? Clearly, Mr. Speaker, it is. For members opposite to say that they're against any increase in costs and then to, on the other hand, say well, if it's the situation of secretarial allowance, it's different, that is clearly hypocritical, Mr. Speaker; it is not consistent. For members to get up in this House, as a number have done already, and say we're against this bill because it results in increase in costs is clearly an invalid argument. I would suggest they think it through, Mr. Speaker, think through their own position on this bill.

Well let's get to the facts about what this particular bill would accomplish, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of changes which would result from it; one which I feel is very important is the change in regard to the travel allowance which would change the system that we have at the present time which allows for 26 trips a year, during the Session of the Legislature, to 40 trips over the calendar year.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely imperative if members of this House are to serve their constituents, and I say that as a member who has to travel perhaps the furthest - there are a number of my colleagues who also travel a considerable distance - but perhaps the furthest of any members in this House. I can tell them, as a member, that I have many commitments in the city when the Legislature is out of Session. These are commitments, Mr. Speaker, which are not personal commitments. They are government commitments; attending government caucus meetings, taking care of government business on various occasions. I'm doing what I was elected to do, Mr. Speaker. I'm representing my constituents when I do that. And is there any allowance for that under the existing legislation? Well, no, Mr. Speaker, there is no allowance for that.

I can tell you how I made allowance for it personally. I took the bus; 10 hours on the bus down and 10 hours on the bus back. Many times I took the overnight bus down here, I attended a meeting and I took the overnight bus back. What was the reaction of my constituents to that? Many of them saw me on the bus; many of them who would never even go near the bus were amazed, Mr. Speaker, at the fact that an elected representative would have to spend 10 hours on the bus there and 10 hours on the bus back. I said, Mr. Speaker, that is the way the system is set up at the present time. I don't really mind it that much, other than the fact that it's a considerable waste of time; that 20 hours on the return trip that I've spent on the bus I could have spent doing something else in representing my constituents in some way, Mr. Speaker, either in Winnipeg or in Thompson.

Their reaction, Mr. Speaker, was that system should be changed; it's ridiculous. There was another reason why they said that too, Mr. Speaker, and that was because the previous member who was a member of cabinet, who had to attend a considerable number of government meetings in Winnipeg over the same distance, didn't have that problem. That previous member charged it to his department. It was government business, Mr. Speaker. Whether he was attending the same kind of meeting as I was attending or attending some other kind of meetings, it was always government business; it was always charged to the government.

There are members sitting in this House now who did the same thing, Mr. Speaker. I note, for example, the Member for Swan River, the number of plane trips he took while Minister, a considerable number of which were to his constituency. I don't criticize him for that. I do not criticize the previous member for the constituency of Thompson for that, Mr. Speaker. However, I say that we have to look at the present system. We have to recognize that there are serious gaps, Mr. Speaker; that those gaps are a major problem for the members. They affect that member's ability to service his or her constituency, and that we should look at a change such as this which makes it equal across the board, Mr. Speaker. It means that I have the same opportunity to attend a government meeting in Winnipeg as did the Member for Swan River when he was in government, as did his former colleague, the Member for Thompson, then the Minister of Labour when he was in government, and as do my colleagues in the Treasury Bench, Mr. Speaker, at the present time who have the same options available to them.

That is one of the changes, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite can call it greed if they want. They can say all they want about taking it back to their constituencies and saying what a bad bill this is, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm quite happy to go back to my constituency and say this bill would allow me to attend government business in Winnipeg more readily; it would allow me to spend that former 20 hours that I spent on the bus to service you in the constituency of Thompson; what do you think about it.

I will accept their verdict, Mr. Speaker. I will say, though, that in talking to many of them about a matter very similar to this, that they are quite pleased to see that provision made, that travel provision. They recognize that, particularly, when it comes to representatives from northern constituencies such as Thompson, that some allowance has to be made because that's really another root of this particular bill, Mr. Speaker. It's very easy for the Member for Roblin-Russell to get up and say how he's willing to come in at his own expense from Roblin-Russell.

Well, I've got news for the member, Mr. Speaker. Thompson is not Roblin-Russell. Thompson is a considerable distance further away from Winnipeg than is Roblin-Russell. I've got news for the Member for Virden. It's a considerable distance further away from this House than is his constituency. I've got news for him, Mr. Speaker. It's 10 hours on the bus; that's the distance away. How many times do you have to drive 10 hours, I would ask the members opposite, and that is really the root cause of getting some equality, Mr. Speaker, not just between members but between

constituencies. This change would allow me, as a representative from a northern constituency, at least some semblance of equality in terms of attendance at government meetings and representation of my constituents, and I think that is only fair. That is one feature, Mr. Speaker.

Another feature of this bill is the change to the constituency allowance which I referred to previously. It would allow, Mr. Speaker, members on an accountable basis to expend money in service of their constituents in terms of printing, of hiring staff, constituency offices, whatever. That flexibility is built in, Mr. Speaker, for a very deliberate reason; that being that what may be the best way of serving my constituents, a northern constituency, a one-community constituency, obviously would not necessarily be appropriate for the Member for Rupertsland or the Member for Roblin-Russell or the Member for Virden or any other members of this House.

Each constituency is different; each constituency requires a different type of service, Mr. Speaker, and that flexibility is built in. I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there are different cost factors involved in terms of the servicing of that constituency which relates specifically to those differences, and that's another reason for having this flexibility built in; for allowing those that need to spend \$2,500 and their constituency's ability to do that; and those that don't, to spend \$1,000 or \$500.00.

Mr. Speaker, to those members who indicated they had a real concern about this particular measure, I would suggest that they demonstrate their concern by specifically doing that, by spending only \$500 or by spending nothing. If they are so concerned about the cost factor, they have a control over it in their own constituencies. They can spend zero if they want. I would suggest to them that they would not be making the right move; I would suggest to them that they would be better serving their constituents by using this particular allowance in various ways, but if they really want to be consistent to their arguments, which I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, but if they do want to be consistent, that is one way of doing it.

As I have said previously, too, Mr. Speaker, there are other changes involved which would increase the secretarial staff to the caucuses. This is a move that has been suggested by members opposite, as I have said previously, and for them now to get up and start talking about cost factor of other allowances and then to completely ignore the one thing which they really want and which really benefits them is very hypocritical, Mr. Speaker. They are saying, we don't mind spending money on servicing people in the way we want, but forget about these other things; that's costing money. I mean, that's very inconsistent to me, Mr. Speaker, very, inconsistent.

But beyond the specific arguments, I would suggest that there is a fundamental difference in approach that has been exhibited by members opposite, by members on this side, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Emerson says that is true. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, many members opposite have a different conception of the role of an MLA than do members on this side. Most members on this side, Mr. Speaker, feel that the job of an MLA is a full-time job. In some cases, our members may have some outside form of

employment, although this would, I think, be the exception rather than the rule; but even in cases in which that is the case, Mr. Speaker, those members feel that the fact that they are an MLA should require them to be providing full-time service to their constituents.

Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest are not saying that. Members opposite are saying basically, through their approach to this bill, that members of this Legislature should be part-time members, that they should come here for the sitting of the Legislature, perhaps attend some constituency functions, but then for the five or six or seven months that we are not in Session, that that should be considered a time when members go and have some other form of employment and basically wait for the next sitting of the Legislature before they really act as MLAs again, because how else can I read, Mr. Speaker, the fact that they are against expansion of the travel allowance. Implicit in their whole argument, apart from the red herring about the cost, is the fact that they feel it is not needed. Well how can they feel it is not needed, Mr. Speaker? Only if they view their having little or no role in Winnipeg, in the seat of government, during the period in which the Legislature is not in Session. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, let's hear it; let's debate that.

I disagree with that approach; I know most of my constituents would disagree with that approach, but if that is really what they're saying, rather than these red herring arguments, let's hear it. I feel it is; I feel they are saying that MLAs should be part-time; that they shouldn't have to attend government meetings during the out-of-session period and, if they do attend such meetings, Mr. Speaker, they should be somehow optional, there should be no allowance built in for any cost incurred for attendance at those meetings.

They're saying the same thing, Mr. Speaker, I feel, in terms of the constituency allowance. They are saying that \$2,500 is an extravagant figure. Well perhaps they should compare the amount of constituency service that we can provide under existing legislation, and even under a proposed legislation, to the constituency service that can be provided by other elected representatives in Canada. I'm not just talking about the Members of Parliament, Mr. Speaker, who can have constituency offices, unlimited mail outs; who can have, I believe, four or five staff people. I am talking about MLAs in other provinces. If one looks at other provinces, Mr. Speaker, one will find that many of them do have an allowance built in for constituency offices. We're surrounded on both our borders, with Saskatchewan and Ontario, just to start with, they both have provision for constituency officer and that provision, Mr. Speaker, stems from the recognition that MLAs have a role outside of this Chamber, or outside of their respective Chambers. That provision stems from the recognition that Members of the Legislature have a significant role in helping their constituents with problems, and helping their constituents receive answers to enquiries, Mr. Speaker, about government programs, and helping them as their own local ombudsman, if you like. That recognition is there in other provinces.

What this bill does, Mr. Speaker, I think is reinforce that recognition here in Manitoba. For that reason, I think it's a very welcomed move, Mr. Speaker. I think the fact that members opposite disagree with that is

indication they do not feel that members should be out there servicing their constituents in-between elections. They do not feel that their members should be servicing constituents, even when they're in Session, because this provision would help them do that.

I could continue with some of the other features, Mr. Speaker, but I believe on each and every case you will see a distinct difference when they approach members from this side of the House and members opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I wish members opposite would be a little more courageous in expressing that view. I wish they would they would get up and say, yes, I feel that the position of an MLA should be a part-time job; that I should come here for the sitting of the Legislature then go to some other form of employment and that's it; I do not believe there should be constituency services, and I do not believe there should be constituency offices or any travel allowances in-between Legislative Sessions. I wish they would have the courage to say that, Mr. Speaker. I know, however, that they won't, and there's a very good reason for that, Mr. Speaker. That is, because if they do get up and say that they will get a very negative reaction, I think, not just from members on this side of the House, but from many of their constituents.

A MEMBER: That's for sure.

MR. S. ASHTON: I have found, Mr. Speaker, in talking to my constituents, that they, not only hope that their members will be full-time members of the Legislature, they expect it. I receive phone calls at home from 8 o'clock in the morning until 12:30 at night, Mr. Speaker. What does that stem from? Does that stem from the idea that I represent people here?

A MEMBER: That is only because they know you've got a baby, the rest of us get them all hours.

MR. S. ASHTON: Does that stem, Mr. Speaker, from the fact that they feel that I should be their representative here and nowhere else; that I should come in here, after an election campaign, and represent them during the sittings of the Legislature, and that is it? Well, no, Mr. Speaker. When people phone me at home they phone me on constituency matters. They have a problem or they have a question they want answered. The expectation is that I will answer it, and I do. I am sure that members opposite will find that is the situation in their constituency. Perhaps they haven't made themselves available enough to find that out, Mr. Speaker; perhaps they haven't been accessible enough. It's very easy, I know, if an elected representative starts sending out signals that he or she does not want to be disturbed at home, or does not want to be bothered with constituency business, he or she won't get it; he or she may get a nasty surprise in the next election, but for three or four years that MLA will hear very little from their constituents.

That, I think, Mr. Speaker, is why the members opposite do not have the courage to get up and say that. The fact is, over the last 20 or 30 years in this House, things have changed dramatically. Things have changed from the days when one did come here for a six-week sitting, or a two-month sitting; one did sit

as an MLA, and one did receive a salary commensurate with a part-time position, and one did expect, as an MLA, to be a part-time MLA. Those were the days of 20 and 30 years ago, Mr. Speaker; that has been changing. There has been a recognition in terms of salaries, the fact that it is more of a full-time position. That is why, I presume, the members opposite did increase salaries of both Cabinet Ministers and MLAs when they were in government. It is because they felt, Mr. Speaker, that it was more of a full-time position and that the salaries should be commensurate with it.

It has changed, not just in this House, Mr. Speaker, through particular matters as that, but it's changed in the province, as well. I find, in my constituency, that the expectation is that MLAs will be full-time MLAs. That that MLA will be visible, that MLA will be available, that MLA will do a number of things, Mr. Speaker, outside of this House, including talking to people about their concerns, in terms of helping them out with any problems, in terms of answering any questions.

For members opposite to oppose this bill, Mr. Speaker, is basically out of tune with the changes that have taken place over the last 20 or 30 years. That is really what is involved, Mr. Speaker. I guess we should be glad on this side because it really exposes the mentality of members opposite. After all we know they are Conservatives; they like the past. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, on this bill there is no better evidence that they like living in the past. They believe that they're in the days of 20 and 30 years ago when MLAs did come here on a part-time basis and that was it. I would suggest to them, Mr. Speaker, that has changed, not only in constituencies represented by members on this side of the House, but is changed in some of their constituencies, as well, and they better be careful because, if they're not providing that level of service, if they're opposing means such as Bill 55, which would allow them to provide that service, really they're opposing the right of individual Manitobans to have a full-time MLA, to have a full-time local ombudsman, if you like. You can attach any kind of name you want to it, Mr. Speaker, but I think I've gotten my message across clearly about the kind of role that I perceive an MLA as having, and a role I think my constituents perceive of us having.

I would suggest that they look very carefully, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that they will find that there are a number of members on this side of the House who perhaps owe their election to the fact that the previous member was not a full-time MLA, was not servicing his or her constituency.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Right on.

MR. S. ASHTON: The Member for Springfield says, right on. I am sure there are other Members in this House who would feel the same way, Mr. Speaker. I might suggest that one of the reasons why it was a very close election result in Thompson in the last election was that my predecessor did have some concern about servicing his constituency, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that, but I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that really this is the bottom line of this legislation; it is not expanding travel allowances strictly, although that is part of it; it is not expanding constituency allowances,

although that is part of it; it is not expanding secretarial service, Mr. Speaker, although that is part of it. The real bottom line of this issue is whether or not Members of this Assembly are in favour of, first of all, being full-time MLAs, and second of all, of providing full-time service. I would suggest that if they are truthfully in favour of being full-time MLAs and providing full-time service that they have no option but to support this bill.

I would really suggest that, Mr. Speaker. I would also suggest that by the comments in debate thus far, by the fact that they are not in support of this bill, that they have indicated what they don't have the courage to say otherwise, and that is, the fact that they feel it is only a part-time position. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I will take this bill back to my constituency and I will justify it with my constituents. I will talk to them about it; I'm sure I'll have no problem with that. I will also take back the idea of full-time MLAs to my constituency, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure I'll have no problem with that either.

The members who have problems in this House, Mr. Speaker, are members opposite who are living in the past on this and I would suggest, on many other issues.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a fine bill; it's a step in the right direction and I think it's a bill that will receive support from the average Manitoban, support the members opposite were very surprised to see.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wants to speak at this time, I would move, seconded by the Member for Virden, that debate be adjourned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is moved by the Member for Swan River and seconded by the Member for Virden that debate on Bill 55 be adjourned.

The Member for Springfield on a point of order.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Virden has already spoken in this debate and therefore cannot second the motion for adjournment.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's correct. The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: In that case, the Member for Kirkfield Park will second it.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, would you now call Bill No. 60 please?

BILL NO. 60 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation, Bill No. 60, standing in the name of the Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand, but if any member would like to speak on it, I'm certainly in agreement.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We're dealing with an amendment to The Highway Traffic Act for the Province of Manitoba and I think perhaps it would be advisable that when we're looking at these particular amendments, we take a look at the Province of Manitoba as a whole and try and analyse the unique characteristics of Manitoba; characteristics that this province has that don't apply in any other jurisdictions that I'm aware of in the Dominion of Canada.

I refer, of course, to the concentration of population in one particular part of the province, where over half of the population of the Province of Manitoba lives in one very small, congested area in this province - in the City of Winnipeg - and the rest of the province is rather sparsely settled and the Northern areas, in particular, are areas that are quite different in character, quite different in road conditions and quite different in driving conditions than applies in other parts of the province. Yet here we are trying to pass uniform legislation that applies to all parts of the province and treats all parts of the province in the same way and but if we sit back and take a look, we realize that conditions are different in different parts of the province.

I think it's important to recognize that when you start to take a look at accidents, the types of accidents and the cause of accidents, and you will see patterns develop that are distinct according to the geographical region that you're referring to.

When you're talking about seat-belt legislation and safety, I have seen the proposals put forward by the College of Physicians and Surgeons and those people that are concerned about seat-belt legislation and automobile safety. In all of the presentations I have seen, they refer entirely to head-on and rear-end collisions. They made no presentation at all on automobile rollovers or side collisions which occur in rural Manitoba on icy roads, maybe through the loss of control and a car will skid sideways, and conditions that are vastly different than the City of Winnipeg. I'll admit that head-on and rear-end collisions occur to a far greater degree in the heavily concentrated urban area and the conditions in rural Manitoba are vastly different. But the Minister hasn't taken that into account in the bill that he has put forward here, because I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister had taken it into consideration he might have changed his rules as they apply to seat belts.

I'm not talking about helmets or child-restraint systems; I'm talking about seat belts only. I think the Minister knows rural Manitoba, rural driving habits and rural road conditions as well as any member on the opposite side of the House. He's been in this Assembly a long time; he's had a lot of experience. I respect his ability to analyze any given situation and I would suggest to the Minister that he might want to think twice about making seat-belt legislation mandatory in rural driving conditions, in a rural setting, because I would suggest

that if he went back and did a study of the accident statistics, he would find that in rural Manitoba head-on and rear-end collisions are not the major accidents. They're a minor portion of the accidents. In fact, the major cause of accidents in rural Manitoba is loss of control and that is driver error, and when you lose control on icy roads a car can roll, you can have a side collision and when you do have those, then any statistics that are available from professional people on side collisions and rollovers, do not substantiate the use of seat belts.

I received a letter from the Manitoba College of Physicians and Surgeons on seat-belt legislation. They're a group in society that are pressing for change and they have the right to write to every MLA, just as MONA has and any other group that wishes to, in society, and I received their correspondence and I replied to it. I asked them for information on rollovers and side collisions and after quite some time, I got a reply from a medical practitioner who thanked me for my concern.

He admitted that they had done no studies at all on side-impact collisions or on rollovers and in his efforts to try and provide me with statistical information, the closest survey that he could refer me to on that particular subject was a study that was done in Australia. The results of that study done in Australia - and this was dealing primarily with pelvic restraint seat belts, not the shoulder harness because, I believe, the study was done several years ago before the shoulder harness was in popular demand. The results of that study were such that they found there was considerably greater danger of thoracic and pelvic injury from the wearing of seat belts in side-impact and rollover accidents.

However, they felt that the possibility of cranial damage might be somewhat less, but they weren't sure but that study indicated there was greater danger of pelvic and thoracic injury from the wearing of seat belts than if seat belts had not been worn.

I can give the Minister some information and I'm sure every member in this Assembly can recall some incident that have occurred very close to either their own home or their own family or their own community, and I'm sure that they can find an instance that will support their own particular point of view. What I want to tell the Minister is supporting my particular point of view and I'm sure that there may be other cases that would support another point of view.

Three years ago in my little village, there were six people climbed into a car to go to a hockey match. It had just started to rain a freezing rain and something happened to the car, the accelerator stuck. They were coming to the intersection of the road and realized they couldn't stop the car and a truck was approaching. At the last second, they pushed one person out of the car; four of the people got out; two of them did not get out of the car until after impact. That car went completely under the semi-trailer truck. The top of the car was completely sheared off and the car was rolled half-a-dozen times under that truck. Now, if those people had not been able to get out of that car, chances are none of them would ever have lived. As it turned out because they were able to jump out, to bail out of that vehicle, they all survived with some scratches, but no broken bones.

That's just one case that I bring to the Minister's attention. It happens to enforce a particular argument that I am trying to put forward, that the wearing of seat belts in the heavy traffic in an urban area where there is a greater danger of head-on and rear-end collisions is probably more important than the wearing of seat belts in rural setting where there is not the heavy density of traffic and the change of head-on and rear-end collision is much diminished.

I would ask the Minister to seriously consider that particular point, because I think it's important to rural Manitoba, to the various factors that we who live in rural Manitoba must live with, the dangers that we do get from freezing rain in the winter, icy roads and the difficulties that do occur with side impact and rollovers. I know the medical evidence is not there for the advice of the Minister in dealing with seat-belt restraints in side-impact and rollovers.

I would ask the Minister to think carefully again about having a possibility of the wearing of seat belts in heavy traffic in an urban setting, as compared the light traffic that occurs on secondary rural roads. I don't know whether he has considered it. I think it's a matter that's worth the considering. I put forward the suggestion in all sincerity because I believe it is of sufficient importance to be worthy of full consideration by the Minister.

When it comes to the issue of child restraint, I look at the bill and there's a section in here that causes me some concern, and it's dealing with regulation. It says, "The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations, (a) prescribing the standards for child-restraining devices and, (b) providing for exemption from any provision of this section in respect of any type or class of motor vehicle or any class of drivers or passengers in motor vehicles."

Those regulations have to be dealt with in consideration with the particular sections in the bill that deal with the child restraints that the Minister is going to require. I'm not too sure if the Minister is insisting that supplementary equipment must be used for any child under five years, or whether or not a child under five years must have some kind of restraint, whether it be a seat belt or a child restraint system.

As far as I'm able to ascertain from the bill that is somewhat unclear. I would hope that when the Minister is giving his final summation in this bill, if he would take that matter and clarify it for members before this bill goes to committee because I think it's important.

I can tell the Minister why. This past weekend - in fact it was Monday evening - on coming back to the Legislature I brought my daughter-in-law with her two children into Winnipeg. One is a boy two, and one is a boy three. The two-year-old was in a child-restraining approved-type seat in the backseat, and the three-year-old, because there was lack of room to put a child-restraint seat in the front seat, the three-year-old sat in the front seat wearing a seat belt. He wasn't of the age of five, as the Minister is stating in here, and yet I can tell the Minister that the child sitting in the front seat with a seat belt was much more comfortable, much easier to manage, than the child that was only two and in a child-restraint seat, even though his mother was sitting beside him.

I think it's important because I can tell the Minister that I was the driver of the car and, after you have

been on the road for two or three hours, and a child is sitting in a restraint, a severe constriction on their activity, can become very restless, can express that restlessness in a rather vocal manner for a considerable length of time. I would suggest to the Minister that the action of that child made me an unsafe driver. I'm sure that if it affected me, personally, that way, it would affect other drivers the same way.

I was very tempted to pull off to the side of the road and let the child out to exercise, however, it was raining and it was raining fairly hard. That was the only thing that prevented me from stopping. We did arrive, fortunately, in Winnipeg without accident, but I know from my own personal experience that if a child-restraint device in the back seat causes problems to the child it can cause problems to the driver of the car. I don't know whether that would cause an accident or not, but I think it is of sufficient significance to be a concern to me and I hope would be a concern to others, as well.

So I'm not too sure whether the Minister wants to insist on a child-restraining seat for every child under five years of age, or whether he's going to give an option. I know that the three-year-old in a seat belt was restrained, but didn't seem to mind it near as much as the two-year-old in the child-restraint seat. Those are personal observations of my own from my own particular family. I refer it to the Minister purely for his consideration because I think it's important that we know what type of regulations he's going to be bringing forward, and I think it's important that we should know whether there's going to be an option of a seat belt or a child restraint, or whether that option is not going to be there.

The third aspect of this bill, Mr. Speaker, deals with motorcycle helmets. It's probably the section that has been most visible around this Legislative Building. I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that having talked to many of the motorcyclists; having a son who owns a motorcycle, and having once owned a motorcycle myself, that I have a great deal of empathy with their particular point of view. I know my own son on his motorcycle happens to wear a helmet most of the time, not all the time, but most of the time. I have heard the arguments put forward about the restraint on vision and the restraint on hearing, and knowing something about Manitoba and the vagaries of the weather, I can visualize the heat problem that you could have on a particularly hot day wearing one of those things.

So I think that argument is a very valid one, but I think the one that is probably as valid as any is the look at statistics. The statistics that I have seen is that Manitoba has the second lowest per thousand registered motor vehicle accidents - I'm not too sure whether it's accidents or fatalities - of any province in Canada. I think we are probably the only province in Canada that does not have helmets. So, whether or not we pass a helmet law, I think we have to look at statistics and, if Manitoba has had that type of statistic without forcing use of helmets, then I would suggest that the Minister think twice about making helmets mandatory.

If something is working for us, don't fight it. If we have the second lowest fatality rate per thousand motor bikes of any province in Canada there must be something — (Interjection) — That's possible. I know

I have driven a motor bike and I have driven it in February, and I've driven it in February and I've driven it in November, and I haven't driven it in December or January, but I'm the first one to admit that I only do it on a mild day in the wintertime, I don't do it in 30-below weather.

No, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that is important in Manitoba is the freedom of choice that has been an inherent part of our democracy in this country. If the person has the freedom to choose, I would suggest that if there is a concern about the medical cost as the Minister has indicated, offer the motorist that freedom of choice and I would suggest to the Minister that if a person chooses not to wear his seat belt, then third-party liability on accidents under our compulsory insurance system could be reduced, could maybe even be negated, depending on what the Minister wants to do with it. So I'm saying that there are alternatives that are open and maintain a freedom of choice.

A MEMBER: Which one do you recommend?

MR. H. GRAHAM: I personally would prefer that you change the Autopac regulations, so that if a person did not wear his seat belt, his personal insurance was null and void, I would prefer that. Then the choice is up to the person. I realize there is a possibility of having difficulty in proving in the case of an accident whether or not that seat belt was done up but is that any worse than what the Minister is proposing now in that seat belts must be done up and it's an indictable offence not to have it done, not to have them.

A MEMBER: Summary conviction.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Summary conviction if you refuse to pay. Mr. Speaker, one of the things about this whole legislation is, is it enforceable? I would suggest that it probably is going to be very difficult to enforce compulsory seat-belt legislation, to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that your seat belt was done up or was not done up when you were apprehended by an officer of the law. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it should not be the purpose of this Legislature to pass laws that are difficult to enforce. I think it would be in the interest of the public that before we pass any laws, we check with all of the law enforcement people and society at large to see whether or not there would be any difficulty in the enforcement of the laws that we're proposing.

Quite frankly, I would be happy in this Legislature if before we pass any laws that we repealed one before we pass the new one. I think we, in this Assembly and in every jurisdiction in Canada are putting in place a proliferation of legislation that is ensuring work for the legal profession for years and years to come. I find that morally offensive and I would like to see a general policy that before we pass any new legislation that we get rid of one or two old Acts. I think if we did that we would be doing a great service to the people of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: 1370 legislation.

MR. H. GRAHAM: We may have to go back that far, but at the same time, I think it's a good philosophy

and it's something that we should always be thinking about when we're bringing in new legislation. In that respect, I would ask the Minister why he would want to bring this in at this particular time when we know that it has been tried before, it's been proposed before and has been turned down. I would like to know what new information has come to the Minister's desk since those previous attempts at bringing in this type of legislation? Has it been the constant knocking on the Minister's door by the Member for Elmwood? That's a distinct possibility. I know the position of the Member for Elmwood. But has there been any new information that has been available to us now that wasn't available to us the last time this bill was brought before the House? The Minister didn't indicate anything of that nature when he introduced the legislation.

I would hope that before this debate is over, that somebody bring forward new information that was not available to this Assembly the last time this bill was before the House. I think it's important if we're going to bring it in now when we were unwilling to bring it in before, there has to be some reason unless, of course, it's a penchant that this government has for social tinkering. It's a possibility that this government is obsessed with the idea that they have to tinker with the laws just to let people know that they are the government and this is what they are going to do. That possibility is there. At one time, and I have to say this to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, I had a high regard for his position in this Legislature and his position as the Minister of Agriculture, but I know from his own activities of the last year and a half and the tinkering that he has done with agriculture in this province, that I had a wrong impression of the Minister of Agriculture because his activities of the last 18 months have proven me wrong.

Fortunately, the Minister of Transportation has done reasonably well and I'm sure that he will tell us, in closing debate, why he is bringing this forward now and tell us the new information that he has that would make this legislation necessary now when it was turned down by this Assembly a few years ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I hope the Minister will give us the benefit of his knowledge when he closes debate on this bill.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to take part in this debate, I was pleased that I had the opportunity of listening to the Honourable Member for Virden in making his comments to this legislation. He did primarily throughout his speech, as I indicated from my seat, was at the high level of debate, until I felt that he was putting his points across, until he started lowering himself towards the end of his remarks and attributing motives to my colleague, the Minister of Transportation, about wanting to tinker with laws in bringing this matter forward.

As the member knows, safety legislation, and he alluded to it, was debated in this House a number of times, in fact, by members of the Schreyer administration. I believe it was brought in two or three times, measures were brought in, in the eight years,

and did not pass or various aspects of them did not pass. That's not to say, Mr. Speaker, that the need and the desirability of such measures have been very clear in their effectiveness. I mean, I think we can blame our automobile companies for doing a lot of things and making many mistakes, but certainly over the years in the manufacturing of automobiles and the testing of same, safety equipment was on the part of governments' minds as well as the manufacturers' minds, and it's been borne out that those pieces of equipment do help to reduce injuries. They may not in many instances, if the collision is to such an extent, actually save a life, but it certainly has been borne out that they do reduce injuries.

I know the issue, I have to say, is not the most popular issue. In fact, I would say there is an awful lot of emotion on this issue. Yet, in the letters and the comments that I do receive - and I'm sure the honourable member gets them as well - people say, "Yes, I agree that seat belts, that helmets, that child restraints are a safety measure and they do help and they're a good thing, but the key is don't make me wear it." That is really the crux of the matter; not that they disagree that the measures and the items are not good and that they do help and they lower the incidence of injuries, but the crux of the problem, Sir, is that we don't want to be told what to do and that's really the crux. In all the letters opposing this and comments that I get, "You want to wear it, that's fine and I think they're good; don't make me wear it," and that is a difficult situation.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member talked about any new information that my colleague had brought out. I really think, in terms of the benefits of the use of the safety devices, it has proven itself over the years. The only thing that would be new, Sir, would be the experiences of other provinces that he has raised in terms of the statistical analysis, and it ends up as a numbers question if you're bringing forward new information. So I'm not sure; there may be some new information that I'm not aware of, and I've certainly looked at and had a lot of information provided to me over the years. I've only brought a small portion of it with me this afternoon in making some comments.

The question will be talked about of enforcement and it was raised by the honourable member, whether the law will be enforced. The member knows - and I'm sure he realizes - that most laws are brought into being, they will be enforced, and they're not 100 percent enforced. I mean, you have many laws on the statutes that what comes out is the spirit and the intent of the law and that the majority of the public, because they are law-abiding citizens or whether it's the Province of Ontario or other provinces which have similar legislation, they will support the measure. Granted, there will always be people who will not support a measure. We have laws prohibiting the manufacture of illicit spirits; the laws are on the books. The majority of the public support those laws. There are a few in society who say, notwithstanding the law, "I want to cook my own moonshine and I'm not going to support the law," and, Mr. Speaker, we do that. That is just but one example; maybe not such a good example, but it's typical of many laws.

The law on farm lands ownership; the intent is what is put forward and the majority of our citizenry will support the measure and will not try to circumvent it through devious means.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member raised an interesting point. I'm not sure how he ended up and what his recommendation was, and that was a suggestion that in a case of an accident if you are not utilizing your safety device, and that you are liable - I'm assuming that liability would have to be shown - that you would be liable in the accident or maybe not liable regardless of fault - maybe he's speaking of regardless of fault, that the increased injuries that you sustained in that accident as a result of not wearing the safety device, if that can be determined, should not be covered by your insurance policy.

It's an interesting suggestion, Sir, and I am sure it's been thought of by different Legislatures, but I can advise the honourable member that he recalls, and I'm sure we all are aware of private members' bills that have been brought into the Legislature trying to force insurance companies to redress, either for some technical reason that they refuse to pay a claim, or for some other reason, because of the negligence of a lawyer, or some other technical or law reasons of a technical nature that the insurance company refused to pay a claim.

I can foresee, Mr. Speaker, if we went that route, that there would be bills of that nature brought before the Legislature to say, our insurance company is not prepared to pay this claim and there's enough evidence contrary to it, so we will have to pass a law and force the company to either allow this matter to proceed to court so at least a court could hear the evidence, because that's been the majority of the way the private members' bills have gone. They have actually not adjudicated on the matter, but what they have allowed is the individual to take this matter further to a court to be heard, to see whether there is some validity to the claim. I could see many of those kinds of situations coming, if you went the route that the honourable member is suggesting.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the honourable members, and they probably have received copies of the Manitoba Traffic Safety Committee's advice on various questions that are raised about seat belts or helmets or child-restraint devices. There's no doubt that if one was to put an argument on any matter, one could develop an argument that certainly could indicate or at least draw one's conclusion that the use of a safety device might jeopardize one's situation in terms of driving.

It's really a matter of adjustment over many years as it is with children. Our children at home are grown up, are past the age of five in my family. I have to tell you, in terms of my own family, my wife is not that crazy about the use of seat belts. She does utilize them but she herself is not. I share that with honourable members; I'm not afraid to share that. Our children do use them. It's a matter of education and continuous use. One gets used to the matter and to the device and uses it. I do, I would say 95 percent of the time; I am not 100 percent complete. One of our farm trucks is relatively old; there is no seat belt in there. There's no way of using it — (Interjection) — Pardon me? No. That was a tractor in a grain box. Taking aside the comments, Mr. Speaker, I'll leave that.

Much of the commentary that is made is that, I don't want to use seat belts because I'm only taking a short distance, I'm only going a short way. As I understand

it, it's been established that three out of four fatal accidents are sustained within 25 miles of a person's home, so that the argument whether it be urbanwise or ruralwise really should not matter in terms of the seat belts. As the honourable member knows, fatal injuries to unbelted drivers and passengers have been inflicted at speeds as low as 12 miles an hour.

No matter how careful you are as a driver, you probably cannot always avoid the high-speed crash inflicted by someone else. That's really where it all comes into play. Mr. Speaker, I spoke on a resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood a number of years ago about some very close friends of mine just inside the Perimeter here on Metro Route 90, were coming into Winnipeg, two families with four children, a couple, and a wife and a child of another couple. They had four children of their own. It was a van. They were not belted in. They met a stream of oncoming traffic and apparently the driver of a tractor - not a trailer; he just had the tractor and either was testing it out or whatever - and the vehicles skidded into their path and it was virtually - not quite head-on - a head-on collision. There's no doubt that the driver and I would say the front seat passenger in the van, the likelihood of them surviving would not have been good regardless of whether they wore seat belts. It's the passengers in the back seats who were virtually - with the impact the doors were thrown open; they were thrown out of the vehicle, and they were crushed. Children. In fact, three children lost their lives and all three parents lost their lives in that one single vehicle accident.

I would venture to say after seeing the vehicle and knowing what happened in that collision, that those people in the back seats of that vehicle would have survived the collision - they would have been injured, there's no doubt about it - but they would have survived that impact because once the doors flew open - in fact one of the children was crushed by the door, because they were loose in the van.

There are some neighbours of mine who recently had occasion to be involved in a side collision. They went through a stop sign and they collided with another vehicle, not belted in. The driver of the vehicle will, I'm sure, not be well for the rest of his life because he had the bulk of his stomach torn, as a result of being thrown through the windshield, and he took part of the steering wheel with him as he was going through the windshield. Both parties were thrown out of the vehicle and he, who was involved - the collision wasn't at high speeds. I would say, if I recall in discussing it with him, it was probably in the 30 to 40 mile an hour range that the collision occurred but, with the impact of the vehicle, there was no doubt that they both ended up through the windshield.

The question, I guess, really in this whole issue is should the matter of safety be compulsory? I mean that's really a question. I don't think honourable members across the way or the majority of people in this province really have terrible objections, other than, of course, for medical reasons or other reasons, and those are understandable. But, in the main stream of thinking, that the safety devices that are provided are, in fact, good pieces of equipment, should be used - I haven't heard that argument to say that none of them are any good. Even the helmet question, and I, like the

Honourable Member for Virden, do ride a motorcycle and a trike and do wear a helmet, all the time. There is no doubt in the warm summer air you want to go and, as the commercials say, let the wind blow through your hair as you stream down the highway, that kind of macho performance, because we do have one of those dirt bikes that you can, as they say, do a pop-a-wheelie in three gears - you can shift three times and have your front wheel standing up.

A MEMBER: That's like the Dukes of Hazzard. That's Duke Uruski.

HON. B. URUSKI: I may be a hazard, not a duke.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What's the sheriff's name?

MR. J. DOWNEY: It's Boss Hogg, that's you.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, there is no doubt that everyone agrees that the safety measures - Mr. Speaker, I am sorry there's a bit of dialogue going on that has allowed the members - I hope that my comments haven't allowed the Legislature to start rolling in the aisles and the safety measures that we are discussing, Sir, will be approved of. Maybe the honourable members feel in such a mood today that they may wish to acknowledge the question that the safety devices are necessary.

It's not a matter, as has been suggested, somehow that because it's an NDP Government in Manitoba that there are some of those kinds of statements appearing that now somehow your rights are threatened. Mr. Speaker, when you look at the similar packages of legislation that have been adopted, they haven't been adopted by basically Conservative Governments across this country. To make such a suggestion that, if it's an NDP Government in this province somehow your rights are threatened, Sir, is flying in the face of reality, and I would ask honourable members to be honourable members and to desist from such kind of verbiage because they know, themselves, that it isn't factual because other provinces, of similar party stripe to themselves in this Assembly, have put in such measures and certainly their experience, in the main, they're experience has borne out that these devices do assist and do help.

Mr. Speaker, the question of youngsters in safety devices, the Honourable Member for Virden raised the point saying that youngsters really can't get used and they can cause you just about as much problem in the car or in the seat as they can outside the seat if they're going to raise a ruckus. Mr. Speaker, he's right, notwithstanding where one sits, if one does not want to sit in a restraint mechanism, or in a seat belt, and wants to raise its ire, no matter what you do you will have the attention of the driver disturbed and that could be a problem. But it will not be, I don't believe, the case as a result of the restraint measure. It will be a problem for those families whose children have not gotten used to it; I would have to admit that, that there will be a learning period for all of us who haven't had, or haven't used, the safety devices, it will take awhile to get used to them.

I know my wife's cousin, they have a little boy, and in Ontario - they come from Ontario, they have recently moved to Manitoba - there it is mandatory that child restraint systems be put into place. The child was in that unit since birth and, frankly, he is now a year-and-a-half and there is no difficulty at all. In fact, the vision of the child sitting in the back seat in that restraint is great; they've raised the platform just to make sure that the window height in the car is perfect and the use of that restraint mechanism, the child has no difficulty with it. Albeit, if one does fill the diaper, or be uncomfortable in one way or another, the question of irritability and causing a disturbance for the driver will occur, as the honourable member has suggested, but the use of the units are certainly much needed; not only needed, but I would say families who have lived in Ontario and have used the law and have obeyed the law certainly see merit in it, at least coming from the people that I have been associated with.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that — (Interjection) — Oh, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Emerson asked the question, what percentage? I don't have those figures here and I am sure that 100 percent of the people in Ontario do not use them, I am sure. The honourable member should read my remarks because I dealt with that question. There is no doubt that there isn't one law on the books that is, at any point in time, 100 percent either enforced or obeyed. There is always someone the moment that you bring in whatever kind of a law or a measure, there will be someone figuring out a way on either I don't like the law or I will find a way of how to get around it. So, Sir, there is no doubt. — (Interjection) — Except the income tax. No, I believe even that may be one of the worst ones, so there's no doubt.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, there was once I did vote against this measure at one time but in the other, over the period of time, over speaking to many physicians, reading a lot of material, I have come to the conclusion and, of course, having some responsibility in the insurance field, having seen what does happen around the province in the types of accidents and involvements, we are responsible for one another lest we say that the accident that I caused will only be my damage, Mr. Speaker, that's not the case.

The fact of the matter is, we will have to support one another whether it's through the insurance system through our premiums or whether it's through our social welfare system if we are unable to look after ourselves we are, we end up, being one another's keeper and we do and we will, regardless of what one might feel about one another, we certainly will have to support in terms of safety measures.

Now there are can be other arguments on other issues, that why don't you go this far on other matters? There's no doubt that the issue of impaired driving comes into play on this issue, that we should step up the enforcement against impaired drivers and tighten up our regulations in terms of those who persist coming back on the highway time and time and time again while impaired. But that, although people try and bring the two together, is really a matter of enforcement, a matter of timing and a matter of tightening up as best we can. But certainly the safety measures that we are putting in I hope that the honourable members, at least in the main, see the merits of them and will support them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly agree that anyone that chooses to wear seat belts certainly reduces the risk of personal injury by doing so. However, I can point out that my oldest brother was killed in a truck accident at the junction of No. 1 and 10 just north of Brandon back in 1960. He lost his life because he wasn't wearing his seat belt. But the vehicle he had at that time was not equipped with seat belts but had there been one and had he worn a seat belt he would have saved his life and probably would not have been seriously injured. The vehicle that he was in was just clipped on the front by a big stocker transport that was going through. He was trying to cross the highway and didn't see the transport obviously and the truck was not seriously damaged but my brother was thrown out onto the highway and was instantly killed. It didn't even break the headlight on the truck.

However, the problem that I have is that there is a chance that if you are wearing a seat belt you could also lose your life. This has been proven in a number of accidents. I'm not sure that there is accurate statistics available to show the number of fatalities because a passenger in a vehicle was wearing a seat belt. But it does happen and for that reason I have difficulty in supporting a bill that would make it mandatory for an individual to buckle up, even though the chances of reducing risk are there.

Certainly I know of an accident that happened last summer in my constituency where there was a couple proceeding on Highway 83 and they were both wearing their seat belts. There was another individual coming across the highway, didn't stop at the stop sign, he was not wearing a seat belt. They had a very serious accident and the young fellow that was not wearing his seat belt, his truck rolled and caught on fire and the truck was completely demolished. He was thrown from the truck, was not seriously injured but the fact that he was not wearing a seat belt saved his life.

In the case of the other vehicle the two passengers who had their seat belts on were not injured and if they had not worn their seat belts they would have suffered very serious injury, they perhaps may have lost their lives in that accident. So it was a good example of when not to wear seat belts and when to wear seat belts.

It is a very difficult position to be put in but certainly I just don't feel that I can support this type of legislation that makes it mandatory.

I have had a number of calls on the bill, primarily from people that are objecting to wearing seat belts and in most cases they quote examples of where they have been involved in accidents, or they know of someone that has been involved in traffic accidents whereby the people did not wear seat belts and saved their lives because they were thrown from the vehicle, but had they had the seat belts on they would likely have had serious injury.

I respect the medical people, the doctors and the nurses and those people that are working with injured persons. They see the results of numerous serious traffic accidents and I respect the promotion that they are currently doing to support this type of legislation.

However, after having said that, I think really that they only see one side of the story and, as I say, they have good reason to promote their cause. But again the statistics are not readily available to show the number of injuries or fatalities because of people that wore seat belts. Now, the medical people will tell you that they are aware of some injuries resulting in the wearing of seat belts but in most cases the people that are in serious accidents with seat belts, they are fatalities and they don't get to the hospital for treatment.

A recent survey that I did in my constituency in which I got 208 replies back, some 78 percent of those inquiries said that they would not support legislation; 22 percent said that they would be in favour of the proposed Bill No. 60.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We have a matter of procedure which is not covered by our rules. The Honourable Member for Swan River, having spoken for five minutes, will presumably be able to complete his remaining 35 minutes when the bill is next called. The bill will stand also in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

The time being 4:30 - Private Members' Hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. NO. 9 - RELEASE OF YURIY SHUKHEVYCH

MR. SPEAKER: The first item on the agenda for today, Resolution No. 9, the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, the Honourable Member for The Pas has 20 minutes.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak on this resolution put forward by the Member for Roblin-Russell, as he put it in his opening remarks, he spoke of the contribution the Ukrainian people have made to the development of this province, and so it gives me great pleasure to speak especially because all of my grandparents were born in the Ukraine and emigrated to Canada in the late 1800s.

The Ukrainian Canadians have made a great contribution to the development of Canada, especially Western Canada, and they have also made a contribution to the arts. Some of the singing and dancing troupes, which include the Shumka Dancers of Edmonton and the Rusalka Dancers of Winnipeg, are enjoyed and appreciated as being some of the most colourful dancers in Canada. I have had the privilege of seeing both the Shumka Dancers and the Rusalka Dancers perform at the Ukrainian Festival in Dauphin and I have witnessed the Rusalka Dancers on other occasions in Winnipeg, and I think they are a very colourful and talented group.

When I mention the contribution Ukrainians have made in the field of arts, I am reminded of William Keruluk. William Keruluk was born in Alberta about 50 miles from Edmonton. When he was approximately five years of age, his father went east, to the eastern part of the west; he moved to Stonewall, Manitoba, just outside of the City of Winnipeg, and the Keruluk family followed the year after. The Keruluk family was educated in the community of Stonewall where the family farmed

and, in later years, the boys moved to the north end of Winnipeg where they bought a house of their own, they lived together, and they attended the University of Manitoba.

After completing his education at the University of Manitoba, he had visions of becoming an artist and he wanted to go to Europe to study in the field of arts. In those days, it was pretty difficult to find employment, and he went and worked in Northern Ontario in the bush camps for a year, saved his money, and then travelled to England where he had hoped to enroll in a school of art. After arriving in England, William admitted himself to a psychiatric hospital where he spent most of the next four years getting psychiatric help. After about four years, he was able to overcome his psychological problems and finally after shock treatment, he was able to pursue his art work.

After many years of struggle, he was recognized for the talented artist that he is. The time he spent on the Prairies as a youth plays a great part in the paintings that he displays, and I can identify very closely with his paintings because I guess his youth parallels mine very closely. Some of his paintings that are distributed in "A Prairie Boy's Winter" and "A Prairie Boy's Summer" are some of the scenes that he paints, and I can really identify with them because I have lived many of the scenes myself, hunting gophers and swimming in the local swimming hole.

His paintings also gives us a glimpse of the experience that he went through when he worked in the woods in northern Ontario. I've also had a period of time when I've worked in the woods, so I can again identify with the time that he spent in the woods in northern Ontario, and I guess I really enjoy his art work maybe because of that.

Before he passed away, he completed his autobiography called, "Someone With Me." In his book, he describes the struggles he goes through to reach an understanding with his maker, and he goes through a period of being an atheist and in later years he becomes a believing, practising Catholic. He dies with an understanding that God was always with him, and that is how he comes up with the title of the book, "Someone With Me."

While I'm speaking on Ukrainian culture, I also would like to say that my son, Mark, has attended the minor seminary, a Ukrainian school for boys at Roblin, which is in the constituency of the member who introduced the resolution. I think it's a very good high school which provides university entrance education and provides a strong, moral direction for the young boys who are attending the school. While he attended St. Vladimir's, he also took part in their dancing troupe and I just had the occasion to witness this year's version of the St. Vladimir's College in The Pas last Friday, and again, they have a very good singing and dancing group.

Presently, my son is serving an apprenticeship with the Rusalka Dancers in Winnipeg here, so I hope that some day he would also become a . . .

A MEMBER: Does he take after you, Harry?

MR. H. HARAPIAK: No, he doesn't take after me. He gets his talents from his mother.

A MEMBER: Harry's fast off the dance floor.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: But the resolution we are presently speaking on . . .

A MEMBER: Harry likes to sit it out.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: That's right. I can do a polka. The resolution we are presently speaking on is the oppression of Yuriy Shukhevych. It has been stated before that Yuriy was born in the Ukraine and his father was a proud patriot who devoted his life to the cause of freedom and the independence of his country.

Since the age of 14, he has been imprisoned by the Soviets. First, he was sent to Siberia along with his mother, and later he was again put into jail because he would not renounce his father who was involved as a freedom fighter. He received additional jail terms because of the charges brought against him by the Soviet government agents. The Minister of Cultural Affairs, in his presentation when he spoke on this resolution, stated that Yuriy's cause has been endorsed by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee of Winnipeg and also by Amnesty International, a human-rights organization that is involved in liberating people in many countries throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, if I had been aware of the vigil and the march that was carried on by the Ukrainians of this city to give the plight of Yuriy Shukhevych public attention, I would have joined them to march because I am opposed to oppression. It does not matter if the oppression is done by the Soviets, by the Americans or by any other country.

I believe that the demonstration that was held at the U.S. Consulate, again, to demonstrate against oppression; we were demonstrating because we opposed the American involvement in Nicaragua I believe that is a reason that this resolution was brought forth. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of that demonstration and I do not apologize for it.

A MEMBER: Why not?

MR. H. HARAPIAK: We still have freedom of speech in this country and that is what we were doing. We were expressing our distaste for the American involvement in Nicaragua and that was the reason we were participating in that march. We still have freedom of speech in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to refer to another form of oppression that I'm opposed to. This year, Ukrainians throughout the world are observing the 50th anniversary of the Great Famine of 1932-33. In the early 1930s, Stalin moved to collectivize the farms of the Ukraine in order to finance the industrialization of the Soviet Union. The farmers resisted because they did not want to give away the grain. In order to break the backs of those resisting the move by the government of that time, Stalin exported most of the grain produced in that region. Because of the exporting the grain that was produced in that region, it caused an estimated 7 million Ukrainians to perish. Because of this 50th anniversary, the Ukrainian community has published a weekly magazine which has 14 pages of stories dedicated to the horror that went on, that many of the people witnessed first-hand and experienced in that famine. I think it's a tragedy to know that anybody

could have gone through some of the conditions that the people of the Ukraine were forced to go through. They were starved to death.

The world knew little of this famine. The American media were aware of it. They stifled the story because of that fact Stalin was an ally of the Americans. In a special issue, as I mentioned earlier, of the Ukrainian Weekly, there are countless stories of the horror that millions of people experienced during that tragic period in our history.

Mr. Speaker, we who are fortunate to live in a country that has freedom of speech must not take it for granted. That is why, when we have an opportunity to speak and express our opposition to some of the oppression that's going on in this world such as we did at the American Consulate because of the American involvement in Nicaragua, I think that we should take every effort to do so.

Once again, I encourage the members of the Assembly to support this resolution put forward by the Member for Roblin-Russell, so that we can be a loud voice in support of Yuriy Shukhevych and other political prisoners who are under an oppressive government. We can, once again, become a loud voice and demand that Yuriy be released in the name of mankind.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this resolution that's put forward by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell is an opportune time for all members, I think, to put on the record their feelings and their views with respect to the issue of freedom. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that all members make it clear and take an opportunity to speak, to clear up in their own minds where they stand on this fundamental issue; not only where they stand from a political sense, from a partisan political sense, but where they stand in human terms on a larger scale.

Mr. Speaker, much has been made by members opposite and some members of the public as well, of the appearance, the attendance of members of the NDP caucus at the recent demonstration concerning the situation in Nicaragua. Whether or not it was that controversy which initiated, which provided the motivation for this particular resolution, really isn't important. The resolution certainly has merit and members on this side have spoken quite eloquently to that resolution and certainly support the sentiments of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Yuriy Shukhevych and numerous other political prisoners in the Soviet Union, numerous other individuals who, over the past 30 or 40 or 50 years, have been imprisoned and harassed and tortured and denied basic human rights because of their political, because of their civil, because of their personal, religious, or other views.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this Chamber tolerates, accepts those acts and I can say unequivocally that I am of the opinion that no one on this side supports in any way, the demeaning of human life regardless of who the perpetrators are, whether those be totalitarian governments in the Soviet Union, in Argentina, in Chile,

in Nicaragua, in El Salvador, wherever they might be. I think that's an important point and members opposite seem to be of the opinion and have expressed the opinion that members on this side somehow see the world as black and white, that anything the Americans do, anything that other regimes do, other regimes being those that operate on something other than what we consider to be democratic principles, they've assumed that we decry the lack of freedom only when it relates to those countries.

The fact is that it doesn't matter what type of government, what type of regime is imposing its will on a people, that is something that individuals in a free and democratic society should be opposed to, and not only opposed to from their seats. I don't think that's good enough, to be opposed to the trials and the misfortunes of other people on your seat.

Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions members from this side have marched in demonstrations and shown their solidarity and their support with issues relating to personal freedom.

MR. J. DOWNEY: They should be ashamed of themselves.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur says that we should be ashamed of ourselves for marching in those demonstrations. Mr. Speaker, there was a demonstration here not too long ago in support of the Solidarity Movement in Poland, and I don't think, Mr. Speaker, in all honesty, that the member would oppose someone speaking up for the Solidarity Movement for the people of Poland in their opposition to some very undemocratic principles. Mr. Speaker, I was there at that demonstration; I wonder if the Member for Arthur was there? I wonder.

So, Mr. Speaker, we come back to the old dilemma. Do we support freedom from our seats? Do we support freedom when it's convenient? Do we support freedom only when it conflicts with our particular interests? Is that when we support freedom? Do we support freedom out of principle? — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a clear indication of how some members opposite feel about the issue of freedom. The Member for Arthur says, no, he wasn't at the demonstration for freedom for the people in Poland, for the people that are fighting, in some cases, putting up their life for the principles they believe in and the principles which we all espouse to; some loosening of the yoke that is around the people of Poland's necks, Mr. Speaker. I suppose if it comes down to a question of whether we fight for our freedoms, if it becomes an issue of necessity - I won't say no one, but certainly I would not be opposed to that, in principle. Members opposite can say, well the real test of whether you believe in freedom is whether you're prepared to lay down your life for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, if it comes to that, if that's a necessity, then members on this side believe in freedom as much as members on that side. My father was a veteran of the Second World War. We have veterans of the Second World War as members on this side, which indicates that we, as New Democrats, certainly are prepared to defend freedom. The interesting point is that we're willing and we're prepared to defend freedom, not only

when it affects our particular interests and those of our children, admittedly justifiable reasons for supporting and for becoming involved in actions to defend our democracy.

The question is, do we go beyond that. Is there a principle of freedom, a worldwide, a universal principle of freedom? The answer is quite simply, yes, there is. The principle of respecting basic human freedoms that we have known since the beginning of the western world, principles of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, basic freedoms we believe are universal.

So, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this one resolution I wouldn't want members opposite, or others, to assume from that that we are speaking only about freedom in the Soviet Union; that we're speaking about an individual. Mr. Speaker, I think most members on this side, when they spoke to the resolution did so because the situation of Yuriy Shukhevych symbolizes a tyranny of man over other men. Mr. Speaker, that's the dilemma. That's something that we have to face in our own conscience. Can we support the tyranny of one society, one group or one elite over other individuals in that particular society. It doesn't matter what the guise of the particular government is, whether it be called a military junta, or whether it's a benevolent dictatorship, or whether it's an enlightened despot, or what the term we want to use is, the fact is that it's a form of rule, it's a form of government that should not be tolerated; it should not be taken lightly.

I think that as individuals we have a duty and a responsibility as citizens of the universe to protest and to do that in whatever way we feel comfortable protesting.

If we feel comfortable writing letters to the editor, then that's what we should do. If we feel comfortable making speeches in the Legislatures across the country then that's what we should do. If we feel comfortable marching on the streets and illustrating our support for people who are struggling to obtain a certain level of freedom, then that's what we should do.

I'm hoping that the support that has been shown for this resolution, the indication from various members that there is no support, no sympathy for the totalitarian government in the Soviet Union. Mr. Speaker, there is no support for that government. There is no support for the policies which deny individual citizens in the Soviet Union, deny them their basic human rights. The principle has to be expanded. The symbol of Yuri Shukhevych and the situation that he finds himself in is a situation which is exemplified in many countries of the world.

We had examples of Argentina. On one occasion the Member for Morris inadvertently referred to Argentina as a free country. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we increasingly find reports out of Argentina indicating that more and more people there are becoming aware of the fact that the military government that has been leading that country since 1976 — (Interjection) — it's a principle. There's increasing resistance on the part of the people of Argentina to the rule of military government. There's indications that they're going to move from that to a democratically-elected government.

Mr. Speaker, in that free country from 1976 to 1983 we have seen literally tens of thousands of people disappear; people who were slaughtered; people who

were tortured by the military police; people who were denied their basic freedoms and denied their life - by not a communist government and by not Soviet Russia - but by a military dictatorship; another form of totalitarian government. Did we see the Member for Morris standing up and leading a peace march, talking about the injustice and the lack of freedom? Because clearly, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — there are thousands of Yuri Shukhevych's in the prisons of Argentina; there are. There are political prisoners who have been denied their freedoms as Yuri Shukhevych has.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore both systems, both kinds of governments, which perpetrate that kind of totalitarianism on its people. That's what we have to address. Mr. Speaker, we have to accept our responsibilities as citizens of the world and speak out not only in those instances where for whatever reasons we find their particular political perspective objectionable, we have to speak out wherever the issue of freedom is what needs defending. The political systems, Mr. Speaker, I think we can agree whether they're communist in the sense of the Soviet Union or a military dictatorship in the sense of Chile or Argentina are reprehensible forms of government the way that they're being run at the present time. But I would like to see members opposite go beyond the issue of Yuriy Shukhevych, as members on this side have from time after time, speaker after speaker, and indicate that the issue of freedom has to be a universal one. I would like to see some members opposite stand and deplore the situation in Nicaragua as members on this side have deplored the situation in Afghanistan and the escalation of fighting in Afghanistan, Mr. Speaker, is as horrendous to members on this side as anybody else. — (Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris suggests that I read the speech 30 years from now, this particular speech, well, I would suggest to the Member for Morris that 15,000 people killed in Argentina, 15,000 people denied their basic rights and eventually their life is as serious in Argentina as 15,000 people killed in Afghanistan or 15,000 people in Czechoslovakia or anywhere else in the world. What I am suggesting is that the issue of Yuriy Shukhevych is one that we have to generalize. Certainly we recognize that the Soviet Union is a totalitarian government and that people there are denied many of their basic rights. That's a deplorable situation; something that we don't tolerate; something that we have time and time again spoken out against, that we have demonstrated against, and I think that we're following a very simple and a very basic principle. It is a principle I hope we all share and that is that the particular stripe of the government, the particular stripe of the tyranny isn't really the issue. The issue is tyranny and whether we, as inhabitants of this world, will tolerate it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell will be closing the debate.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am most grateful, Mr. Speaker, for the members of the House

offering their sentiments and expressing their goodwill in this resolution. When the House passes it, it will be in the hands of the Clerk and he will in turn pass it onto the Prime Minister of our country and the Minister of External Affairs to be given the treatment that it deserves. Mr. Speaker, in case there is any doubt in the minds of members opposite about how this resolution was motivated, I am not associating myself in any way with that incident that took place on the front steps or the grounds of the American Embassy. I hope that the members opposite disassociate us as far as possible from that incident because it's a different issue altogether, Mr. Speaker. May I point out that the vote of the House will indicate, but I regret very much that the members opposite are somehow trying to tie their tails onto the fact that this is a similar resolution to the one that they were dealing with on another subject matter in regard to that.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, was motivated by the people from the Ukrainian community and others who saw fit to present themselves in front of the Legislative Building, light candles to the memory, and the inhumane treatment that Yuriy Shukhevych and his family are receiving in the USSR.

Mr. Speaker, that was what motivated me to bring the resolution in; it was orderly. There was nobody standing there burning flags that I saw, and I respect the Ukrainian community for what they did and the way they presented themselves and the plea that they presented to the people of this province and to the legislator who was standing there on the steps. This Legislative Building, as everybody knows, everybody has an equal share of it. They have the right to stand on the steps of this building and address themselves to a problem like that, but we don't go on the property of a neighbour and make an issue of an incident such as was done by the members opposite.

Well, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I thank all the members for making their contribution and I look forward to the Clerk addressing this matter to the Prime Minister of our country and to the Department of External Affairs. I hope that the message gets there at the earliest possible date.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

RES. NO. 14 - UNPOLLUTED WATER SOURCE FOR WINNIPEG

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that

WHEREAS Shoal Lake is the only developed source for the essential service of water supply for the residents of the City of Winnipeg; and

WHEREAS development on Shoal Lake could increase the risk to Winnipeg's water supply and might result in water quality that is unsatisfactory without full treatment prior to use at a large increase of cost; and

WHEREAS there is currently under consideration a proposed 350-lot cottage development on the shores of Shoal Lake;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of the Province of Manitoba protect the right of the people of Winnipeg to an unpolluted water source without unnecessary cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In presenting this resolution to the House my purpose was to direct attention to an area of very substantial concern, I believe, for all residents of the City of Winnipeg and indeed most Manitobans. The reason for bringing this resolution forward, calling attention and allowing for some debate and discussion is to ensure that there is no question in the minds of the administration or the elected representatives of the City of Winnipeg or indeed any of its residents as to what is the position of this Provincial Government and the Members of this Legislature with respect to that very serious commitment and concern to protect the water supply, the domestic drinking water supply, of the residents of the City of Winnipeg.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, against the backdrop of what I consider to have been a rather unsure and not very direct kind of response that we have received from various members of the government whose responsibility I believe it should be to ensure that this water supply is protected beyond any question and without any possible other considerations. Because as this matter has been up for debate and discussion, there have always been a few sort of riders thrown on the end of the statements of concern, statements of responsibility and the statements of support for the city in its endeavours to protect its water supply.

Even as recently as yesterday, when the Minister of Urban Affairs, in speaking about the concerns that our side of the House had with respect to the protection of the city's water supply, he put on a few riders about his concerns for the economic development opportunities and economic considerations of those members of Shoal Lake Indian Band No. 40 and their rights to some employment and economic opportunities and so on. So in the past there has always been that lack, in my view, of a firm direct response with respect to the position of the Provincial Government.

I will say, in fairness to the Minister of the Environment, that in the course of his Estimates during the past couple of weeks, he did finally take a firm position on this and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's also fair to say that prior to that, his position was less than totally equivocal on the situation. I used the term yesterday with the Minister of Urban Affairs that they were dancing around the matter rather than going directly at the heart of it and taking a firm position but, at the same time, I will acknowledge that the Minister of the Environment only within the past two weeks said that he - he finally put on the record a firm unequivocal position.

I have to say that this resolution was placed on the Order Paper a number of weeks ago and perhaps the Minister finally in his overall thought process decided that he must make that firm stand and give that bottom-line position, and I credit him for having done so. I

hope now that we will see some action to back up those words that he finally gave us in respect to this very, very serious matter.

The matter that is facing the City of Winnipeg is a proposal to develop 350 cottage lots right around the bay in which the city's water supply originates. That bay on Shoal Lake is one that has a very unusual type of water supply, and I probably mentioned this before, but that water supply is so unusual and so unique that it is used as an example in schools of engineering such as at the University of Manitoba when we talk about municipal water supplies, the quality standards, and the various parameters that are used to judge the quality and the essence of the water. In all of the groups of parameters that are used, this water supply falls right in the desirable category in its natural state, and that's not only unique but it's highly unusual when we look at water supplies for major cities throughout the world, particularly in North America, because traditionally, of course, cities, in looking at potential sources, looked to sources that were relatively close by.

You take a look at the City of Brandon and its water supply comes out of the Assiniboine River, close at hand, very low initial capital cost in providing for the intake and pumping and supply works to get it to a distribution point. You take a look at Selkirk and it comes right out of the Red River, again similar low cost. If you take a look at Regina or Calgary, or on and on, they went very short distances. Winnipeg, back in around the time of the First World War, Major Charles, who was the engineer and designer of the aquaduct and was the consulting engineer for the city on this particular matter, selected a source 100 miles away. Now, today 100 miles doesn't sound like a phenomenal distance, but in those days it was unheard of. There was virtually no major city in North America that went 100 miles distant to get its water supply source. They built an aquaduct of the size that you could drive a truck through, even today, reinforced concrete all the way 100 miles from Shoal Lake to Winnipeg. In those days, I can assure you that Major Charles was probably considered by most average people to be a heretic to have suggested the massive capital expenditure to put that source of water for the City of Winnipeg in that particular location.

Of course, what he was looking for was something that would never, in his view, be subject to pollution. It would be so distant from the city and so distant from normal urban development or environmental pollution that nobody would ever consider that it could possibly be polluted. Well, of course, time has evolved and for something in the range of 70 years now that has been the case, that that totally unpolluted water supply, that unique water supply because it needs no treatment other than chlorination and fluoridation, so that means that there's no clarification, no filtration, no screening, no solids removal, no mineral removal, no softening. In every case, it requires virtually no treatment. All we do is add a bit of chlorine through the course of the aquaduct, a bit of fluoridation which is a development that has come within the last 30 years or so, and, presto, we have an absolutely ideal water supply source for the City of Winnipeg's domestic water supply. Very unusual.

Here we have that situation having prevailed for almost 70 years now, and today we're faced with a

variety of different things that are occurring as a result of development in a variety of ways in that area. In the past, we've dealt with the potential adverse consequences of mining developments. We have gone through some difficult times, and I'll refer to the discussions and debate that took place some years ago when a mining operation that was some 30 miles away from there at High Lake was proposed and the attitude of members opposite when they were in opposition to the protection of this water supply, and today we're dealing with a different type of pollution from the domestic and recreational use that is proposed by the Indian band and its cottage lot development right on the shores of the intake to the water supply.

Let me state right at the outset that the matter of the rights of the Native Indian Band No. 40 to economic development is not something that we're dismissing out of hand. That has been talked about at some length by members opposite as they, as I say, gave a less than clear and direct response to this issue. They've talked about the fact that the band lost its fishing rights as a result of an Ontario Government move many years ago, and so that was one of its sources of economic development and its sources of income and that was gone as a result of that decision by the Ontario Government.

In this particular case, I even question to what extent this can be considered a legitimate long-term economic development on behalf of that band. We're dealing with a band of several hundred residents, and in this particular proposal, they would gain in a financial sense from the capital return which they would get out of leasing the land on a long-term basis, but it would not create to any large extent any long-term jobs for the area. There might be some involved with the recreational aspects of it but, in essence, there would be no permanent long-term employment or no real economic activity. What they would get would be the return on the value of the land that they were giving up for this cottage lot development.

I think that's a rather short-term view of economic return on economic development and not a real solution to the long-term problems of income for the Natives in that area in any case. But that is aside from the matter because I believe that it only diverts attention from the real issue and that is, as I said, the right of the people of Winnipeg to an unpolluted water supply.

In dealing with this whole area, I have to put on the record that initially the band, I think, did not act in a very direct and fair manner when they refused the FEARO Study and they fought it, and they fought it through whatever political means were at their disposal. The Federal Government was reluctant to impose the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review process on them because they put a great deal of pressure on the various levels of government. They put pressure on the Honourable John Munro, as Federal Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, and through him on the Federal Minister of the Environment. But at the same time I have to say that, when we were in government, and this was first proposed, we immediately took the position that this was too important an issue, that it was too major a potential threat to the City of Winnipeg water supply. I met personally with the Honourable John Roberts; I wrote to the Honourable John Munro. The City of Winnipeg equally put pressure on that federal

level of government and had meetings with those particular Ministers and said that there is no way that this kind of thing should be or could be accepted without a Federal Environmental Assessment Review Study, because we're dealing with something that's very different, even from a mining development or even from, say, a commercial development on there.

In those cases, generally, we're dealing with a point source that can be monitored, assessed, controlled, tested very, very easily. Here what you have is 350 cottage lots spread out along the shore, each with their own domestic pollution control system for their domestic sewage, and each point source potentially having the opportunity to malfunction at some point in time and no way of being able to assess it on an easy basis. You can't be constantly going in, testing and monitoring 350 different sewage septic tanks or fields, that sort of thing. The possibility for dealing with tanks of spills is always there.

More so than that, when you introduce the potential for thousands of people to be using the lake for recreational purposes, then you have the spectre of garbage being dumped and dropped into the lake, oil slicks, gasoline and exhaust from the boats and all sorts of refuse and floating material occurring on the lake which you don't have today. So consequently that is a very, very serious consequence in my view of having a cottage lot developed there.

In any case, we've gone beyond that point; sufficient pressure and sufficient encouragement from the provincial and the city level of government, I think, mostly due to the efforts that were put in place prior to this government, resulted in ultimately the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review process being triggered. That's been triggered, but we have the unusual situation of the band not co-operating very well with it. During last winter, the band undertook some coercive, I believe, action in dumping garbage right on the ice at Shoal Lake and saying, "You're going to have to agree to put a road through; you're going to have to do some things with us, otherwise, you're going to get garbage in your water supply," and I don't believe that was the way to go. Although the Minister of the Environment responded to it eventually, I don't believe that he took very firm action in the matter.

At the same time, the band had agreed quite some time ago that it would submit its environmental impact statement and they agreed to submit that statement by April 1st. It's now more than six weeks beyond that point in time, we have not yet seen an environmental impact statement submitted by the proponent of the project. That obviously stalls the whole process because you can't do an assessment and a review until you have a statement in which all of the various proposals are laid out and can be assessed by the engineers, by the technicians, by the environmental officials who will look at this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Urban Affairs speak about the band's right to economic security and I agree with that, but it should not be at the expense of the City of Winnipeg's water supply - that is the bottom line. I don't believe that they have directly answered that matter because the city, so concerned as it is about the threat to its water supply, did not believe it either and it took the unusual step of spending \$28,000 and sending a folder to every

resident of the City of Winnipeg last fall telling them of the potential threat to their water supply. They got tens of thousands of replies and they did that to reinforce their case, to say to the Provincial Government, "We need your assurances." I say to you now that the Minister of the Environment has recently given those assurances and I hope that he's willing to carry them out.

Mr. Speaker, I just say that this is a very different position than these people took when they were in opposition a couple of years ago. There we had a case of a mine 30 miles away, a mine in an Ontario jurisdiction, there we had a case of areas in which the effluent would be filtered through 30 miles of channel, through a bog, through a marsh and eventually it might only get in after tremendous filtration, whatever was the effluent from this mine, and ultimately it was proven by agreements between the Ontario Government and the Province of Manitoba that we were able to assure that there was no pollution whatsoever possible, no degradation to the city's water supply. That was the bottom line.

I say that this government, when it was in opposition, argued for that position. Yet today, when they are faced with an even greater threat to the city's water supply, they have not taken such direct action. They have not stepped forward and advocated on behalf of the city with the band and with the Federal Government, rather, they've preferred to play a mediator role and that isn't good enough. I say that until they get off that middle ground and off the fence and state very clearly, as the Minister of the Environment finally did last week, and I hope that his colleague, the Minister of Urban Affairs, will equally take that position and argue on behalf of the rights of the citizens of Winnipeg to an unpolluted, non-degraded water supply for the City of Winnipeg.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think there's an understanding, a willingness to call it 5:30, so therefore I'd like to move, seconded by the Minister of Northern Affairs that the House be now adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If there is leave to call it 5:30, a motion to adjourn is not required. The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow.

ADDENDUM Re:

RES. 11 - UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(English Translation of Mr. G. Lecuyer's speech in Vol. XXXI, No. 70, 18 May 1983, 2:00 p.m.)

MR G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, this resolution, introduced in the House by the Member for Thompson, seeks the support of the Manitoba Legislature on two specific points.

First, support is needed to underline our position relative to all additional fees imposed directly upon users of health services, whether through extra billing

imposed by doctors, or deterrent fees imposed by hospitals or governments for hospital care, or for any other charges imposed for health care.

Second, this resolution calls upon the Federal Government to maintain its level of financial support of Canada's Health Care System. We are aware that the Federal Government has unilaterally cut back on its funding to the provinces and changes now being contemplated for The National Health Act should concern us greatly.

This resolution therefore is most pertinent and most important at a time when everywhere in Canada, provincial governments, caught between recession and inflation and the lowering of revenues, are all seeking, as is the central government, for ways to avoid assigning the total cost of health care to the provincial treasury.

In Manitoba, a certain number of doctors have opted out of the medicare system. Whenever a patient visits one of these doctors or receives care from same, he/she also receives a higher bill than the amount reimbursed under medicare. This type of practice or any similar practice (for the benefit of the intervening member, I emphasize that I am speaking of physicians who have opted out of the system), this type of practice or any similar practice tends to discourage people from availing themselves of the health services they need. Measures already implemented or now being considered in certain provinces are proving detrimental to the medicare system. It is our duty as elected representatives to protect the right of all Canadian citizens of access to the best possible health services.

The Canadian medicare system is the most progressive available and is the envy of our neighbours to the south. You are no doubt aware, as I am, from reading in last week's Free Press, of an article telling of a fund-raising campaign on behalf of a child from Ile des Chênes, Manitoba, in need of a heart operation. To obtain the necessary specialized care the child must be brought to the United States. The article indicated that costs would total \$60,000, out of which \$2,000 per day would be charged for intensive care, whereas here in Manitoba intensive care comes to less than \$300 per day. At the present time, universal access to health services is in jeopardy, and unless determined effort is exerted by all levels of government, the Canadian medicare system faces collapse under these various assaults.

Looking backward for a moment, we remember that the medicare system we enjoy in Canada has been with us for 17 years and draws its origins from the system introduced by the CCF Government of T.C. Douglas in Saskatchewan during his first term of office between 1944 and 1948. Why was a personal health system adopted, a system accessible to all Canadians? Precisely, because it was recognized that medical services are a fundamental right which must never be subject to a person's economic status.

Access to first class medical services, to education and to justice must never be considered a luxury in a modern society which has the resources for such services. There was a time, of course, when some described medicare as pure socialism - using the latter term in a pejorative sense, to be sure.

Wasn't G.S. Woodsworth accused of being socialist and communist for having introduced a bill on old age pensions? Who are those people who were never kindly

disposed toward medicare? First, they are the narrow-minded who believe that services should be available only to those who can pay for them; second, they are the healthy; third, they are those persons who do not have a sense of social justice and who both accept and superimpose a Darwinian philosophy on modern society.

Lately, we have been hearing such comments from the right wing as: we must lower taxes, increase services, prevent abuses, abolish debts, etc. These are admirable principles, to be sure, but how can one be sincere and logical and enunciate these principles all in one breath?

We already have proof of the general erosion of medicare. At a meeting of staunch Conservatives, the Premier of a rich province was warmly applauded for having assailed medicare and its universal character. In British Columbia, annual fees of \$384 per family are required, and this is only a beginning. They are now talking about daily fees for those who have the misfortune of finding themselves in a hospital bed.

Do you think a hospital bed is a motel room where people relax as though they were on vacation? In Alberta, Canada's richest province, another Conservative Government makes each family pay \$494 per year for its medical insurance. Whether a multimillionaire or an ordinary wage earner, the rate is the same. In its great magnanimity, this kind-hearted Conservative Government offers financial assistance to persons of low income, that is, to those earning less than \$4,000 per year. The latter only need pay 50 percent of the regular fees. What charity! What compassion! And in Alberta, once again, it is being suggested that a \$20 per day fee be exacted from those who have no other choice but to go to the hospital. Just recently in an article in the Globe and Mail, the Alberta Minister of Health, faced with the fact that a considerable portion of this insurance has not been collected, is quoted as suggesting a cutback of medical services to those who have not paid their premiums.

Just where are these venerable Albertan MLA's heading with this \$20 per day fee? Perhaps this figure will go up to \$50 next year, and at this rate a patient will, in a few years, be paying \$100 a day for a hospital bed. Once embarked on this pernicious course, what will stop it? And especially now that the private insurance companies have been invited to re-enter the area of health care insurance.

Are they aiming for the American rates where the private enterprise is booming? South of the border, fees varying between \$500 and \$2,000 per day are not uncommon. After all, the shareholders of our multinational companies-owners of hospitals must be rewarded for having invested in such profitable businesses. South of the American-Canadian border hospitals are managed much like an oil company. First, come the profits for the investors; second, yes, second, come the health services. Is this the system some wish to reintroduce in Canada?

Let the facts speak for themselves: In Ontario, also a Conservative province, a family of two or more persons must pay \$680 per year to qualify under the medicare program. Obviously, to some this \$57 a month is nothing, but for many others it is a lot of money and for still many others this represents an amount that they don't have, even for small luxuries from time to time.

Who are the people who use our medical services the most? Obviously, these are the aged, the handicapped, the chronically ill and those who suffer from injuries or illnesses related to their occupation or workplace. It is said that some abuse medical services, and no doubt there are certain number who visit their physician needlessly. Should the doctors be more strict with such persons (who, incidently are not hard to identify)? When a rotten apple is found in a box, do we throw out the whole box in order to get rid of the rotten apple? Not at all. Yet those who wish to destroy medicare in order to prevent abuses are doing precisely that. Even by imposing extra billing or deterrent fees on the hypochondriacs, the latter will not cease to regularly visit their doctor.

Can we truthfully speak of abuse in the case of extended hospitalization? In the affirmative, who is to blame? Is not authorization of a physician required for admission to a hospital? What are the consequences of monthly rates, extra billings and all other forms of deterrent fees? Obviously, those who have money will continue to receive first quality service, while those who have less will have to forego such service, or wait longer and sometimes allow a disease to advance to the place where it will cost even more to treat and in many cases be too late to cure at all.

We now know that it is possible to treat most cancer conditions, provided these are detected soon enough,

but if fees must be paid for tests or examinations, how many persons will wait longer before going to their doctor? It is probable that many will wait till the pain becomes unbearable, but then it will be too late.

Savings, where this is the point of concern, may be realized in the area of prevention, in better use of our resources, and where governments are serious about reducing costs, by looking elsewhere for solutions. First of all, governments could immediately, through stricter legislation, ensure a healthier and safer environment. We must succeed in controlling and in disposing of chemical products which, as we know, are the cause of many sicknesses in our society, of industrial diseases which affect not only workers, but everyone, even in the residential areas of our cities.

Mr. Speaker, a society which calls itself Christian, just and modern, cannot allow itself to have one system of justice for the rich and another for the poor. It must not have a superior educational system for some and something less for the others. Last, it cannot have a health system which provides medical treatment for those with money and "soup line" services for the rest. Funding for the maintenance of the medicare system must continue to come from general taxes; otherwise, we will regress to the system of bygone days where there was one level of care for the rich and a completely different one for the poor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.