



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXII No. 20 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 11 MAY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. 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, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
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	Virden	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, Hon. 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

Friday, 11 May, 1984.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have the statement.

Mr. Speaker, May 12th is Manitoba Day, the date designated by this Legislature as a time to reflect on our past and think of the future.

It was in May 12th, 1870, that Royal Assent was given to The Manitoba Act, creating the Province of Manitoba. The first of the provinces to join the original four in the great experiment of nationhood. It was The Manitoba Act that led to an extension of our country to the Pacific Coast, creating a nation truly from sea to sea.

No one has ever defined just what it meant to be a Manitoban. During the course of our history, there have been many occasions when the question has been pondered. Always with different images resulting; geography, history, language, customs, occupations, all play into our perceptions of being a Manitoban. A common factor in all of these images is diversity. Historians tell us that people have lived in Manitoba for at least 12,000 years, learning, adapting to the land, to the climate.

Cycles have changed and varied during this period with the most dramatic happening being the arrival of the early fur traders, settlers from Europe. The influx of newcomers to the province, not only had a significant change on the native culture, but also on the culture of those who chose to make Manitoba their home.

The process of adjustment and development that is present in the history of all people has continued not only in learning and adapting to the land and the climate, but also adapting to technological, political, social change. We come from a hundred different nations, a hundred different histories. Each of us selected our own special part of Manitoba, put down our roots; each of us selected that particular piece of our heritage that individually we highlight as being important to being a Manitoban. Out of this diversity, the province, and we as individuals have grown, changed, flourished.

From the beginning the arts have been important in our lives. So, too, has the preservation of our history, libraries, archives, going back to the earliest days. Today, we have a record of those times, a record we can bring to life to give today's generation a taste of what it was to be among the first of our people to set foot here.

It was with these thoughts in mind that I not only wish you a happy Manitoba Day for tomorrow, Mr.

Speaker, but ask that you recognize and pay tribute to that diverse group of people who developed this land, created our province, maintained it, sustained it during its 114 years.

As well, I invite all Manitobans to join with me in reaffirming our affection, our loyalty, our dedication to this province. Let us celebrate with our hearts our collective history, our creative potential.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We, on this side of the House, of course wish to join with the Premier and his colleagues in recognition of Manitoba Day. We thank the Premier for providing us with this proclamation and these flowers in tartan that mark this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, certainly this is a time for us to remember our forebearers, the pioneers who sacrificed and put forth a great deal of time, energy and effort in creating the province that we all have today, that we all enjoy living in today. Although we are made up of people of many diverse origins and backgrounds, we certainly all can respect our different backgrounds and yet take pride in the things that have brought us together, to work together, to create a better future for our children and our grandchildren. Sir, as well, we take pride not only in the accomplishments of those who preceded us in this province, but also take pride in the things that we all wish to share and work together for in the future.

Birthdays are significant occasions always, regardless of whether they're the birthday of a province, an institution or individuals. I suppose individuals sometimes would prefer not to remember birthdays, but on this occasion I guess all of us would like to remember Manitoba and take pleasure in this occasion and certainly all of us on this side of the House would join with members on the other side of the House in inviting all Manitobans tomorrow to participate with us in saying, "Happy Birthday, Manitoba."

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to update the House on the status of Manitoba's oil activity during 1983 and 1984.

There are four areas which deserve attention - first, Wednesday's oil lease sale results; second, the release of our 1983 Oil Activity Review; third, Manitoba's current oil activity; and fourth, projections for 1984.

First, the results of the sale of Crown oil and natural gas leases held on Wednesday, May 9th, of this week. The sale was a great success, setting a new record average price per hectare of \$193.53 or \$79.41 per acre. The highest price of \$63,200 or \$790 per hectare, \$316 per acre, was paid by Tri-Star Resources Ltd.

and Beaverhead Resources Ltd., for an 80 hectare (200 acre) lease, in the Daly field located 19 kilometres west of Virden. The sale generated \$767,964.66 in total revenue to the province with 53 leases, covering 3,807 hectares. The corresponding sale last spring generated \$647,000, while the most recent sale last October netted \$454,000.00.

Although none of the leases offered at the sale were in the highly popular Waskada area, results indicate that interest is extending to other areas of the province, including renewed interest in the older established fields. Sixteen different companies successfully participated in this week's sale. The next sale is scheduled for October 24th.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the release of our 1983 Oil Activity Review brings encouraging news. Here are the highlights:

During 1983,¹ 247 wells were drilled in the province, representing the highest number in 27 years, and a 27 percent increase over 1982. This increase in itself is very promising.

Manitoba's oil production increased for the second year running to 738,000 cubic metres, or 4.65 million barrels, also a 27 percent over 1982.

The value of oil produced in 1983 exceeded \$152 million, a 52 percent increase over 1982.

Provincial revenues collected from the oil industry increased at \$21.7 million during 1983, up 26 percent from 1982.

Oil industry expenditures totalled \$114 million, up 38 percent over 1982.

Fourteen geophysical licences were issued in 1983. Seismic programs covered a record setting 3,875 kilometres at a cost of \$4.2 million, a 132 percent increase over the previous year.

Finally, in June 1983, the department opened a new district office in Waskada to improve upon our inspection and support service to the industry. I knew I'd get the other side clapping sometimes.

Copies of the 1983 Oil Activity Review are available from the Department of Energy and Mines Info Centre at Eaton Place.

Mr. Speaker, the third area is an update of current activity to the beginning of this week. I might add that all the signs are here for a productive year.

In drilling, 60 wells have been drilled, compared to 49 during the same period last year. Fifty-six of these or 93 percent have been completed as potential oil wells.

In geophysical activity, nine licences have been issued for seismic programs covering 919 kilometres compared to five licences and 753 kilometres this time last year.

In oil production, current levels are 2,200 cubic metres or 14,000 barrels a day, or 15 percent higher than at this time in 1982.

In gas activity, an official opening is planned this June for the Natural Gas Liquids Recovery Plant near Waskada. The plant is the first of its kind in Manitoba and recovers propane, butane and heavier liquid hydrocarbons from natural gas.

And lastly, the Waskada-Cromer oil pipeline is expected to be operational by late fall. As you know, Intercity Gas Manitoba Pipelines was issued a construction permit this past February. ICG has met with municipal officials in the areas to be crossed, and right-of-way acquisition is expected to begin shortly.

The line will be approximately 50 miles long, will cost about \$4 million to \$5 million to construct and will provide employment for Manitobans. As I emphasized in February, construction of this pipeline confirms our confidence in the future of the Waskada oil field.

The fourth and final area is a projection of oil activity for 1984. Our forecast, I am pleased to say, is nothing but optimistic. We are expecting activity levels to reach or exceed last year. Drilling for one should exceed 200 wells, meaning at least 150 new producing oil wells. Production should reach the 850,000 cubic metres, 5.3 million barrels mark or \$180 million for a 15 percent increase over 1983. Royalty tax and lease revenue to the province should exceed 22 million in 1984.

Furthermore, our good fortune does not end with Waskada. New developments have already taken place in Pierson, Tilston and Virden with exploration in other localities as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our review of 1983 and our forecast for 1984 speak clearly. Oil activity in Manitoba is no longer merely holding its own, it is actively progressing and holds promise for all Manitobans.

I would also like to table the Oil Activity Review for 1983 mentioned in the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's not always given to persons in public life to be able to witness and see the fruition of long-term policies that were put into place when that responsibility was theirs. The kind of announcement that we have this morning, however, is just one such case.

Let me say, it hinges on two particularly important decisions made by a Conservative Premier, by a Conservative Government. The first one took place when Premier Duff Roblin introduced the checkerboard system of buying oil leases of this kind. Prior to that time, the then Liberal Government was buying large tracts of land or was allowing oil companies to buy large tracts of land which would not have made it possible for the Crown and the people of Manitoba to have retained the mineral and the oil rights that we still have.

Mr. Roblin introduced what was referred to as the checkerboard system of purchasing oil leases and oil lands, which meant that in any given area, in any field, one could only purchase in a checkerboard pattern - quarter-sections of land were available for private sale, always retaining for the public a degree of interest in a given oil field. That was the first policy introduced by a Conservative administration back in Duff Roblin's days that made this kind of announcement possible, Mr. Speaker.

Of course, the second policy which most of us are more familiar with, having been part of that policy-making, was changing the business climate that makes it possible to see the kind of success that the oil industry now has in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I can only say with complete satisfaction that the programs, the policies that were made are working.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask, to the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, in the form of this statement, whether or not he, even in reading this statement to the House and talks about the activities

of 16 different oil companies in this province, whether it is really necessary at this time when his colleague, the Minister of Finance, is facing such heavy, borrowing responsibilities, whether the \$20 million for ManOil is really required in this province. When will ManOil come close to contributing the \$21.7 million in revenues that the private oil companies are contributing today, according to the Minister's statements, to the revenue of the people of the people of Manitoba? Let's forget the ideological rhetoric, give your Minister of Finance a little break and let him save and apply that \$20 million to other hard areas of concern.

Mr. Speaker, with this kind of increased activity, I would want to see a little bit more activity in the Department of Highways that we are just considering. If we're going to see this kind of activity in the southwest, then let's do the role that government ought to be doing. Build the infrastructure, provide the services, maintain the business climate to see that our oil industry can prosper.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have a number of visitors.

There are 50 students of Grade 9 standing from the Ken Seaford Junior High School under the direction of Mr. Zuk. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Labour.

There are 50 students of Grade 10 standing from the Nelson McIntyre Collegiate and from St. Bruno, Quebec, under the direction of Mr. Peckham. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health.

There are 80 students from Fargo High School, sponsored by the Optimist Club of Assiniboia, under the direction of Mr. Schellenberg.

There are 43 students of Grade 5 standing from the Precious Blood School under the direction of Mr. Wellbrenner and Miss Bouchard. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Health.

There are 27 students of Grade 11 standing from the Shaftesbury High School, under the direction of Mr. Semotok. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before proceeding with a question, I wonder if I could just offer, on behalf of the members on this side of the House, in a non-political sense, our congratulations to the Minister of Energy and Mines on the receipt of an award by one of the Ukrainian Cultural Organizations in our province last evening, recognizing him as a distinguished citizen of Ukrainian origin in our province,

who has achieved a number of distinctions, including among others, being the first Manitoban of Ukrainian descent to have been awarded a Rhodes Scholarship, so we on this side would like to congratulate him.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Unionizing of workers - IGA

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Labour.

I wonder if she could indicate whether or not she or any members of her department or the Labour Board have received any complaints about the aggressive tactics of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union in attempting to unionize workers at the IGA Store on North Main Street.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, I know of no complaints. They've gone to the Labour Board and I wouldn't see them anyway. I have no information on it.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that on a radio background program on, I believe, it was CKY Radio earlier last week, members of the staff of that particular store were quoted as saying that 40 of the 41 workers had signed a petition which, I believe, was forwarded to the Labour Board, requesting that the particular union involved cease and desist from its attempts to certify a bargaining unit at that store.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister would check with the Labour Board, and perhaps intervene to prevent this unwarranted harassment of the workers.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not intervene in the proceedings of the Labour Board. The Labour Board is highly trusted by both management and labour. They have rules of procedure and process and whatever goes before them, they conduct, they hear, and they make decisions.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that, as I say, it is indicated that 40 of the 41 members of staff have expressed, by way of petition, a desire to have the union stop their harassment; in view of the fact that among other things, it was indicated that members of the staff are being phoned at home on unlisted, private numbers by the members of the union in an effort to try and persuade them to join the union, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether her proposed new legislation would prevent this sort of aggressive harassment from taking place under the new laws that are being contemplated by the government.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, again this is obviously something, by the Leader of the Opposition's admission, that is before the Labour Board. With regard to his question about the contact of employees at home, that is the way that unions organize. They don't come onto the business property and sign people up during their working hours. They contact people individually at home.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, we are speaking about the proposals in the White Paper that the Minister brought forward and indicated would serve to create a better climate of relations between employees and employers in this province. My question to her is: would her proposed legislation prevent the unions from phoning people at home on private, unlisted telephone lines, in order to try and recruit them and sign them up for a bargaining unit?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not sure whether the question is asking for an opinion of the Minister, or whether it is in fact asking for a legal opinion of the Minister. Perhaps the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would wish to rephrase his question.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify, it's my understanding that the intent of the White Paper and the proposed legislation would be to create a better climate of relationships between employers and employees in this province. I am asking the Minister whether or not part of that proposal, part of the legislation that she will be bringing forward, would serve to prevent unions from phoning people at home on private, unlisted lines in a form of harassment and invasion of privacy?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is the same question. The same objection applies to it.

Adoption moratorium

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community Services.

Following upon questions I placed to her last Wednesday, with respect to the proposed adoption of a three-and-a-half-year-old girl that has been stopped by the Interim Board of Winnipeg Children's Aid Society, could the Minister confirm that there is universal recommendations among all the child care workers involved in this case - social workers, psychiatrists, doctors, child care workers recommending that this child be allowed to be adopted by her foster parents?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that case is before the court, so I don't think it's appropriate to comment on the detail here.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the matter is before the courts, and the fact that the

foster parents are incurring substantial legal cost, would the Minister undertake to investigate this matter and confirm that there is unanimous recommendation by all of the child care workers involved in this case, and that being so, and intervene in this case and ensure that the decision of the Interim Board of the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society, that this government appointed, is changed?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the board has the responsibility to weigh the evidence and to make their decision. The specific case, there is the right of appeal. That avenue of appeal is there through the courts, and that is the avenue they've chosen quite rightly to follow.

I think what's most appropriate for me as Minister at this point in time is to be silent on the specifics of the case.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister then supporting a decision of the Interim Board of the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society that flies in the face of unanimous and universal recommendations of all of the child care workers involved in this case? Does she support such a decision?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, boards in the child welfare system have the responsibility of weighing the evidence and analysis that comes from the staff, and then to make a decision. That board is acting according to its responsibility. It's not for me to make a judgment whether it's acted appropriately or inappropriately. It is my responsibility to appoint people who can bring the variety of concerns and perspectives from the community, and then to let the process of the board discussion and decision-making take place.

Careerstart

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, who I believe is responsible for the Careerstart Program. Has the government approved the hiring of two students by the Provincial Liberal Party?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to say I am no longer responsible for the Careerstart Program. I think it's one of the finest programs this government has ever put in place and I was very proud of it last year.

As the Acting Minister of Employment Services in the absence of my colleague, the information that the member refers to was in the paper and I believe that answer is given in the response of the Acting Assistant Deputy Minister in the paper. Yes, there are two Careerstart students hired by a non-profit agency, which is the Liberal Party.

I might add that both the opposition party and the government employ STEP students.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could then clarify her last comment. Were there

applications from the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party for students under Careerstart and can't she indicate how many they applied for and how many were approved?

HON. M. B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any applications, but I will take that as notice.

I see the Leader of the Opposition saying no, they didn't apply, I don't believe we did. We have access to students in the government program, which are the STEP students that we're all familiar with. The Liberal Party is not represented here and does not have that access.

Oil industry in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that during the last election the Conservative Party was saying that if the NDP came to power, the oil industry would enter a period of decline, could the Minister of Energy tell this House whether, in fact, that Conservative prediction has come true?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, that's a very perceptive and interesting question, but before I answer the question, I'd like to say thank you to the Leader of the Opposition for his ecumenical statement in respect to me earlier.

Now, yes, there were statements that if the New Democratic Party did come to office, the oil industry would somehow be undermined. That was the scare tactic that I think the Conservative Party tried to promulgate on the people of Manitoba. The facts, indeed, Mr. Speaker, prove otherwise and the facts that I read out this morning show clearly that the business climate in Manitoba after November 1981 has improved markedly with respect to the oil industry.

I don't deny that there are changes with respect to the agreements, and I don't deny that we, in fact, indicated policy changes ourselves when we came into office. I met with the oil industry, I met with the mining industry and I said that a past policy of compulsory ventures would not be the policy of the new New Democratic Party Government after November of 1981. I was told by the industry that they were very pleased with that statement, it marked a very positive business climate, and that they would be investing in Manitoba and showing confidence in Manitoba, and that has been proved correct.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I was only going to ask you to remind the Honourable Minister about our Rule Book with respect to replying to questions.

MR. SPEAKER: We have, in fact, passed Ministerial Statement, we are now on Oral Questions.

The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a follow-up question. In view of the fact that the oil industry is healthy now under the NDP, could the Minister of Energy tell us what role ManOil would have to play in that development?

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, firstly, the honourable member that is asking that question is on the Board of Directors of ManOil. Mr. Speaker, that kind of interplay is a clear abuse of the rules, particularly that of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order, on the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, very clearly the rights of members on both sides of the House are the same. Mr. Speaker, we had a Ministerial Statement this morning. We had the Member for Lakeside reply to it. Certainly, it was a significant statement to the people of Manitoba, and members opposite have just as much an opportunity to ask the Minister questions about that statement and the implications that flow from it as members on this side. I think it would be inappropriate for any member to want to deny another member to explore questions which flow from statements made in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Since the question asked seeks an opinion, perhaps the honourable member wish to rephrase it to ask for information.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

Diesel fuel - farmers

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Finance and would ask him, in light of the fact that farmers in Manitoba are now paying approximately 37 cents per litre for provincial tax-free purple diesel fuel, while other consumers are paying roughly 35 cents per litre for clear diesel fuel, which has an 8.6 cent provincial tax on it; in other words, since farmers are paying more for tax-free diesel fuel, then for regular diesel fuel, which has the 8.6 cents tax on it, I wonder if he could confirm to the House that the differential now is something like 9 cents a gallon. In other words, the tax-free fuel is costing the farmers 9 cents more than the fuel that has the 8.6-cents-a-litre tax on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for that question. He had indicated yesterday that he was going to be asking it. My department did a survey of service stations and fuel depots on May 7th and 8th of this year and it does indeed show that there is a significant differential; that is, marked diesel

fuel is selling at some stations for more than the taxed fuel. We have been aware of this problem for some time.

We have been in contact with the oil industry. I was just showing the Attorney-General a letter I had received from one of the oil companies - I just got it on my desk this morning - in response to a request from my department for the oil companies to ensure that the agricultural community shares in the advantages of price reductions, and unfortunately the letter contains a clause indicating that it is subject to The Access to Information Act and that it is not to be disclosed. I'm going to be asking the Attorney-General whether indeed we can, or whether this document is indeed a privileged document.

We are attempting to see what we can do about it. It appears that it is as a result of a price war in the retail field, which the oil companies have chosen not to carry on in the agricultural community, and the agricultural community is now in a position where they are not getting any of the advantages of the tax deduction that the province has for them.

It appears initially, Mr. Speaker, that there is neither federal or provincial legislation in place currently for us to deal with it, but we are looking at other ways, other methods of ensuring more fairness from the producers of oil to the producers of food in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see that the Minister is now aware of the fact that there is a discrepancy here. Now I would ask him if he would immediately implement a program which would allow farmers who purchased clear diesel fuel at a savings of some 9 cents a litre cheaper than the taxed fuel, allow them to claim a rebate from his department, allow him to claim the 40 cents a gallon back from the Provincial Government that the Provincial Government is now collecting on clear diesel. In other words, at a time when farmers are facing the pinch, will he allow the farmers to take advantage of this gas war and allow them to claim 40-cents-a-gallon rebate which this government is now getting on clear diesel fuel?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, let's make it very clear that overall in the province the bulk of stations are still selling gasoline to farmers - that marked gasoline or diesel fuel - at lower prices than unmarked, although there are several where that indeed is happening in the other way. We are considering a response to the problem. We are completely dissatisfied with the response that the oil industry has provided to us in the last month since we asked them to ensure fairness, and because they have not responded we are looking at ways of responding.

My officials tell me that the particular response suggested by the Member for La Verendrye, which we have under consideration, does have some drawbacks in that the oil companies - because as I mentioned earlier they have no legislation controlling any of their wholesale pricing mechanisms - could in response simply boost the price of clear diesel fuel, by whatever amount we provide as a subsidy, without doing the

same thing at retail gasoline stations and we would wind up then having simply put all of that money into the pockets of the oil companies and we're not going to do that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would confirm that by allowing, if they adopted the rebate system on clear diesel, they would pass on a substantial saving to the farm community without driving the price of this commodity up. What the Minister is advocating now is that the price be increased for all consumers in this province. Will he not instruct his department to simply allow farmers to claim the tax rebate, just the tax rebate, which is 40 cents a gallon on clear diesel and allow the farming population a well-needed break in taxation on fuels in this province?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It's pretty clear, Mr. Speaker, the member didn't understand what I said. What I said was that if we did precisely what he is suggesting, there is nothing to prevent the oil companies from turning around and boosting the price of diesel fuel, clear diesel fuel at bulk plants by 8.6 cents a litre, the same amount that we would have been providing back to the farmers, and we would simply be subsidizing the oil companies and that is exactly what we are not prepared to do. That is why I am telling the members and the House that what we are prepared to do is to look at other solutions, which will not put us in a position where we simply attack the problems from the perspective of cutting down on our revenues, without ensuring in any way that the benefit will be passed on to the farmers. Because the members talking are now saying . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the farmers right now are not receiving the benefits of the price war. What is there to make those people over there believe that they would receive the benefits of the price war, if we turned around and subsidized by another 8 cents a litre? That is incredible thinking and people on that side have also been saying something about the price at the pumps. Well, the price at the pumps, Mr. Speaker, even if it is lower, does not help the farmer because the farmer is in a position where most farmers, 90 percent of farmers in this province, are not in a position to be able to transport it from the pumps onto their farms, and so they are the captives of the oil industry. I don't want to be in a position where I'm subsidizing the oil industry in reducing taxation.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, two questions, Mr. Speaker. First of all, will the Minister confirm that a bulk agent can deliver purple or clear to any farmer on any yard and no farmer has to go to a retail outlet, that the individual bulk dealer can do that? And secondly, how can the Minister say that you are subsidizing the oil

company when you are allowing farmers to get a tax rebate? How is that subsidizing oil companies?

I'd suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the difficulty we have and the difficulty the farming community has is that this Minister doesn't understand what's happening there. We are just asking this government to give back to the farmers 40 cents a litre that they are charging them right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, my concern was that the member asked two questions and then proceeded after them to make a speech of several paragraphs, and it's certainly inappropriate but the member has ceased.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If there is to be a preamble to a question, it should by definition come before the question. The first of the member's two questions where it was on a matter not within the administrative competence of the government and hence is out of order. If the Honourable Minister wishes to answer the second question, he may do so.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first question, Mr. Speaker, is dealing with bulk plants. That's exactly what I had been talking about, Mr. Speaker. A bulk plant — (Interjection) — maybe the Member for Morris might explain it to the Member for La Verendrye - can charge whatever price it chooses for clear fuel, for taxed fuel and for the marked fuel, for the untaxed fuel. If we say to the bulk dealer - and it's not the bulk dealer whose fault it is, it is the oil company - we're going to have the same tax on the purple diesel fuel as on the clear fuel, no tax, that is, there is nothing to prevent the oil company from boosting the price of the clear fluid that they are then moving from the bulk fuel dealer to the farmer.

I would hope that the member would begin to understand that, because if he thinks that the market is working so well, Mr. Speaker, if he thinks that the oil companies are giving the farmers a good deal and that it's somehow the government that is taking advantage of them, Mr. Speaker, that is in fact a complete falsehood. It is the oil companies who are choosing not to pass along the 8.6 cent a litre savings to the farmer, but what the Member for La Verendrye is suggesting is an assurance, basically, that the oil companies make larger profits. The farmers are not going to benefit from it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it appears through the information provided and the questions asked by my colleague from La Verendrye, that there could be a possible 40 cents a gallon saving to the farmers on farm fuel, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the First Minister if he would immediately call the Agriculture Committee so this matter could be brought before it. The Minister of Finance could call or have

the fuel representatives brought before the committee to fully explain and point out if there is a possibility of 40 cents a gallon saving, which is a massive amount of money for the farm community; that the First Minister take on his responsibility and do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, regrettably the Minister has advised honourable members, truly, the facts of the situation. It's unfortunate that honourable members have not listened. If they would do a little more listening and a little less hollering and shouting and a little bit more homework they might, indeed, comprehend the responses that are provided to them by Ministers on the Treasury Bench, Mr. Speaker. It would be helpful, I think, to all members in the Chamber, if there was a little bit more listening, which we all should do from time to time, a little less hollering and honourable members would then not make the kind of requests that we've had from the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the question to the First Minister was, will he call the Agriculture Committee, so that listening and that dialogue and that information can be tabled publicly and the farm community can be assured there is, or there is not, a 40 cents a gallon saving which, in fact, could be going to his provincial government and not a savings to the farmers, Mr. Speaker? Will he call the committee so that it can be fully explained and understood? That is the process we're asking for, Mr. Speaker.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has clearly pointed out that the responsibility rests with the oil companies if, in fact, what the honourable members are asking for is that this Provincial Government use . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the question is very simple. Will he call the Agriculture Committee next week so we can resolve this issue and truly point out if there is a well-needed saving, that we can accomplish it for the farm community?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I trust I will be given an opportunity to respond and I would suggest that during the question period we attempt, when questions are asked, to provide opportunity for members to respond without having to holler to make themselves heard. I've noticed that that has been a practice which I don't believe contributes to positive debate in response to questions for information in this House.

The answer is, no, Mr. Speaker, because there is a responsibility pertaining to the oil industry in respect to this, and the Minister of Finance has outlined that very clearly, very directly, to members across the way, and I'm fully satisfied and convinced the farmers of this province know, if honourable members don't know, where the responsibility for the present situation rests.

Job creation - Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. Once again, this province has witnessed a substantial decrease in unemployment in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Labour to translate the statistics as far as percentages go, and percentage decreases for Manitoba, as to actually how many additional people are working in this province. How many new jobs have been created in Manitoba over the past year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Answering that question for my colleague, I can share with members the information that Manitoba's actual employed was up by 9,000 between March and April of this year. To give the actual statistics for the year over year, which I believe the Member from Inkster asked for, 19,000 compared to April 1983; 19,000 more people working.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Quite often we hear the relevancy from the opposition as to Manitoba compared with other provinces. Would the Minister compare what is happening with job creation in Manitoba, and compare the increase in jobs in Manitoba to that of Saskatchewan, and to some of our other western provinces?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is a sort of broad question that would be better dealt with in debate rather than the subject of an oral question.

Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then, very specifically, would the Honourable Minister compare, or give us the comparison between job creation in the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Saskatchewan over the past year?

HON. M. DOLIN: The figures in Saskatchewan on seasonally adjusted unemployed have always run around the 7.5 percent level, 7.5, 7.6, that sort of thing. They had experienced an increase last month but, when one compares the actual number of new jobs, people working that were not working a year ago, we find that in Manitoba we have the 19,000 jobs I mentioned in the answer to the previous question, that have been created here in Manitoba, and those are almost all full-time jobs, a tremendous increase in full-time jobs; and in the Province of Saskatchewan they have experienced a 3,000 job increase over the same period.

Diesel fuel - farmers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. In view of the fact that clear diesel

fuel contains a provincial tax of nearly 40 cents per gallon, would the First Minister instruct his Minister of Finance that farmers who find that the purchase of clear diesel fuel is more economic than the purchase of purple diesel fuel, that his Minister of Finance implement immediately the ability for farmers to apply for the 40 cent a gallon refund so that the provincial government is not the benefactor of this diesel fuel price war?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do have to ask you how many times can the same question be repeated?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Finance has refused to undertake the suggestion of my colleague of rebate of the provincial road tax on clear diesel fuel because he fears the oil companies will raise the price inordinately, will the First Minister instruct him to rebate to farmers the provincial tax charged, of 40 cents a gallon, if the farmers find that they can purchase clear diesel fuel cheaper than they can purple diesel fuel? The question is simple, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, may I ask another question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish honourable members would express the same extent of concern about the gouging by the oil companies and the responsibility for this situation by the oil companies. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat disturbing, I think, to Manitobans, to witness a double-forked tongue attitude of honourable members across the way. Mr. Speaker, not a whisper about gouging by the oil companies; not any question, Mr. Speaker, in respect to whether or not his is legitimate free enterprise practice, Mr. Speaker, but an anxiety on the part of honourable members across the way to ask questions repeatedly in this Chamber without really dealing with the basic root of the problem that is confronting Manitoba farmers at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. For the benefit of all members, Beauchesne's 357 (c) says that, "A question, oral or written, must not multiply with slight variations a similar question on the same point." There appears to be a certain similarity in the nature of questions that are being asked.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the First Minister instruct his Minister of Finance to stop gouging Manitoba farmers who are going to pay 40-cents-a-gallon road tax by exercising an option to purchase cheaper, clear diesel fuel than they currently have to pay for purple diesel? Will the First Minister

instruct his Minister of Finance to stop gouging the farmers of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I have just quoted to honourable members, that questions should not multiply with slight variations a similar question on the same point. The question is out of order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: I would just like your guidance. The question was put fully on the record. The honourable member had the opportunity to place a question which you've now ruled to be out of order on record, Mr. Speaker. Do I then have an opportunity to provide a response to a question which is fully put on the record, which you have now ruled to be out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The matter was ruled out of order because it has been asked with slight variations previously and the Honourable Minister had every opportunity to answer it. If a question is out of order, the answer to it is also out of order.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. For many years in the Province of Manitoba, farmers were allowed to claim rebate for the purchase of clear diesel. Will the Minister of Finance reinstitute that program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the member is well aware that if we were to institute that policy, what that would mean is that in times of price wars and non-price wars farmers would have to pay the full price for gasoline and diesel fuel, and then go for a rebate later on to the Department of Finance and I don't think that very many people would want that.

The members opposite don't seem to understand, when they suggest that we're gouging, that we have a system whereby two sets of diesel fuel can be sold from the same bulk station - one purple, one clear - that is, one taxed, one not taxed. It is the oil companies who are choosing not to send along any of the benefits of the tax deduction to the farmers.

That is, if a farmer purchases the purple gas, the Province of Manitoba receives no tax whatsoever, but where the farmer purchases the clear gas, diesel fuel, where we've added 8.6 cents a litre which the farmer need not purchase, what does the oil company do? Does it give the 8.6 cents off that we have reduced the tax? No, no. On the purple gas, they charge just as much. On the untaxed gas, they're charging just as much as on the taxed gas.

Now they are saying, well, maybe the oil companies just wanted that 8.6 cents. Maybe they wouldn't do it if we gave you 16 cents. Well I don't think that there's any evidence to show that the oil companies are going to be nice to the farmers of this province.

If the farmers of this province wish to choose to purchase non-taxed fuel, they're entitled to do that. If they choose to purchase taxed fuel then, as I say, we are looking at ways of ensuring that the oil companies will bear the burden of the difference rather than the Province of Manitoba, rather than the taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba.

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

The Honourable Member for Arthur on a point of order.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a non-political statement that I would ask leave of the House to make, please.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

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

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, last week I asked members to join me in wishing well the Collegiate of Deloraine and the members on the Reach for the Top team in Regina. I have just received a report that last night they won the National Reach for the Top contest.

They defeated New Brunswick, and I want all members of the Legislative Assembly to join with me, and I think give true congratulations to students who have demonstrated nationally out of Manitoba and my constituency that they are worthy of the kind of support that were given here from their parents and from everyone else and I just want that clearly on the record.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would you call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 2?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 2 - THE LOAN ACT, 1984

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 2, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say a few words to conclude the debate on this bill. Our side in a number of speeches has expressed our concern about the overall deficit of this government and the impact that is going to have on Manitobans, not today, but in the years to come. It is of concern, I believe, now not only to the Manitoba citizens but to citizens all across Canada. We notice that politicians right across the country of all political stripes are now expressing their concern about the high deficits and the borrowings of government as a whole.

My colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, has expressed our, I guess, most important concern, and that is the one of the nature of the loan. In other words, are they self-sustaining? One of the difficulties that many of us realize has faced governments in the last while is that, while borrowing to cover deficits, we have been borrowing money to pay off borrowings on former borrowings. So it's becoming a relatively ludicrous situation where we're borrowing money to pay off former borrowings. Mr. Speaker, that in the long run will catch up with us and that's why I believe that politicians all across the country are starting to worry about deficits, because there comes a time when the bill has to be paid.

We all know that if the government becomes too hungry as far as capital borrowing and deficit financing, it has a pretty devastating effect on the money marketplace. In other words, what happens is their demand for the money really means that it drives the interest rates up, because there is a certain supply and demand - there's only so-and-so much money that's going to be borrowed - and one has to really realize that in order to try and maintain the rates as low as possible, we should not be putting the tremendous strain on that market for government borrowings.

Of course, what has happened is that tremendous strain by all governments on the borrowing markets has driven up the interest rates and has slowed down, to a large extent, the recovery we have all been waiting for, because businesspeople are nervous about what is going to happen in the future if the rates continue to climb. Yesterday we saw another example of the rates climbing in this country by .5 percent which will further cause uneasiness in the business community who want to see this recovery happen, and who want to make large capital investments. So I say to the Minister that it is time that you really seriously watch and take stock of what your deficits are doing.

So the big question is: are these borrowings self-sustaining? Are they of a self-sustaining nature, or are we borrowing money to pay off the interest on loans that we've had before, because that in the final analysis will mean the ruin of this country?

So, Mr. Speaker, we assure the Minister of Finance that we will be doing what oppositions are supposed to be doing, and that's watching this borrowing very carefully. We will be monitoring this government's borrowing practices over the next while, and assure him that we do not want to see the government put this province into such a situation where we are going to, not only have a tax regime which is out of step with the rest of Canada, but also have deficits which are totally unacceptable to the people of Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple of comments to close debate. There had been some discussion a few days ago about whether or not the funds we are voting at this time were for self-sustaining debt or whether they were for current account programming. I just want to make it very clear that the

projects which have been included in Loan Act, No. 1, and in the Jobs Fund, specifically, because there was some reference to the Jobs Fund as being non-budgetary, were included as being non-budgetary on the basis of the best information available in terms of their long-term viability and self-sustaining nature.

Now, having said that, there is no question that any capital investment has an element of risk factor associated with it. As the members know, the marketplace both rewards and punishes risk takers, and it is incumbent on any government interested in the well-being of its people to take calculated capital investment risks. Of course, later on, with the benefit of hindsight, it will become easy for critics, maybe the odd cynic, to identify capital investments which are winners and those which are losers. We don't have the benefit of that hindsight when we are making the decisions, but we are using the best available advice.

Now just a couple of other comments, the Member for Turtle Mountain raised the issue of current account deficits versus total budgetary requirements and suggested that there wasn't really much of a distinction - and he refers to Alberta and Saskatchewan as showing a bottom line that includes both the current account deficit and the capital investments made by the province as being the deficit. He should keep in mind that was, of course, prior to the Premier's Conference, and it must be the case then, if that was the way they showed their deficits, that Premier Pawley demonstrated to them that their method of showing their deficits in the past had been wrong. In fact, I refer to one of the communiques issued by the Western Premiers, this includes Premiers Devine, Lougheed, Bennett and our Premier. They said on deficits, "The Premiers reiterated their commitment to controlling and reducing their deficits as the economy strengthens. They emphasized the distinction between borrowing for current expenditures, which must be systematically reduced, and borrowing for capital expenditures that increase the productive capacity of the economy." Of course, that's exactly what we have been saying all along.

So now we have a New Democratic Government here in Manitoba finally persuading the two Tory provinces next door to us that we were correct all along and, of course, the Socred Government that we were correct all along. Now we only have to convince the opposition in Manitoba, and I'm sure that won't take long now that all of their friends agree.

One other comment, and I'll end it with this, and that has to do again with the comments of the Member for Turtle Mountain who said that hospital expenditures don't add anything. We shouldn't show a hospital expenditure as a capital investment. Well that's an interesting concept, Mr. Speaker, and I can understand the logic of it. You say, well, nobody's coming in and paying you money when they get sick and so on. We have a system whereby people pay for our whole medical costs through the tax system, through their income taxes, through sales taxes, through liquor taxes. You know, we all complain about those taxes; we say that our liquor taxes are far too high. I believe we have some people here from North Dakota and I'm sure that if they go to the liquor stores here, they feel that the taxes may be somewhat higher than they would be in North Dakota. Of course, I'm not talking about the students. I am talking about the people who brought them.

You can say that they don't add a thing, those investments in our health care, but what is the alternative? The alternative is a much more expensive, a much less fair system of health care. Here every Manitoban is entitled to walk into a doctor's office and get treatment for free because they have paid for it in their taxes — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, you either pay for it this way, or you pay for it through private investment. You build up a private hospital and all of a sudden you have shareholders. They say, well, here's a private hospital, I can get a return on my investment of maybe 12 percent, maybe 14 percent, so people go and invest in that. Is that considered a capital investment? You bet, that is considered a capital investment.

Somehow when all of us get together and do it as a community so we don't get ripped off, so we don't have to pay the exorbitant costs you have to pay in a private system where there is profit involved then, all of a sudden, we wind up in a position where we shouldn't talk about our capital investment. That's what the Tories think about public investment. When the community-at-large does it, it doesn't count, it shouldn't show as a capital investment, it shouldn't show as something that we are doing for ourselves, for our children, for our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, we philosophically disagree with the opposition on that. I know we're anxious to get this bill passed so I'm not going to talk — (Interjection) — how do we get a return on it? Okay. I'm sorry. Now I'm going to have to deal with that a bit.

How do we get a return on that? We get a return on that by reason of the fact that we don't have to spend the kind of money on health care that you spend where you have a private system. Okay? As I indicated the other day, two years ago in the United States, which has a mixture of private and public and fee-for-service paid for medical care, on average there is \$7,000 per man, woman and child spent two years ago on medical care in the United States. Here in Manitoba, for a system that is totally accessible to everybody in the province, we are spending \$4,000 on the same basis now - \$4,000, much cheaper in a public system.

Now the investment we have is very simply an investment that puts us in a position where we don't have to go into that other kind of a system where we would spend more money, where we would have more paid in taxes. Just for example, let us take — (Interjection) — It's a tremendous saving, it is \$3,000 per family, and that's assuming that health care costs have not increased in the United States in the last two years, and I think that's a false assumption because, I think, they have increased. And that system does not provide equal access to everyone. So I think that that is an area where you have to look when you are looking at capital investment. We have no difficulty, no difficulty whatsoever, defending that kind of investment as capital investment. We will continue to do so in the future.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 2, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the same.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I move, seconded by the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of Bill No. 2, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same (Loan Act, 1984) referred for third reading.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of Bill No. 2, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same (Loan Act, 1984), with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

BILL NO. 2 - THE LOAN ACT, 1984

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee of the Whole please come to order.

We are to consider Bill No. 2, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same. Do you want to consider this bill page-by-page or clause-by-clause? Page-by-page.

Page 1—pass; Page 2—pass; Page 3—pass; Page 4—pass; Page 5—pass. Title - The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, before the bill is reported, the Minister of Energy and Mines is not in his place, but he did at the other committee stage where we had extended this questioning and debate on the individual items, the Minister of Energy and Mines did indicate to the House and to the members of the committee that the \$5 million item with respect to his department had to do with the Manitoba Government's obligations toward the various studies to bring about energy agreements, including the NSP, including the potential Alcoa agreement, I would just ask him to accept as notice that we would, at his convenience, find it useful to have that broken down somewhat more specifically. He did give us a range of activities that this \$5 million is going to cover, but perhaps as the time progresses, he could specify that a little more accurately for us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, if I could just get a clarification on that, because I came down when the member was in the middle of his question.

I can provide that information. Is he wanting it right now or today? I will take it as notice, but if you want it for my Estimates or something like that, would that be fair enough? Given the undertaking that I will try and break it down to the best of my ability without, in a sense, letting everyone know including potential

competitors or people with whom we are negotiating what we are allocating to this type of discussion or that type of discussion or another type of discussion. I will make it as specific as we can within the bounds of what I would call commercial confidentiality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Title be approved—pass; Preamble—pass; Bill be Reported—pass. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: I move that the report of the Committee of the Whole be received, seconded by the Member for Inkster.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READING

BILL NO. 2 - THE LOAN ACT, 1984

HON. A. ANSTETT by leave, presented Bill No. 2, The Loans Act, 1984, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few remarks on third reading of the legislation.

My concern is to attempt to watch some of the negotiations and some of the agreements that are made between the Federal and the Provincial Governments. I think it's very interesting and instructive to see some of the manoeuvrings and some of the public statements being made between Federal and Provincial Ministers and then to track it against DREE grants, shared-cost programs, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, my concern is based on the fact that the government appears desperate to succeed in the economic area where they have failed in some of the social and other areas of their responsibility. It's my concern, Mr. Speaker, that they are becoming somewhat like Faust who was willing to sell his soul to the devil. In this case, they are trading support on certain social and political questions in the hopes of an economic payoff, and the payoff, of course, would come by some return on their support for certain federal programs, and then the feds would then pump money into the province in the form of grants and other programs. So I would say that out of desperation springs a Faustian arrangement by which the Provincial Government is in bed with the Federal Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, we don't have to look much further back than yesterday, and I don't want to get into the details of yesterday, but I say, by way of observation, that the Attorney-General and the Minister of Justice clearly are working together in an attempt to promote a particular viewpoint in our province.

We see the Federal Minister painting a horrendous picture. Mark MacGuigan, who is campaigning for the leadership; Mark MacGuigan, who has been working

on the French language question from Day One with the Attorney-General; Mark MacGuigan telling everybody that the sky is going to fall down, running around like "Chicken Little," screaming and alarming everyone with the remote possibility that Manitoba's laws will be declared invalid, that it will cost a fortune to translate them and that it must be done within two years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we know that is what the Attorney-General has been telling us, and we know that Mr. MacGuigan is only trying to make the Attorney-General and his friends in the political arena of Manitoba look good. We know that they look bad, and we know that there's an attempt here to help the government, help the Attorney-General and then, of course, as a result of this, later on both helping each other, both on the same wavelength and so on, then we know what many people suspect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order related to your ruling, Sir, on Tuesday last, and the Citation in it to Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 338 (4). I appreciate that the honourable member wishes to debate on Third Reading of The Loan Act matters which may not relate directly to The Loan Act itself, and that's certainly been traditional that this debate is what we often describe as a cover-the-waterfront debate. Sir, that waterfront does not normally include matters which are sub judice and have been ruled by you, Sir, as recently as three days ago, to be sub judice.

Sir, to reflect on the reasons for positions taken in factums which have been filed before that court and the consequences thereof, is certainly a reflection on that matter and certainly, Sir, by any standard, borders on contempt for the Supreme Court of this nation. I suggest, Sir, that that debate is certainly out of order in this Chamber.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that my remarks are general and I believe that I'm not discussing the specifics of the case before the Supreme Court. I understand what the concept of sub judice means, but I simply point out, by way of comparison, that yesterday the Attorney-General of Manitoba made comments freely to the press on this question, was quoted on CJOB, was quoted in the Free Press, and appeared on CTV national television in terms of this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think, if it is reasonable for the Attorney-General to make some comments on this question, it is also appropriate for me to make some comments, as well.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. R. DOERN: I don't need advice from the House Leader.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I will review Hansard to see, in fact, what was said. There are rules against sub judice statements by members in this House and I hope the Honourable Member for Elmwood will keep them clearly in mind.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I will simply reiterate my main point, and that is that I am concerned about the fact that this government has, on more than one occasion, exhibited support for federal policies and I, for one, among many thousands of people in this province, believe that it is in the hope of a payoff in the sense of grants and programs and policies that will then be implemented by the Federal Government to reward the government for that particular support.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The allegation, Mr. Speaker, that certain policies adopted by this government were in the hope of payoffs in the form of grants, etc., is the imputing of motives to honourable members on this side and to this government. Furthermore, Sir, the honourable member is persisting to address the same issue, made disparaging remarks with regard to the point of order that was made addressing the Rules of this Chamber, and I suggest to you, Sir, that if the honourable member persists he should be asked to cease his speech.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

There is, within our rules, a clear prohibition against imputing motives to another member. I'm not sure whether that also includes another level of government, however, it would be safer if the Honourable Member for Elmwood chose his words with care so that he is not accused of imputing motives to anyone.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned all along with the performance of the government and, as I say, I believe it's founded on a desperation by members opposite to do something to catch the public eye in the hope of being elected. They're trying now the mega project route. That's the latest hope announced every few weeks, or every few months, a new mega project and then the public will accept that hope. Hope, Mr. Speaker, not necessarily reality, and take the public's mind off the day-to-day problems of the government; take the mind of the public off the concerns about the performance of the government and some of the damage that they have done. It is, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the 1984 Manitoba version of the old international version of taking people's minds off is to declare war against another country, or get involved in some military action against somebody else and then hope - like the Falkland Islands which helped

Margaret Thatcher get re-elected, like many other similar excursions, Mr. Speaker. So, in this particular instance, the government has come up with the brilliant concept of mega projects to sell to the public in the hope that the public will not focus on the incompetence of the government.

Mr. Speaker, the only problem with that is that none of the projects that have been announced by the Minister of Energy can be translated into practical terms by the end of the office of this particular administration, by the end of 1985. So, we're confronted in this province with announcements of \$3 billion hydro projects and \$300 million aluminum corporations and smelters and so on, but none of this will be concrete in the province. The best that we can hope for - and this is a terrible thing - is for the government to commit the province to these projects, regardless of consequences and then get that shovel in the ground, get that bulldozer working up there at Limestone, have a picture of the Minister of Energy somewhere in the Interlake or wherever, digging a hole so that the government can announce that they're well on their way to more jobs, and prosperity is just around the corner.

Mr. Speaker, they're replaying 1981 and they are putting the government on the line, backing a position that could not be sold in 1981, and giving up the ground that they held in 1981 to the Conservatives who are simply going to take the same arguments and the same approach and the two sides will clash once again, and the opposition will be successful and victorious once again. Well, they have another weapon in their arsenal to bring the government to its knees where it is now, or keep them on their knees.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that we have a responsibility here, on this side, to very carefully watch all the economic arrangements being made by the government, because the worst thing that could happen would be for those agreements to be signed and then succeeding governments have to stagger under the burden of those agreements signed by earlier governments. Although the New Democrats may sign the deals, the Conservatives who may follow in government, will be the ones staggering under the burden of those same arrangements. Of course, underneath both political parties is the taxpayer and the people of Manitoba who will have to carry that particular burden.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that we have very little confidence in the Budget, in the capital programs, in the economy. When I say we, I speak of myself and my colleague from Brandon West, who are from the fastest growing political movement in Manitoba, in addition to the Conservatives, in addition to the taxpayers of Manitoba, the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that no matter how much explaining the Minister of Finance is going to do, he's not going to explain away some of these problems.

He tried very hard a few weeks ago to explain that a \$500 million deficit was really some kind of a surplus. That was an incredible exercise. I sat here in awe of a man who would try to say that a \$488 million deficit was somehow or other, hard as it may seem to believe or explain, somehow or other it was a surplus; it was an investment; it was something to the credit of the taxpayers of Manitoba. Whatever it was, Mr. Speaker, it was not a deficit and that point was explained for 45 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say to the Minister of Finance, that in first year economics, those concepts are dealt with. Anybody in first-year Economics knows that what he described was a deficit. It was not a surplus.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Why do you lie about that? I never said anything about a surplus. Why do you lie about that?

MR. R. DOERN: No, I said, Mr. Speaker . . . now I'm going to have to debate the Minister who is standing in front of me.

The Minister implied, suggested, that somehow or other this was a surplus, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of language, that's the kind of approach that Orwell talked about in 1984, where you call war, peace and peace, war and you use terminology to explain things away. Double think and double talk and double speak. So, Mr. Speaker, that's what the Minister of Finance was giving us. . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying that you cannot explain away minus \$488 million. You cannot say that that is not a deficit. That is what the Minister of Finance said.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that it's very interesting to watch the government from this side of the House. I think my colleague from Brandon West and I have a degree of freedom and a perspective that is not available to anyone else in the House. We are free to examine the issues exclusive of party pressures and we are also free as Independents, Mr. Speaker, to make decisions free of federal obligations. Both the Conservatives and the New Democrats are, to a certain extent, damaged or under the burden or have an albatross around their necks because of positions taken by their counterparts in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, we are not burdened by that, and we are not obliged or beholden to anyone outside of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I think that probably concludes what I wanted to say initially, and I also would like to say to the members across the way, that I notice in recent times, there's a revival going on in the New Democratic caucus.

Since 1981, the name of Ed Schreyer has been rarely mentioned by the government. It was felt for a long time, Mr. Speaker, that it would be better off for the government - they would be better off, the Premier would be better off - not to mention the name of the former Premier. This had to be a brand new government, they had to make it on their own. They had to hold at arm's length some of the failures of the Schreyer Administration. There weren't very many failures. Mr. Speaker. It was largely a success story.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. R. DOERN: I heard what he said last night. He was speaking of the Attorney-General and he was speaking of the Premier and speaking of the various Ministers in the second row; people who have caused division in this province, people who have set back the Province of Manitoba and have introduced divisiveness into this province. I know who he was talking about, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say that it's very interesting to watch what has happened in the party and in the caucus and in the Legislature in regard to their leader, the Premier and the former leader and the former Premier of Manitoba, because from the moment that the Honourable Howard Pawley became Premier, it was an unwritten law not to refer to Premier Schreyer; to demonstrate that the party didn't need Ed Schreyer; that the party could stand on its own. That was one of the themes in Rossmere; that was one of the joys. Imagine, we celebrated in those days, when the Honourable Vic Schroeder got elected. How little we knew. How little we knew. Everybody rejoiced at the fact that he won a by-election.

Mr. Speaker, that was taken with great joy by the present Premier and the party, because to them it demonstrated that they could make it on their own and didn't need the help, or assistance, or name, or the magic, or the myth, or the charisma of Ed Schreyer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, years have gone by and the government has done extremely poorly. The government has disappointed, not only the people of this province, but the New Democrats who have supported them for decades. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is happening is that, all of a sudden, the name of Edward Schreyer is reappearing in this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, what has happened now is that the name of the former Premier is starting to surface once again and, if you were to translate this into stock market terms, this is how the advice goes - Sell Pawley and Buy Schreyer. That's the advice that they are getting from their brokers. In other words, don't talk about the present Premier; don't talk about the government's policies; try to reassociate and bring back the old magic from the old days, from the '60s and the '70s, when there was a good government in place, when there was a leader in place who had the support of the province, a lot of the province, most of the province but, in particular of course, had the support of the party members.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that it's very interesting to watch the revival of the former Premier's name and the former Premier's magic. I also note, Mr. Speaker, that, in my judgment, he was one of the finest Premiers in Manitoba's history. His name, Mr. Speaker, will go down with the great Premiers of this province and in modern times, meaning in modern times only looking back in the last decade or so, I think you will see that his name will go down with names like the Honourable John Bracken, the Honourable Douglas Campbell, perhaps Stuart Garson, Duff Roblin and Ed Schreyer.

I don't want to make a judgment on the Lyon administration or the Weir administration that were in our particular time, but I think that it will be true that when history is written that the Schreyer Government will prove to be one of the best of the 20th Century.

Mr. Speaker, this administration will go down as the worst in the past 65 years. I don't think there is any doubt that the present Premier will never measure up to the gentlemen that I have mentioned. So, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: How about Schroeder?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have already made my predictions on what will happen in the next election. I know, as everybody else knows, that the support of the government is hovering around the 20 percent mark and that the Conservative support in the province is over 50 percent.

I don't think that's a matter of opinion, Mr. Speaker, I think that's a matter of fact. The problem for the government is to try to elect a small core who will survive the onslaught because there is no question whatsoever that the government is going down. The only question, Mr. Speaker, is, how far?

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader that, by leave, Bill No. 2 be read a third time and passed.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe Her Honour will be here shortly for a Royal Assent, but I would ask you in the interim, Sir, to call the referral of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House. It may be we may interrupt that debate, if debate proceeds on that, momentarily unless members are willing to wait for perhaps five minutes so that we can proceed directly to the Royal Assent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on the point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, if Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor is intending to give Royal Assent to the bill within the next few minutes, I would suggest we sooner wait. It's somewhat difficult to ask a member to get started in a debate that I know he is anxious to commence, or either that, if we ask her to come in at 12:25, 12:30.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, we had originally hoped that the Royal Assent would take place at 11:30. Her Honour has been on call since that time, so if members are agreeable to wait a few moments, I believe, we can proceed with the Royal Assent and then proceed to call the next item.

Thank you.

ROYAL ASSENT

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS (Mr. Myron Mason): Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

Her Honour, Pearl McGonical, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne:

Mr. Speaker addressed Her Honour in the following words:

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of this bill:

Bill No. 2 - An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same (The Loan Act, 1984); Loi autorisant des dépenses en capital et l'emprunt des sommes requises à cette fin (Loi d'emprunt de 1984).

MR. CLERK: Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to this bill in Her Majesty's name.

Her Honour was then pleased to retire.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, it had been my intention to call the Rules Committee referral motion.

MR. SPEAKER: On the motion of the Honourable Government House Leader, the resolution as moved, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, by leave, I ask that the resolution stand in the Honourable Member for Virden's name. He indicated to me, though, he would have no objection to having someone speak. The Member for Virden is somewhat indisposed.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate then will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to enter into the debate on this referral motion today for a number of reasons.

First of all, I want to deal briefly with the subject matter of the resolution. This resolution purports to, and proposes to put a 15-minute limit on bell ringing, the first limit ever so imposed in this Legislature in its 114 year history. It is a limit, Sir, that I, No 1, question the need of. Having accepted that the government, in its majority, is going to, in all probability, force it through with their majority without consensus, which is a bad precedent in terms of making rule changes in this House, and I believe the first time that any rule change has been undertaken in this House without consensus. But, given that the government, with its majority, is bent on changing the rules, I suggest that a 15 minute time limit is too short; that if they're going to have a time limit, which I disagree with entirely, they should consider a slightly longer time period.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, they are putting you, Sir, in an untenable position.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: They are saying that the limit shall be 15 minutes unless we, the government, need more time, and you, Sir, are going to have to decide, in consultation with the Opposition Whip and with the Government Whip, whether the request by the government is a legitimate one for an extension of time beyond the 15 minutes. Because, Sir, there's no need for members of the opposition to ask for an extension of time because we can never win a vote. That provision is not for the opposition, Sir, because if some of our members are missing and if we wish to have it on the record, our Whip can stand up and say that my colleague, the Member for Pembina, if I were not there for the vote, was absent from this vote but would have voted against this measure or for this measure and we're on the record.

So this extension is solely for the government and, Sir, you as the impartial officer of this Chamber, the defender, I submit, Sir, and I maybe breaching parliamentary rules, but the government doesn't need you to defend their right, they have the numbers to defend whatever they wish to do. You, Sir, are here to defend the minority in this House, to protect their parliamentary rights. I believe, that this provision to come to you, Sir, to arbitrate whether the government should be extended a time limit beyond the 15 minutes puts you in an absolutely untenable position.

You, Sir, in your office cannot win with this provision because, if you grant it when the government could face defeat, the opposition and the people of Manitoba are going to say that the Speaker has not been impartial as his role dictates he should be. If you disagree with the government and, Sir, the government is defeated, it may be on a sizable enough issue that an election is called, the government which appointed you to your office is defeated and you are out office. It puts you an incredibly bad position and I don't think that any Legislature in the parliamentary system should place their Speaker, their chosen neutral senior officer of this Chamber in such an untenable position. You, Sir, cannot win no matter what decision you make on the requested extension by the government of time beyond the 15 minute limit.

It is a no win situation and, Sir, I sympathize with the position that it has put you in and I would not do that if I were a member of a governing party in this province. I would not, No. 1 bring in a 15 minute limit on bell ringing; and No. 2, Sir, I would not put you as the chief officer in this Chamber in such an untenable no win situation with, either the members of this House or the public of Manitoba; it's untenable, Sir.

Now, they say that the bell ringing can't go beyond 24 hours - well, I suppose as an addendum to a bad amendment why not put a 24-hour limit in. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, given that we're going to have to accept this amendment because the will of the majority is dictating it and is going to bring it in and are going to force it on this Legislature without consensus, without consultation, without agreement by all parties in this Legislature, including the independent members that are sitting in this Legislature; given that they're not going to listen to any change or any amendment, I offer a third suggestion and a third criticism. Once again,

I offer this suggestion on the basis that we should be doing nothing. But, given that we're going to put a limit on bell ringing, we certainly should exempt in that provision constitutional amendments because constitutional amendments, above and beyond all other legislative matters which we debate and consider in this Chamber, should only be passed with consensus on both sides of the House.

Even in the case that's been cited time and time again, even the Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, in his 14-year desire to patriot the Constitution from Westminster, did not do it without consensus of the opposition Progressive Conservatives and opposition New Democrats. But yet this passage of this amendment to our rules will allow the government to pass a constitutional amendment by simple weight of their majority. Had these rules been in place, Sir, the French Language Constitutional Amendment, as originally proposed by this government, would now be law in the Province of Manitoba when even the government themselves, on second thought, admitted it was a bad constitutional amendment and changed it.

So, Sir, if we are going to accept a bell ringing limit, which I disagree with, then please add a fourth amendment to the provisions 10(6) saying that this limit on bell ringing does not apply to constitutional amendments. Mr. Speaker, I am making the most sincere plea to members opposite that I can possibly make on this matter because the Legislature cannot operate successfully under these kinds of rules and the threat that these kind of rules impose on the opposition and, in turn, on the people of Manitoba.

Members opposite are not always going to be government, they're going to be in opposition and this rule which they are bringing in for their protection will be reversed on them, Sir, when they are in opposition. They have not considered that, Sir. That is why I say we don't need a bell ringing limit, and other speakers on our side of the House have said that, in the 114 years that the rules have existed in this House, there was never a circumstance in which bell ringing was abused; never. Not even during — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, not even during the Autopac debate on which an election was fought and the New Democrats were first elected, in which there was changes in political affiliation across the House to achieve Autopac, not even then did the members of the opposition use the bell ringing tactic to defeat the government. Mr. Speaker, do you know why they didn't use it? They didn't use it, Sir, because they weren't necessarily certain that they had majority public support on the Autopac debate. As much as the Progressive Conservative Party disagreed with Autopac in those days they didn't know whether they could defeat the Schreyer, the newly elected Schreyer Government, on that issue.

MR. BANMAN: On an election promise.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the second thing is that the Schreyer Government campaigned and were

elected to do that. So the opposition didn't ring the bells on the Autopac debate because the people of Manitoba weren't drastically opposed to it, and the government was elected to do it. Furthermore, if it didn't work out, Mr. Speaker, and it was bad legislation, it could be changed in the change of government.

But, Mr. Speaker, when did the opposition ring the bell, in both Ottawa and here? It rang the bells when a bad government, out of touch with the people, was going to rain irreversible damage on the nation of Canada and the Province of Manitoba. That is what this government was doing during the French-language debate. They did not campaign on it so it was not an election promise and 80 percent of the people of Manitoba were against what they were doing. Thirdly, Sir, it is an irreversible change they were making. That is the only time that bells have ever been rung in this province for prolonged periods of time and it was to stop a bad government from doing something they weren't elected to do, from doing something that was irreversible and bad for the Province of Manitoba that the majority of people were against.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how many times are we going to be faced with future bad amendments to the Constitution from a socialist government; from a right-wing conservative government that are going to be able to be forced through now with the passage of this law?

What happens - I'll put a speculation out to my honourable members - if an ultra right-wing organization achieves government in the Province of Manitoba? Not the Progressive Conservatives. They defeat the Progressive Conservative Party, they defeat the New Democratic Party, and we've got an ultra right-wing government in Manitoba. And that ultra right-wing government bans the Human Rights Commission, equal work for equal pay, all labour legislation, etc., etc., that they take away minimum wage provisions, that they abolish the health care system and the education system, and they do it with a 15-minute bell ringing limit.

Have the people of Manitoba been well-served by this amendment, Sir? No. Clearly, the answer is not. But why are we doing it? Because this government suffered the most ignoble defeat of any government in the Province of Manitoba in February of this year, and to patch their tattered, shattered and torn image in the Province of Manitoba, they are doing a rule change, saying that the parliamentary system was being compromised by such a change.

Mr. Speaker, this morning, on CBC radio, I heard two legislative reporters commenting on this. The one legislative reporter was objective about it; the other one indicated that this bell ringing was terrible because it was destroying the parliamentary system. The problem with that reporter, Sir, is that reporter is philosophically and politically in tune with the Liberals in Ottawa and the New Democrats in Manitoba. That reporter agreed, or believes, that bell ringing was wrong to stop the government not because of bell ringing, but because she agreed with the Liberal Government federally and the New Democratic Government provincially with what they were doing. She agreed with the issue that they were proposing; so, therefore, she had to blame the bell ringing for the defeat of the issue.

Now that person would be terribly embarrassed two-and-a-half years from now if we are government and

we were to come in and we were to make a change in the Province of Manitoba that was against the popular opinion of 80 percent of Manitobans, that was against the will of the people, that was not campaigned for, that reporter would be the first one in her column to condemn the Progressive Conservative Government for going against the will of the people, for doing something they weren't elected to do, and to use tactics unbecoming of a parliamentary democracy by ramming it through when that reporter is supporting what is going on to allow us to do that should we choose to do so when we're government two years from now.

Incredible, Mr. Speaker, how shallow some of the objective analysis of the media who formulate opinion in this province is. If they agree with the issue, they agree with the way to solve the problem but they haven't thought far enough ahead to consider the moment when they might disagree with the issue and hence have to agree with the bell ringing tactic to stop it. The other side of the coin isn't considered by some of these short-sighted people that comment on the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader asked me if I think it's a legitimate tool, and I want to tell him that yesterday he should have got the answer to that question because yesterday there was a vote in this House on the Attorney-General's salary reducing it to \$1, something that every member in the opposition would love dearly to do, including the independents.

We had that vote; it was a scheduled vote, Sir. The Government House Leader knew for two days that it would come up at the first moment Estimates were called, and their organization in that party did not allow the Government House Leader to communicate with the Whip to tell her to have the people here to vote on the Attorney-General's salary yesterday. So what happened, Mr. Speaker? The opposition was here with 22 members ready to vote well before the 15-minute time limit. Who didn't have their members here? The government, Mr. Speaker.

Here's the problem, Sir. You weren't in the Chair; it was the Deputy-Speaker. The rule says that Mr. Speaker, after consultation, can decide to extend it. If this rule was in place, the Attorney-General would be getting \$1 per year now because we had 22 members and, at the end of 15 minutes, you had 19 members here. The Attorney-General would be now getting paid \$1 because the Deputy-Speaker could not make the decision to extend the bell ringing by this amendment.

So what's the government solution going to be to that? Well, they'll bring in an amendment saying the Deputy Speaker can make the extension of time at the behest of the Government Whip.

Mr. Speaker, how many more examples of the foolishness of this amendment do we need when the first one has already proven the government wrong, has embarrassed the government, has shown they can't communicate between the Government House Leader and the Government Whip? They can't get their troops here.

Mr. Speaker, what happened to get on with the business of the House, because this is what the bell ringing is accused of doing. The bell ringing is accused by governments and their supporters like that reporter that was on CBC radio this morning saying that the bell ringing limit is needed so that we can get on with the governing of the province, get on with the business

at hand. Yesterday, when 22 members of the opposition were here to vote at the end of 15 minutes, and 19 government members were here, the motion would have been lost. But what did the opposition do? Four members left this Chamber so that the Attorney-General's motion would be carried by the government. And why did we do it? Did we do it because we loved the Attorney-General on this side of the House?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the answer is loud and clear. I was so angry yesterday when that happened that I could hardly talk. That is the most disgusting thing that has happened in this House. I would love nothing better than to have had that Attorney-General, with his political background, reduced to \$1 per year. I would have loved that, but we, in the opposition, made the conscientious decision that the government will simply ring the bells whether it takes a day, two days, three days, until they get enough members here to defeat the motion, defeat the opposition.

So to get on with the business of the House, the opposition accommodated them by four of our members leaving so the government could carry the vote and then we got on with the business of the House. That's what some ignorant proponents of this bell ringing limit are saying is the reason it should be introduced, to prevent opposition from stopping the business of government. Well, oppositions yesterday allowed the business of government to go on in the face of an incompetent government that couldn't get their people here to support their own Attorney-General.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to ask you how you would have decided had you been approached for an extension of bell ringing beyond 15 minutes to ensure that the Attorney-General got more than \$1, because, Sir, that would be asking you to pass an opinion on what you think of the political abilities and performance of the Attorney-General. That is exactly what I said in my opening remarks, it puts you in an untenable position, Sir. Yet, Mr. Speaker, these people are going to persist with their majority after being proved wrong yesterday that this is ill-considered, that this is stupid, unnecessary, not needed, the people of Manitoba don't want it, the opposition doesn't want it, but they're going to use their majority to ram it through like they would have used their majority to ram through the French language amendment.

Both are bad for the Province of Manitoba, both are bad for the parliamentary system; this government is bad for the province and bad for the people of Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, will these people, after being embarrassed yesterday, after having the fallacy of what they're proposing demonstrated in spades to them, — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, now you've got it. You've got this Little Lord Fauntleroy of a Government House Leader saying that he enjoyed seeing us leave. And why did we leave? We left to get on with the Business of the House, to get on with the business of the Province of Manitoba, that's why we left. And I tell you, Sir, if it had been the free choice of members of this House, including the people of Manitoba, the Attorney-General wouldn't even be getting a dollar. He'd be getting nothing.

We're admitting now, Sir, that we did make a mistake yesterday in walking out of the House and allowing the business to go on. We should have sat here, all 22 of us, for whatever length of time it took beyond the 15 minutes - whether it took an hour or two hours, a day, two days - for the government to drag their errant Ministers, etc., etc., back into this Chamber to save the financial circumstances of the Attorney-General.

So, Mr. Speaker, now having had the Government House Leader indicate how silly we were to do that, I can guarantee him that's exactly from now on what we won't repeat. And, Mr. Speaker, it won't be us in the Opposition that are holding up the business of the House, the passage of legislation, the consideration of Estimates, it will be the government, as was demonstrated yesterday; 22 members finally got here yesterday, after the 15-minute time limit and we would have beaten them, Sir, at the 15-minute time limit. If this rule was in place, the Attorney-General would be earning \$1.00 today.

Mr. Speaker, I think members of the government side of the House can in no way, shape or form justify this constitutional amendment. It is a way to save their political hides and their political hides only. It saved their political hide yesterday; it has been demonstrated that this 15-minute time limit won't work; it has been demonstrated yesterday that if the government is going to be defeated as they would have been yesterday; that they will approach you, Sir, and now they're going to have to bring in an amendment to include the Deputy Speaker, the Clerk of Committees, because they might be in the Chair when approached. They're going to have to bring in all of those additional amendments to this amendment to assure that government measures are not defeated, because the government is not organized enough to have enough people in here caring about the business of Manitoba to represent them as they are elected to do in this Chamber and that's what happened yesterday, Sir.

The disgraceful part about it is, is this ex-Clerk, who used to be a Clerk in this House and understood how the rules of votes are taken and understood the process of this House, who is now Government House Leader, did not even have the ability to communicate with his Whip and tell her that there would be a vote on the Attorney-General's salary.

So really, if you want to get technical about it, we bailed out this incompetent Government House Leader once again. That's who we bailed out. We saved him from the embarrassment of having the Attorney-General's salary reduced to \$1.00.

A MEMBER: Who's really running this House?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, surely objective observers of this amendment, surely objective observers of the parliamentary system, not those observers who agree with the amendment because they agree with the issue that the government was proposing, but the truly objective analysts of parliamentary democracy will say that such an amendment is not needed to preserve democracy.

Those objective observers of the parliamentary democracy will reflect on this from an historical perspective and they will say that limits to bell ringing

was probably the first major step to the demise of parliamentary democracy and to the introduction of tyranny in the parliamentary system. Tyranny by a temporary majority, Sir, will be the outcome of this kind of an amendment.

This will allow governments to do things, once elected, that they never promised the people, that the people do not want. Tyranny will reign; dictatorship will replace parliamentary democracy. It may only be a four-year dictatorship but it will be there, unless of course, as has been suggested by one of the people who so staunchly fought against the French language issue, that being one Herbie Schulz. He said, "We should stop the French language amendment because it's a constitutional amendment and irreversible." And he said, "What is to stop this gang of incompetent New Democrats who currently govern the Province of Manitoba, who know they are going to be defeated at the first call of an election, from passing a second constitutional amendment which says there shall be no more elections?"

There you have not a four-year dictatorship of tyranny, but you have a perpetual one, Sir, given to you by a 15-minute bell ringing rule. This has the finger prints, the markings and the blueprint for the destruction of parliamentary democracy and representation of the will of the people in this Chamber, by all parties, opposition and government. There are no other forms, Sir, other than bell ringing, to stop a government from doing something against the will of the people; and if the government is doing that, they should be stopped, they must be stopped, they have been stopped under the existing rules.

Ordinarily, Sir, when those circumstances appear in this Chamber, the honourable thing for governments to do is to call an election and see if the people really agree with their program; but this government knew

they were wrong, that the people of Manitoba were against them and they didn't have the courage to call an election on the principles of what they were proposing. Instead, we see their principle now being rammed down our throats, killing democracy, killing parliamentary representation by a 15-minute bell ringing limit. That is what they are doing.

I ask you, Sir, before I sit down, is democracy served by this amendment and, Sir, the people will say no. In the next election they will say no in spades, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 12:30 in Private Members' Hour, will the Honourable Member for Pembina indicate whether he has completed his remarks?

MR. D. ORCHARD: What time do I have left, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has 10 minutes remaining.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I haven't completed my remarks, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The next time this motion is before the House, the honourable member will have 10 minutes remaining.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe there's a disposition not to proceed with Private Members' Hour today and I would, therefore, move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday afternoon.