

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 2 March, 1982

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. ROLAND PENNER, Attorney-General (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, with leave, I beg to file the report of the Board of Internal Economy Commissioners for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1981.

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

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before I reach Oral Questions, there is a group in the public gallery from the Red River Community College Adult Education at Selkirk. This is a group of 12 adults under the direction of Mr. Hildeburn. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, the First Minister.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

## HANSARD CORRECTION

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, before making my first question, could I make a correction to an inadvertent slip which appears in Hansard and which I made yesterday in the course of my remarks. When I very inadvertently referred to The Honourable Member for Kildonan, what I meant to say, the Honourable Member for Concordia. It was not the Honourable Member for Kildonan who made the interference to which I responded and I am quite happy to make that correction and to advise the honourable lady that I was not referring to her in jest or disgust at all; it was rather to her colleague who deserved it.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Could the First Minister advise the House of what communications he or his government have made directly to members of the Congress of the United States to apprise the members of that body of what I hope will be the continuing position of objection of this administration to the Garrison project?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that would be a matter that would be more proper for an Order for Return.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, on a matter of the urgency on Garrison, I would think that the First Minister of the province would know whether he or any of his Ministers have had verbal or written communication with members of the Congress of the United States on one of the greatest topics affecting the environment in this province. Surely he doesn't have to wait for an Order for Return for that kind of information.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable First Minister, there has already been a great deal of initiative on the part of this government pertaining to our concerns pertaining to Garrison. First, I am advised that there, indeed, has been deputy ministerial visits to Washington pertaining to this subject which is of great concern to Manitobans. This very day my Minister of Northern Affairs, my Minister responsible for resources, is in Ottawa meeting with the Minister responsible for Manpower and the Minister responsible for External Affairs dealing with matters pertaining to the Garrison, in order to ensure that we do indeed come up with some positive measures that will bring about some improvement in Manitoba's position, comparable to that which it has been in the past in relationship to the Garrison.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, while welcoming the assurance that the Honourable First Minister has given that the traditional bipartisan policy of this Legislature will be continued and effectively continued I hope with respect to communications with the U.S. Government Executive and with the Members of the Congress. Can the First Minister respond, in particular, to the question that I asked at the beginning; have he or members of his Treasury Bench had direct written or oral communications with Members of the Congress — I'm not talking about bureaucracy, with members of the Congress — as the previous government did on a number of occasions and as indeed members of the Schreyer Government did on a number of occasions?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and I want to indeed congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for now shifting his stance. A few months ago, the Leader of the Opposition indicated he was taking the word of the American Government. I am now pleased to see that he is anxious to see action take place. I understand that there has not been any correspondence by the appropriate Minister to congressmen or senators in the United States; I am also advised of course that the reason for this is very clear, up to this point there has been no vote in the Senate or in the Congress of the United States since the swearing in on November 30th. It is my understanding from the appropriate Minister there has been no correspondence.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister telling the people of Manitoba that since the 30th of

November his government has not made any formal comment to the government and to the members of the Congress of the United States, with respect to Garrison, in view of some of the ominous occurrences that have been occurring south of the border and while he has been talking up here about establishing an office in Washington, is he really serious when he tells the House that he has not communicated the position of the Government of Manitoba on these matters to members of the Congress of the United States?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled by the kind of reaction that we are receiving from the Leader of the Opposition, it is in sharp contrast to last year. There has been indeed correspondence with officials in Washington; there has been no correspondence with Senators or Congressmen and the reason, of course, is quite apparent and quite clear there have been no votes in the American Congress in the past three months. On the other hand, unlike what has taken place in the past there has been a great deal of initiative, I've made reference to the Deputy Ministers visit to Washington; there has been a great deal of official contact; there has been ministerial contact in respect to the External Affairs Minister this very day; and in addition, Mr. Speaker, we are insisting that there be a more activist approach than what has been taking place during the past number of years on the part of the Manitoba Government, and that is the very basis, Mr. Speaker, for the discussion.

The House Leader talks about writing letters. Mr. Speaker, what is more important than writing letters is direct and clear indication of the position of Manitoba, face-to-face encounters, the establishment of procedures and processes that will better contribute to the prevention of the damage that could result from Garrison in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, while we are happy indeed to know that the Members of the Government are having exploratory discussions with the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa the problem does not reside in Ottawa; the problem resides in Washington. And how can the First Minister of this province stand before the people of Manitoba, after three months of a new administration, and say there's been no direct contact with the politicians in Washington who are making the decisions which are ominous to the environment of Manitoba, and they sit here talking about setting up an office? What sort of a government have we got, Mr. Speaker, or have we got one at all?

**MR. PAWLEY:** The Leader of the Opposition, it seems to me, protests too loudly. It was the Leader of the Opposition last year, Mr. Speaker, that assured the people of the Province of Manitoba that he had received adequate assurances from the American Government. Now we hear, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition propounding at great length as to actions and efforts that should take place, regardless of the stance taken last year by the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I have listed at length more activity in the past three months that's been taken by the new government than, I believe, has taken place during the process of four years under the former government.

**MR. LYON:** For the record, I am merely saying to the Honourable First Minister and asking him to confirm — which he has already confirmed and which is shocking — that the Government of Manitoba has not made any direct communication with the Members of the Congress of the United States, which the previous government did on a number of occasions, and for which we were chastised by the then-critic for the New Democratic party in opposition.

Now, that being the case, Mr. Speaker, let me ask another question of the First Minister. We notice that the Government in Ottawa, at this meeting that the First Minister is talking about that is taking place today, is going to be asking the Government of Manitoba not to open a provincial office in Washington, which would be contrary to the election promise made by the First Minister. Will the First Minister tell the House and the people of Manitoba whether this is another election promise that he intends to break, or whether he's going to knuckle under to the Federal Government, and to Mr. Axworthy in particular, who says that this will be a test of this government's willingness to be a doormat to Ottawa?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to join in the kind of practices that have been commenced by the Member for Fort Rouge, the Minister of Immigration, by publicly commenting an issue that's under review and discussion today, and I don't intend to join with the Leader of the Opposition in sabre rattling until we receive a report from the two Ministers who are indeed meeting with the Minister of External Affairs and the Minister of Manpower.

It seems to me the Leader of the Opposition has forgotten as well that this government has, in addition to the items that I've mentioned, established a special unit in the Department of Natural Resources; in addition an office has been set up in respect to the anti-Garrison lobby group, office facilities have been made available. It is my understanding that the Leader of the Opposition and the House Leader, when previously in government, refused all these requests. So, Mr. Speaker, we want to list concrete efforts that have taken place in the last three months. We are very very proud to list those items, to repeat those items, for the attention of the Leader of the Opposition and for the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, who did have responsibility for this important area in the past and, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, didn't do as much as indeed was warranted under the circumstances.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Honourable First Minister is so proud of a non-existent record with respect to Garrison, would he then take the friendly advice that I offer him across the House, and that is to immediately convey to the Members of the Congress of the United States of America the stance of the Government of Manitoba with respect to Garrison Diversion, and our unalterable opposition to any progress being made on that diversion because of the impact it will have on our environment; will he do that one simple thing, rather than fuss around about special units in his departments and so on, do that to get to the horse's mouth and let them know what the position is of this province?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this certainly again does sound strange coming from the Leader of the Opposition in view of his assurances, after his meeting with the Ambassador and other officials last year, at a public press conference, as to the lack of any need on the part of Manitobans to have concern. Mr. Speaker, this government will do that which is necessary to ensure that there is a strong presence felt in Ottawa, that there is a powerful message felt in Washington, so that indeed the environment of the Province of Manitoba can be protected from the adverse effects of Garrison.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Could the Minister of Finance confirm that his government has borrowed \$75 million from the Alberta Heritage Fund at an interest coupon rate of 15.75 percent being sold at \$99.82 to yield the investor 15.8 percent, and if so, when was that loan taken out by the New Democratic Party Government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. VICTOR SCHROEDER, Minister of Finance (Rossmere):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That loan was agreed to about four or five days ago with the Heritage Fund. I believe that the numbers outlined by the Leader of the Opposition are correct; the money will be drawn down I believe somewhere around the end of March 1982.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance be prepared to tell the House whether he considers this a good loan for the people of Manitoba?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** The Leader of the Opposition knows that when you have a deficit in the area of \$300 million, and when you don't have a printing press you have to borrow money. This was one of the areas in which we have the good fortune, Mr. Speaker, of having some money. There are very few provinces in this country that have that kind of a fund available. Those provinces which had that fund available, and which are prepared to lend us the money at just under the going Canadian rate without us being required to pay any of the service charges which we would have had to pay had we gone to New York, as the previous government and governments before them have paid to any other particular areas where we might want to borrow money, the rate for Canadian money was certainly a satisfactory rate. It's a rate that is identical to the rates at which other provinces were borrowing at the same time. Now, a couple of months before, had we agreed to take the money when it was first offered, we would have paid considerably more in interest rates so we have in fact saved money by waiting until the last moment to get that particular fund.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the honourable member and other colleagues of his, including the First Minister, when the previous government used to make such loans from the Alberta Heritage Fund, would characterize the position of the then government as being, as I recall, in the lap of Premier Peter Lougheed of Alberta, would the Minister of Finance care to describe to the people of Manitoba what the attitude is of this socialist government now

that they have done precisely the same thing because it is in the public interest?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** I think all you understand, Sir, is noise. The Leader of the Opposition is asking whether we are in somebody's lap; I thought we were in their wallet.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, the question is very simple. In view of the fact that the Honourable Members of the New Democratic Party used to howl about the previous Government of Manitoba being somehow under the thumb of Premier Lougheed of Alberta when they made such loans, would the Minister of Finance tell the House today whether he has changed that rather childish view that he and his colleagues used to have?

**MR. SCHROEDER:** —(Interjection)— As one of the honourable members has suggested we were not bought with that money. I should also say, Mr. Speaker, that there may be one other difference, and that is, that in this administration we don't assume that we have this vast group of capable people in the Department of Finance and we won't listen to their advice. We listened to their advice, we listened to their advice on this particular loan and we have listened to their advice on other matters and we will continue to listen to their advice. We don't believe that just the minute one puts on the hat of a particular ministry that one becomes a complete expert at everything involved in that ministry. We have people who have devoted their lives to financial analysis and we take advice from those people, as we properly should as trustees for the people of Manitoba. That is a problem that those people don't seem to understand, Mr. Speaker, they seem to think that the minute they get into a position they are instant experts and don't listen to expert advice.

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

**MR. G.W.J. (Gerry) MERCIER, Q.C. (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Attorney-General. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Attorney-General has revoked the appointment of Mrs. Beverley A. Scott to the Law Reform Commission and, in view of the fact, that he has written to her and stated as follows: "Although your term of office as a commissioner would not normally expire until March 5, 1983 I have decided that it is an opportune time to make one or two changes with respect to those positions held by non-lawyers. Accordingly I have recommended to Executive Council, and Executive Council has agreed, to revoke your appointment forthwith. I do wish to stress that this is in no way a reflection of your capabilities, indeed the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Edwards, has spoken very highly of your contribution." My question to the Attorney-General is, in view of his statements, can he offer any explanation to this House for this action other than purely partisan

political motives.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. PENNER:** First of all, with respect to the imputation of partisan political motives, I reject that utterly and am critical of the former Attorney-General for even suggesting that. If he would pay attention, and it wouldn't hurt him to do so, as to the composition of the Law Reform Commission of Manitoba, he would note that there is not one person on that commission, with respect to whom any imputation of narrow partisan politics can be made, not one. I took very great care, with respect to that commission because it is a commission that is not delivering programs on a direct basis, to preserve its integrity and I have preserved its integrity. The point that I made to Ms. Scott, and I've amplified it in the subsequent correspondence in answer to her letter which she has taken pains to deliver both to the press and to the former Attorney-General, in answer to her letter I pointed out to her that the two lay persons appointed by the previous government did not, in my view and the view shared by Executive Council, have the kind of connection with disadvantaged groups in the community that I thought necessary to round out the Law Reform Commission; and so I appointed Sister Geraldine MacNamara, the Executive Director of Rossbrook House, who has those qualifications, and I and Executive Council appointed Ms. Anne Riley who also has those qualifications. When I said to Ms. Scott, and I have no hesitation in repeating it in this House, that this was not to question her competence, indeed it was not to question her competence, but she did not have the particular competence I felt was needed. I left, for example, on that Board, Knox Foster of Aikens MacAuley, a litigation lawyer, because I wanted that competence on the Board. I didn't question his political background, a political background perhaps more familiar to members opposite than to me. Indeed, I daresay it would be. So that I am rejecting the imputation, I think it is scandalous that the minister would raise that with no more basis than a letter from someone who is, quite naturally, and I appreciate the fact, disappointed that she no longer sits on that Commission.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my question was raised, not because of a letter from Mrs. Scott but because of a letter from the Honourable Attorney-General to Mrs. Scott. My supplementary question to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that a competition was held for the position of Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission last fall and in view of the fact that a selection board, comprised of Mr. Paul Hart from the Civil Service Commission and Mr. Pat Sinnott from the Attorney-General's department and others, unanimously recommended a Mrs. Mollie Robinson for the position of Executive Director of the Human Rights Commission, and she being subsequently offered that position and accepting it, can the Attorney-General offer any explanation again for not accepting that recommendation from the Civil Service Commission and causing a readvertising for the position?

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, since Ms. Mollie Robinson, indeed at my suggestion, is one of the applicants in the new competition, it would be extremely inappropriate for me to comment on that application, other than to say that the reason why I felt it necessary to have a new competition is what I felt to be a conflict of interest; and the conflict of interest was this — well, if the Leader of the Opposition will listen he will get an answer to his implied question — that Ms. Robinson was a member of the Board which, in effect, chose Ms. Robinson, and I did not think that that was proper. Now, maybe my notion of conflict of interest is different from the former Attorney-General's but I honestly believed that it would be inappropriate to allow that competition to go through and hence there is a new competition in which Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Hart and three members of the present Board act as the referees and those that will select, and I assure the members opposite that the nominee from that selection committee will be recommended by me to Executive Council.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the selection board did not have Mrs. Robinson on it and it was comprised of Mr. Hart of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Sinnott from the Attorney-General's Department and three other persons from the Human Rights Commission, can the First Minister confirm the position he will recommend to his Cabinet colleagues with respect to his recommendations from the Civil Service Commission and the position he and his Cabinet colleagues will take with respect to revoking appointments before their expiry date.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this question is directed towards the Attorney-General and it is appropriate that the Attorney-General will respond to this particular question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**MR. PENNER:** What was the question?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my question was to the First Minister. My question to him was in view of the fact that, contrary to the statement of the Honourable Attorney-General, Mrs. Robinson not being a member of the Selection Board, would he confirm the government's position with respect to recommendations from the Civil Service Commission and with respect to revoking appointments before their expiry date?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Norbert obviously hasn't heard well the answer by the Attorney-General, I think an answer that explains very well the appropriateness of the action that he took, and I fully endorse the action that was taken by the Attorney-General.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Would the previous questioner please Table the letter from which he quoted?

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. ROBERT (Bob) BANMAN (La Verendrye):** Thank

you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the First Minister. In light of the rate freeze on bus fares that was announced in the Throne Speech, I wonder if the First Minister of the Province could inform the House whether or not that rate freeze will apply to Handi Van services for the handicapped in areas such as Steinbach and, I believe, The Pas and other rural areas.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that certainly fits better under discussion of Estimates.

**MR. BANMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that many of these Handi Van services which are servicing the handicapped people in rural Manitoba are facing budgetary problems at this time of year and are going to their respective municipalities asking for more money, will the First Minister of the Province tell the people in rural Manitoba that the same things that are happening in Winnipeg, the benefits that are being passed on to Winnipeg residents, will be passed on to the handicapped in rural Manitoba?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, obviously the Member for Laverendrye is somewhat concerned that this government saw fit to freeze fare increases, insofar as transit riders in the City of Winnipeg, unlike what happened this past year in the City of Winnipeg in respect to transit fare increases during the year 1981. The matter, insofar as the other areas that the honourable member has raised, can be more appropriately and in more detail dealt with under the appropriate sections under the Estimate Review.

**MR. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, without accepting the motives that the First Minister wants to tag onto my question, I want to ask him again, will the First Minister assure the residents of rural Manitoba that they will receive the same treatment as the people in Winnipeg do? In other words, do the people that are using these handicaps services, will they be asked to increase their rider costs while their fellow Manitobans will have their rates frozen? Are you going to treat rural Manitoba the same way you're going to treat Winnipeg residents?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, again we are placed with the same question for the third time basically. The Estimates are going to be distributed next week. There is ample and appropriate opportunity for discussion of those estimates pertaining to this line and I'm not, Mr. Speaker, going to debate the Estimates during Question Period, even prior to the Tabling of the Estimates.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy and Mines. Is the Minister of Energy and Mines planning to address the Mining and Metallurgy Association tonight? My question to the Minister is, does he plan to make any policy statements tonight?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I will be delivering an address to the association tonight and I'm certain that if the former Minister is interested in finding out what I have to say I certainly invite him to attend the gathering this evening.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House is sitting and that policy statements are normally, traditionally and out of courtesy made to the House before they're released to the public, does the Minister plan to make any policy statements at that meeting tonight which have not already been made to this House?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Member for Turtle Mountain to come to that gathering since he seems interested and hear what I have to say and determine whether, in fact, there is any major changes in policy or whether there aren't changes in policy, or whether in fact I'll be talking about the state of the mining industry, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. LYON:** On the point effecting the privileges of this House, I think, Sir, that you may be called upon to indicate to the honourable member of the Treasury Bench who has just spoken what one of the fundamental rules of this House is. He was asked very courteously whether or not it is his intention to make a statement of new policy to an outside group tonight while this House is sitting, and he's attempted, by subterfuge and other means, which we're not unaccustomed to find in his responses, to dillydally around the point. My point very simply is that you should advise the Minister, Mr. Speaker, that statements of policy when this House is sitting are to be made first in this House, not to outside bodies. Realizing, as we all do, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order, please. I rather doubt that the word "subterfuge" which was used by the Leader of the Opposition against one of the Members of the Government benches is entirely in accordance with our lawful procedures. I would ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to give further consideration to that point to see whether it is the sort of language that he ought to be using within the House.

The Leader has brought up the question of whether a question has been answered to his satisfaction in this House, and he knows well enough I am sure that whether or not a Minister answers a question is entirely up to that Minister and that the questioner does not have to be satisfied with the answer that he gets.

Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to restate his question?

**MR. LYON:** No, Mr. Speaker, I was not rising on a question, I was rising on a matter that potentially affected the privileges of this House and asking for reassurance from you, Sir, as the chief presider of this House, that it is the traditional practice of any govern-

ment in the parliamentary system that, if there are statements of policy to be made, those statements should be made to the House first, and we merely wish to have that point underlined for the education and elucidation of my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Energy so that he may be guided by that good traditional point of procedure while he goes about his business tonight. And to warn him, Mr. Speaker, as I think you should that, if he makes speeches outside of this House on matters affecting the policy of the government, that he is then in breach of the privileges of this House; that's all I'm asking you to do, Sir.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on that point of order and comment that the Leader of the Opposition seems rather frantic. It would seem that the Conservative knives are out to get him already and he's trying to prove his point in a rather frantic manner. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is indeed trying to anticipate what I'm going to say tonight and I think it's only a courtesy to the group that I'm going to speak to tonight to speak to them, rather than preview my speech here in the House. To the point of warning, which I find surprising from the Leader of the Opposition who, in the past, was the Premier of this province who, frankly, flagrantly breached the warning that he is giving to me; where he, time after time after time, and his Ministers, time after time after time, made very formal public statements, especially regarding the constitution, Mr. Speaker, without consulting this House, without making those statements in this House, and now he has the audacity, Mr. Speaker, to get up and make comments like that.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I doubt whether either member had a matter of privilege or a point of order. May we proceed with Oral Questions?  
The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I would ask the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy to name those Ministers of the last administration whom he has said breached the privileges of the House by time after time after time making policy statements outside this Chamber. — (Interjection)— The First Minister suggests to me across the floor, Mr. Speaker, check back in Hansard. I don't have to check back in Hansard, I'm one of 57 members of this House protected by the Speaker and I've raised a point of privilege asking the Minister who just spoke to back up those charges or withdraw them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I believe the honourable member who has just spoken recalls from previous sessions that matters of privilege ought to be ended with a definitive motion made to the House. Since there was not one made I cannot consider that a matter of privilege. It may well be a point of order that the Minister may well wish to reply to.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, in due course I'll go through Hansard and I'll supply the instances and the files. Mr. Speaker, there were instances, we all know over the last four years, we had instances regarding

the constitution where a number of statements were made; we had instances where the Attorney-General took positions with respect to policy; we had instances where Ministers were rebuked for having made a statement outside and then come in and done it. I'm going to be making a speech tonight, Mr. Speaker; that's all I'm doing, I'm making a speech. What the honourable member is trying to do is anticipate what I'm going to say. I've asked him very cordially, "please come; determine whether in fact, there is a change in policy," because frankly, there may not be a change in policy, there may be. In terms of my opinion, we'll have to see what it is tomorrow. Please come out.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and I would hope that he hasn't donned the cloak of arrogance that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy has, and we could get a straightforward answer from the Minister to enlighten the farm community and the people of Manitoba. In view of the fact that he is supposed to have introduced an Emergency Interest Relief Program for the farm community of Manitoba, one of their top priorities, could he tell this House and the farm community of Manitoba how many farmers have received interest relief under that program to this date?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. BILL URUSKI, Minister of Agriculture (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, I can tell the honourable member that we are concerned about the situation that farmers, small business people and homeowners have been placed by the onerous interest rate policies of the Federal Government, interest rate policies which your administration supported. We are concerned; we've had approximately a thousand enquiries from the farm community in this area and there have been approximately a dozen recommendations for approval, at this point in time, to the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Province of Manitoba has some 30,000 farmers that are being hard-pressed by high interest rate policies and lack of action by this government, how could he, Mr. Speaker, justify to the other 29,000-odd farmers that they are going to get some support from this government, particularly in light of the fact that the one criteria is that a farmer has to be in danger of losing his or her farm, No. 1; and yet the program, Mr. Speaker, does not qualify for a land-incurred debt? Well, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister answer, where is he going to farm if one of the people that he owes money to repossesses that farm that he is now living on? Could he answer that question, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wants to know why we are not supporting land-incurred debts. One of the reasons that we are not supporting that, because the program that the former administration did away with and, in fact, force people

to purchase the land that they had on their lease, we are now in a position, and receiving letters from a number of people, indicating that they cannot afford the debt load that they were placed under by the removal of the program and the option that they had. We are reconsidering that program and, in fact, we are very very concerned and we mentioned this in this House previously, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of funds that were used for a lending program for the purchase of land we may, the public of Manitoba, end up picking up that land back into the public domain because people would be in financial difficulty. That is exactly what is happening, Mr. Speaker, in many of those instances.

**MR. DOWNEY:** In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is indicating that there is no support for the farmers of Manitoba under their Interest Relief Program for those people who are so desirous of owning their own farms, is he telling this House, and the people of Manitoba now, that the only way they will receive assistance from the Government of Manitoba, the New Democratic Party, and that is if they join their State Farm Program?

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I guess the Honourable Member for Arthur, the former Minister, is still 10 years or 20 years behind time and maybe he didn't read or understand the former program; that the option to purchase land by the lessees, the people who involved themselves in the program, was always there as part of the contract. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition, if he wishes to get into the debate he can obviously get up and ask a question. Mr. Speaker, that has always been an option of the program and certainly people have taken advantage of it, but that program did allow more than 500 families to get into farming in the Province of Manitoba and obviously it was a help. Many people now are being forced into the position of losing the land that they had under lease previously.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister provide for this House the numbers of farmers, once they were given the option to buy that particular land, rather than lease it as tenants of the government, would he tell the House how many farmers preferred to opt for private ownership. I could jog his memory, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was something like two-thirds of those people opted for private ownership rather than tenant farming.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, obviously the member maybe wants to recollect the program that the option was always there for the people, but until the leasing arrangements were changed that's when the option became mandatory on those people who were leasing because it was less expensive for those people to borrow the money and purchase the land rather than continue to lease it. The option of course was forced in that way and now, with the interest rates going up the way they are, they are put into the position of losing the land that they farm.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and I begin by welcoming him to his post on the Treasury Bench.

Mr. Speaker, my question is what action does the Minister intend to take on behalf of thousands of Manitobans who have installed urea-formaldehyde foam insulation in their homes, with the tacit approval of federal regulatory bodies and now, due to a federal ban on the substance, have found that their homes are neither mortgageable nor saleable under present conditions and stand to lose the major part of their family investment and their future security as a result of this action. What action can he assure these thousands of Manitobans he will take on their behalf?

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

**HON. E. M. KOSTYRA, Min. of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Seven Oaks):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, as the former Minister is aware, the Federal Government has not accepted its full responsibility in this regard. The Federal Government was the agency that encouraged the use of the product and licensed its use and is not, at the present time, accepting full responsibility for taking the necessary remedial actions to remove the foam from homes throughout Canada.

We have made our position known to the Federal Government that they should be accepting their full responsibility in this regard; we have indicated to the Federal Government that we're prepared to co-operate with them with regard to the necessary remedial action being taken so that contractors are bonded, so that we don't run into the same problem with remedial action as was the case when the insulation was first put into homes.

We've also suggested to the Federal Government that they undertake, through the National Research Council, a pilot project to look at the various means of remedial action to see which is the best suited to remove the foam. We have also suggested to the Federal Government that through national expert bodies like the National Cancer Foundation and National Lung Association that there be guidelines issued to physicians throughout the country with respect to examination and diagnostic treatment of illnesses that may be related to the use of the foam.

We have also been meeting on a continual basis with the Homeowners' Association in the province and have provided some direct grant assistance to them to help them in their work against the Federal Government.

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

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas, as amended by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I engage once again in a Throne Speech

Debate and one too many that I would like to remember. Again, from this side of the House, second time around for me, I don't know whether I'll enjoy it any better than the first time around, '69 to '77 but nonetheless I look forward to participating from this side of the House and reminding our members opposite from time to time with respect to their onerous responsibilities in government.

So my first words of congratulations of course are to you. I know that you will carry out those responsibilities well. You have demonstrated a capacity in the many chairmanships that you've held during the 10 or 11 years of your legislative life, Mr. Speaker, and I know that all of our group looks forward to assisting you in keeping this House rolling, as it must, on behalf of the interests of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, my first comments, of course, would have to be directed to the Mover and Seconder of the Speech, auspicious beginnings for both of the honourable members in this Chamber. I was particularly intrigued with the comments from the Honourable Member for Burrows because he reminded me of a problem that, Sir, I have not been able to fully resolve in my own mind over these past 16-odd years in public life, when he speaks about the role of responsive representative government. You see, there's always a difficulty that a member, and some of you will face it, where you have a serious conflict with respect to how you carry out your job; whether you are dictated by your conscience, by your party or indeed whether you are dictated by playing and being the representative of the people that elected you. They are not always the same: there are some traditional positions, Mr. Speaker, as you are aware that have been established in this Chamber, for instance, usually on items involving gambling, liquor, or perhaps the religious question of aid to private and parochial schools. There has been a tradition built up in this Chamber over the years that allows members to allow their conscience to be their dictate rather than necessarily their party. I point this out only to the Honourable Member for Burrows that I listen with interest to his comments. I look forward to perhaps having occasion to either privately or publicly expound on those views more fully.

I take this occasion and, Mr. Speaker, I hope the honourable member will not accept this advice in any patronizing way but it is advice I think for all the new members, that they should take advantage of reading their comments in Hansard the next or the earliest possible opportunity because there are corrections, from time to time, that should be made. I point one out to the Honourable Member for Burrows when on page 19 of Hansard edition he talks about this government, or the government that he's part of as a government we have embraced a philosophy of activism in government. Activism in government means that we take initiative. We take initiative to pursue dishonourable social objectives. I doubt very much, Sir, if the Honourable Member for Burrows would want that to remain on the record and I simply point out to him the rule or the custom in this House that when obviously an error has been made that it is an accepted practice which I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, will encourage that the honourable member takes the opportunity of correcting that. I said that not in any patronizing way, but

simply as a friendly gesture to a member who is already sitting on our side of the House and that I am prepared to take some more than passing interest in terms of furthering the cause that I have worked so hard for on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I should also, if I may, one of the features that for a veteran of this House — I am still having difficulty with that accolade, Mr. Speaker, because pursuing the members with the exception of my leader — I find that the Honourable Member for Roblin and I are the only ones remaining from the '66 class, as indeed on that side, I believe the Honourable Member from Concordia and the Honourable Member for Elmwood are the only members from the '66 class, thus demonstrating once again how fleeting and how passing, how quick and how short the life of Manitoba MLA's really is. Somebody once did a survey, I am told that indicated that in recent times over the past 30 years, the average lifetime of an MLA is some five-and-one-half years. There are exceptions to the rule, with some of them it's five.

Mr. Speaker, one of the noticeable changes in the changing of the guard that features this House is of course the addition of so many members of the female sex in our chamber. I don't know what it is, Mr. Speaker, but Ministers of Government Services past and present, from time to time seem to get themselves involved in great debates about outhouses and washrooms and the likes of this and I make this confession at this time because, you see, there was in the Thirty-First Legislature a female member, who fought a noble battle with respect to additional washroom facilities that I admit were badly needed on the second floor. Those of us who enjoyed the privilege of ministerial office, of course, did not always appreciate that but there were no suitable accommodations in the members' lounge for members of the female sex. She fought that battle valiantly, although I, of course, could not knuckle under that; I had a chauvinist image to protect and I resisted any knuckling under to that pressure, although I must admit, deep down in my heart I knew she was right and I gave the necessary instructions to my staff to have those facilities indeed modified and improved. I mention that only that, as fate will have it, that lady is not now present in this chamber. The present eight or nine members who can now enjoy that facility can ponder upon it and, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to acknowledge that this last, lasting contribution on the part of the Liberal party of Manitoba has made the matters of state in the Province of Manitoba and should it be in the hearts of any members opposite that perhaps somebody should move to recognize this by perhaps calling it the "Westbury Lounge", I would be prepared to second and support that motion, Mr. Speaker. I trust you will pass that on to your Minister of Government Services.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in welcoming all new members, one should not particularly single out individual members. There is another member, Sir, that I would like to single out — I look forward to his contribution in the chamber — and that is, of course the Member for Rupertsland. It is my understanding that he has the onus and unique responsibility of being, I believe, the first among his people to represent them and his large and difficult constituency of Rupertsland. It is a difficult inland area to cover for one

member as are so many of the northern members but particular that constituency and I wish him well in his Chamber. I, of course, Sir, would have liked to have had him on this side of the House as a Conservative. I only take this moment to, of course, remind all members that it was the Conservative Party under a Conservative Prime Minister that recognized that longstanding denial of very basic human rights, namely the franchise, that made it possible, to some extent I suppose, for the member to be in this Chamber at this particular time. Mr. Speaker, I welcome him and I look forward to working with him in the debates, whether it involves wild rice or other natural resources and indeed, all the social problems that I know he will be immersing himself in.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there, of course, is one other member that I would like to make a particular reference to. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't happen all that often, although by no means rare, when individuals change their political association from time to time. I am referring, of course, to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. It happens and it is usually legitimately commented upon and noted by the different people that are effected. I recall such people as the long-working Member for Saskatchewan, Hazen Argue, who laboured mightily and with some skill and talent for the then-CCF Party, but who I suppose, finally felt some compulsion — or perhaps it was the lure of the Senate — to join the Liberal Party, and indeed, I think if you ask him, he feels a particular fulfillment at this time as a farm member representing Saskatchewan, now being responsible for the Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, I think in more recent times of that crusty Conservative, Jack Horner, joining the Liberal Party. That certainly caused a lot of eyebrows to be raised, a lot of interest to be expressed by a number of peoples, certainly by his own constituents, who later rejected him when he went back to the people under that banner.

But again, Mr. Speaker, possibly the understandable desire, in fact I think it is no secret that there was a difficulty, a lack of compatibility with the then newly elected Conservative Leader, inability to work with that leader and again perhaps the lure of Cabinet assignment or so forth, that convinced that long-time worker of the Conservative Party to change his political allegiance. Mr. Speaker, even in this House we have perhaps the more recent example in the person of the Minister of Health and Social Services. Mr. Speaker, that political change of allegiance took place during a difficult period in this House. We were in a difficult debate, we had a government in a minority position. I appreciate, and I have indicated so in private conversation to the honourable member, so I do not feel badly about making reference to them in his absence, but I've always appreciated that in his particular case, perhaps it was a simple matter of having a compatibility with the then-Premier, Ed Schreyer. Indeed, I think it could be said and I think he would support it, a personal friendship with the Premier that as much as anything dictated his switching over from the party that he had long served with merit in this Chamber as a Liberal, who indeed was elected as a Liberal, and then decided to cast in his lot with a different political party in the hopes and the beliefs, and I believe, with some success, in the service of his constituency and in the greater constituency of the

people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I have visions, and I have good memory of, my first contact with the Honourable Attorney-General as an activist in politics that goes back a number of years. It goes back to the year 1956, as a matter of fact. It was a difficult year for many people, Mr. Speaker, 1956. It was a time when a party that he at that time was supporting and running for, was imposing its particular kind of human rights on a small nation called Hungary. It was a time when through that tragic affair, indeed, many chose to vote with their feet to come to this country and make a valuable contribution in this country. It was a time, Mr. Speaker, I particularly remember, because my darling sister had her first federal vote and she came back and announced with some pride, that she had supported the now-Attorney-General in that election, running as he was, I believe, against others. I don't remember all the candidates. Gordon Churchill I think, was the Conservative candidate, but he was running for another political party that time. I can remember chastising Marlies for having supported the Attorney-General at that particular election and that particular party at that time. I can always remember her particular straightforward answer to me, which was simply, "With a name like Penner, I thought I couldn't go wrong voting for one of my own."

So, Mr. Speaker, I invite the Honourable Attorney-General at his choosing, to at some time enlighten the members of this House as to what particular transfusion he went through on that particular road to Damascus that he was travelling sometime between '56 and now, that he occupies the present very important and senior position of Attorney-General. Sir, I say this is a matter of legitimate public interest and I would suggest and I would hope that it is accepted as such and in no other way. It has always been a matter of legitimate public interest, when active political people, for one reason or other, make a very definitive change in direction in terms of their political aspirations, their political beliefs, their political associations. Well, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to that story from the Attorney-General at some time and I hope that I'll be in the House to hear it.

Mr. Speaker, referring directly and getting into the Throne Speech, I think that our leader capsulized it very quickly and very correctly, in suggesting the three major themes that come out very readily in reading that document: increased spending, centralization and government intrusion. Of course, nobody in Manitoba should be surprised. I have always credited the New Democrats with being substantially straightforward and direct with their electorate, and there should not be any surprise on the part of anybody that the party does stand for a higher degree of centralization and that it does stand for government intrusion. I think that's accepted fact and acknowledged by all who have watched, who have listened to what New Democrats have to say in this province, particularly at election time. Well, Mr. Speaker, those two major policy positions, if you like, of the party, of course, have to lead to additional expenditures. We've had just a very small example in this chamber on the very first day of the life of this Session, when the Minister of Government Services indicated — for no other real reasons other than to centralize and to uniform the

janitorial, caretaking and security services in this province — it's going to cost the taxpayers of Manitoba substantial additional dollars, and that's just a small example of what the price of centralization, the price of uniformity, if you like, is all about. Mr. Speaker, we weren't told that there was a security problem. I don't really suggest or think that this government has to be more security conscious than previous administrations, that people are breaking into their offices or into government offices around this city. Nobody is suggesting that and it wasn't suggested by the Minister when he made his announcement. Nobody is suggesting that the corners of the offices or the carpets weren't being properly cleaned, or the job wasn't being done. It was simply a desire to centralize, to bring into the greater family of Government Services all those who have access to, and who work for, the government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that in reading that speech, the other obvious thing flowing from that is, of course, the fact that all of the expenditure items referred to in this speech are very clear, very positive statements. There's no doubt about it. I refer at random to some of them. When you suggest that you will be asking for funds to complete the opening of Seven Oaks General Hospital addition of 20 adult psychiatric beds, much of this program of the previous administration, but a firm positive statement of your expenditures. When you suggest that you will be asked to approve an act to establish Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation, again a very firm, positive statement; no ambiguity with respect to the language used in the Throne Speech.

However, Mr. Speaker, if you read the same Speech and you talk about the possible sources of revenue and you talk about the economic development hopes, — while there's a great deal of worldliness in this Speech — the words all become expressions of hope; they become illusory and they become far less definitive with respect to how that development will take place, with respect to how the revenue will be raised. I cite again from the Throne Speech just briefly, you say, "My government's economic program will seek to protect Manitobans from the worst effects of inflation which have been fueled by high interest rates and energy costs. It will take advantage of Manitoba's mixed economy by preparing for public investments and joint ventures with private companies that can help rebuild the structure of our economy." Well, Mr. Speaker, they're fine-sounding words. These are the kind of things, of course — even if their program works — that have to be translated into definitive action, positive programs to supply the wealth, to supply the revenue to carry out the other side of the programs. There we end up with the illusory, with the expressions of hope and, Mr. Speaker, more serious, of course, is the fact that this is not a first time experience for Manitoba, having the New Democrats in power. As it was, Mr. Speaker, in '69 we have had an eight-year track record now to compare the probabilities of success with these kind of phrases.

Mr. Speaker, other members such as the Member for La Verendrye would have at his fingertips, the facts and figures that relate to this sorry story of that kind of government intrusion into industry, into manufacturing and into the industrial activity of this province. Mr.

Speaker, it took four years to get the government out. The surprising and the encouraging and the exciting thing was, that in practically all instances, companies which were to produce, as this Throne Speech hopes, an expanded economic development activity, were to create more jobs, just the opposite occurred. They were a burden on the taxpayers' neck. They provided a minimal of jobs and particularly under the direction of the then-Minister of Industry and Commerce or the Minister of Economic Development, when company by company was placed back — not in haste, not in any pell-mell way — into the private sector; in most instances, as I say others will have the details the severe economic activity doubled; in most instances, the number of jobs created doubled. That is true of door factories, of computer firms, of you-name-it, that this government was involved in, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's that kind of track record that understandably allows us to take an I'm from Missouri stance when you pin all your hopes on economic development, on things that you would like to see happen, things that you believe will happen when the government intrudes in certain areas.

Mr. Speaker, my deskmate can tell you, as the First Minister referred to in his opening remarks on the Throne Speech debate, that the intrusion, the mere presence or the possibility by legislation, of intrusion, of active joint venturing in the mineral exploration field just about brought mineral exploration to a halt in Manitoba, and the northern members are aware of that. It's a very understandable reason. How would you like to play in a poker game and have the privilege of sitting odd man out and, as the hands develop, if you see a promising hand then you can get into the game? Nobody in his right mind is going to let you play that way, but that's really what they're talking about. That's what they're talking about; they're saying to the private sector, "Go out there and find a worthwhile ore body and if we think it's good enough, if we see the assay results, then we want in." Well, that's not a bad position to take if you can get it. But experience has shown that just the opposite occurs; you get no actors and you get no players.

Mr. Speaker, unlike perhaps some of my colleagues, I've never denied the fact that governments can do all these things. Governments can be in the oil business; governments can develop mines; governments can intrude themselves into all facets of economic activity in this province. But, Mr. Speaker, in an open and in a free society it gets far more difficult for the following reasons, because I believe them to be democrats and I know the pressures that they're going to be under, just as any elected government is under. They will be responsive to the people that put them in office to do those kind of things that are uppermost in the minds of the constituents that you represent. And I know that when you take that \$20 million and put it into ManOil it's high-risk venture, and after you've dug \$20 million worth of dry holes — I would suggest it's particularly high risk in Manitoba; it may be a little less risk in parts of Mexico or Saudi Arabia, but in Manitoba it's a pretty high-risk venture — after you've spent the \$20 million and the Minister responsible has to come back to the Executive Council and say, "I need another 40 to dig some holes because we've got the feeling that we're just around the corner."

I know that individual Ministers, the Minister of Health, will be the first one to say, "But I need that \$40 million for a very worthwhile expansion of a health program." The Minister of housing can say the same thing; the Minister of roads can say the same thing; the Minister of Education will say, "Before we invest another \$40 million on a doubtful gamble, and we've already lost \$20 million, I want some relief for our school systems; I want to introduce some new programs in out education program." And you are going to be responsive, I suggest, to those kind of pressures as any government is responsive in an open and in a free society, and, Mr. Speaker, it's for that reason.

Let's take away the ideological hangups on either side of this question. The practical application, the way politics works, the way people interact with their government works, predicates that you will not have the guts, you will not have the nerve to risk the kind of public dollars, time and time again, to create what you now hope will happen as a result of the government intrusion into the private sector because your constituents will tell you otherwise. Your constituents will tell you to build houses; your constituents will tell you to look after hospitals; your constituents will tell you to bring some relief, reduction in education taxation costs. Mr. Speaker, there's lots of room for activism on the part of government other than the role that you perceive for yourself in the sphere of economic development.

Mr. Speaker, that's something that the government that I was proud and privileged to be part of recognized immediately upon assuming office in 1977. One of the reasons why we pursue so actively the expansion of our industrial resource-based opportunities was because we recognized, which more Manitobans should recognize, that it's doubly difficult for Manitobans to provide the kind of services that a modern 20th Century society demands of them.

You know, Mr. Speaker, we are always compared by how we stack up to other jurisdictions. Jurisdictions that we are most frequently, and understandably compared to, are of course, our Prairie Provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Mr. Speaker, we know that if we don't pay our nurses relative compensation to what's being paid in the rest of the provinces we will not have them here. The same thing can be said about our construction workers; the same thing can be said about our doctors; the same thing can be said about our educators. There is a flow of people and as we see the settlements rolling in, very often as I do from the west, we know that within a matter of time we have to match those salary costs, those service benefits that are applicable in other jurisdictions.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a very small reference to some figures. As you know I don't very often clutter up my speeches with figures and facts, they tend to get in the way from my free-flowing thoughts, but, Mr. Speaker, I refer to a Budget, this 1980 Manitoba Budget. I'm assured that the figures for 1981 would not be much different, and I want to bring to the members' attention, Mr. Speaker, just three little figures. This is an interprovincial comparison of major sources of revenue and indicates the degree of revenue earned from resource-based developments — I am again for comparison's sake using our three Prairie Provinces. In Alberta that figure is high, 55.2 percent

of Alberta Government's revenue, to do the things they want to do for their people, comes from resource-based development; in Saskatchewan, that figure is 23.7 percent; in Manitoba, that figure is 1.4 percent. Mr. Speaker, yet we are called upon to provide for our people the services comparable to those in any other part of Canada and, in particular, with the Prairie Provinces. The difference is, even with the help of transfer payments — and I understand those transfer payments are now in some jeopardy — of which Manitoba, of course, is a considerably greater recipient than the other provinces, it doesn't close the gap. That means, Mr. Speaker, that in this province we have to burden more directly the people to make up the expenditures, to make up the revenue for these programs; that means that we have to go directly to the people in the form of sales tax, in numerous other taxation fields to make up that revenue, while Alberta can, with that kind of source, that kind of percentile of revenue resources coming in, can provide those services without sales taxes on gasoline, without a general sales tax. Mr. Speaker, it was for that reason that my government, my former colleague, the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, the former Minister of Finance, my total government placed such an all-out effort to bring resource development in this province. Mr. Speaker, for somebody to suggest, and it has been suggested that was undertaken in the last year as an election gimmick, simply doesn't understand the nature of those negotiations.

In fact, the government is now apprised of the records. They know that as early as '78, serious steps were undertaken in all three of the so-called mega projects. Mr. Speaker, I find it totally incomprehensible that this government would, in a cavalier way, be prepared to toy with what really is a quantum leap forward for this province in the decade of the '80s to provide the necessary base, to provide the services that we all want to provide for our people, no matter what our political description is.

Mr. Speaker, I now speak more directly about the project, of course, that I'm very concerned about, and that is the Alcan aluminum plant to be located in the constituency of Lakeside. I declare my interest forward and up front. I hope that development takes place and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this government would stop and desist from the kind of electioneering propaganda that maybe was even acceptable in the course of an election, but they know better now. I would seriously ask them not to go carry on with that because, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you it's not just Lakeside, it's throughout the Interlake. I think the Honourable Member for Gimli knows of what I speak, when he had to request protection to leave a hall because of the anti-Alcan approach that he took, without being apprised of the facts. Throughout the Interlake, big ads are being placed through all our papers; petitions are being signed, "Endorse Interlake's Future."

Mr. Speaker, the Interlake has since time memorial or since its region as a settled area has exported so many of its younger people, so many of its talented people, to other parts of the province, to other parts of the country to find jobs. We are an area not blessed with the kind of rich, agricultural base that is present in certain other parts of the province. We do not badly. We have some good cattle operations and I certainly

do not want to denigrate any part of it, but we have a large number of marginal farms where it has always been an accepted part of life that the sons and daughters would have to go elsewhere to seek employment, as indeed it is the case throughout rural Manitoba. We see in this project a tremendous opportunity. There's excitement in this project. Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot understand, I can't understand, a government who wants to be — in the words of the Member for Burrows, "to be an activist," an activist in the very social programs — certainly it must understand it needs a generator to fuel, to pay, for these programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's stop playing games with the project of Alcan. Let's stop encouraging the big lie that was used during the election campaign that Alcan is a giveaway, that we are selling Manitoba Hydro to Alcan, that we are giving Alcan cheap electricity for the rest of its duration, when the facts are different and the Minister now responsible knows that. Mr. Speaker, Alcan's offer to put up front for the right, not to buy Manitoba Hydro; all they want is an undivided right for 400 megawatts of power. They don't give a hoot where it comes from. No, for 35 years, with OPEC clauses, and you can renegotiate the deal in 35 years. For that, they're prepared to put upwards to a billion dollars that you don't have to go to the money markets of Zurich or elsewhere, and further jeopardize our financial position with the "borrowing of exotic currency," as my Leader puts it.

Mr. Speaker, another thing: this big lie that was used about Alcan not having to pay for power. Mr. Speaker, you and I and every farmer in Manitoba pays approximately 2.3 cents per kilowatt for the use of Manitoba Hydro. Mr. Speaker,

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood):** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Will the Honourable Member for Elmwood state his point of order?

**MR. DOERN:** I believe that it is unparliamentary language to describe the position of an Opposition party as a lie. If the member is going to start talking about lies, then I think the tone of the debate will deteriorate. He suggested that there were lies being spread by the government during the election campaign and if he attempts to use that language, then we will use that type of language in reply. I suggest that comment be withdrawn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain):** On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside was not referring to any specific Member of this Legislature; he was not referring to anything that took place within this Legislature; he was referring to an event that took place outside of this Legislature when indeed, there was no Legislature and no government of that nature across the way.

**MR. DOERN:** On the point of order, I heard the Member for Lakeside suggest that members of the New Democratic party were spreading lies in the Inter-

lake in regard to the Alcan position. That is not a true statement and I think that the member should withdraw the statement and, in particular, the language, which is clearly and historically unparliamentary and the member knows that full well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Order, please. A dispute involving the facts between two different members does not amount to a point of order. I would urge the honourable member who had the floor not to get carried away with the force of his eloquence.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside may continue.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I was, as suggested by my desk mate, certainly not making any reference to any individual members, the use of that expression, "the big lie" in my judgment is an accepted political description of when a position is taken that is a stranger to the truth, and is used repeatedly in a very smart advertising and marketing technique that if repeated often enough becomes to be accepted as a truth. So, Mr. Speaker, it is in that context that I use it.

I am suggesting, before I was interrupted, that the suggestion has certainly been left by honourable members opposite during that campaign that the negotiations involving the arrangements with Alcan meant that Alcan was getting a gift of hydro resources when, in fact the following happens to be true. As I said, you and I pay approximately 2.3 cents per kilowatt for the use of Manitoba Hydro. Big industrial users like Inco, for instance, because they pay it in bulk and Hydro does not have distribution costs, pay somewhat less. They pay in the order of 1.7 cents per kilowatt. The deal with the negotiation with Alcan would have Alcan paying between 5 and 6 cents for every kilowatt of power used; more than twice that any Manitoban currently uses; more than twice that Inco uses today; more than any other industrial plant in this province uses today. Now where is the giveaway? Where is the gift? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if not the big lie or at least reference perhaps, to the literature. I quote from their election literature, "Our Hydro resource will be developed, not given, to Alcan or any other multinational contribution."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that vindicates the position I have taken. I suggest — look, the election is over — the people of Interlake want those thousand jobs. They don't want to have to travel up north or to Alberta for the rest of their lives looking for jobs. Let's forget about the electioneering now. Let's get on with developing those jobs. To begin with, the government can start coming clean with respect to their position on Alcan. What are we toying around with? Why is this party dealing with American-based multinationals, when a Canadian-based multinational is prepared to do it? Is Kaiser or Reynolds that much more attractive to you, ideologically?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know from the words of the Minister of Agriculture, "What's the difference?" The true bias of my friends opposite towards any corporation, you know, of course, has to surface.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize my time is up, but let me simply remind the honourable members, that although it's disproportionately represented in this House, all it takes is two percentage points of votes to change and we will be back on that side. Premier Ed Schreyer

never received the kind of support that my leader received in the last election - 44 percent of the electorate. Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba are going to awake, we recognize it, all of us recognize it. You recognize it in your Throne Speech. We recognize it in our very urgent efforts to bring about economic development in this province, that the economy will still generate by far the greatest interest, concern and watchfulness on the part of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech indicates that this government is prepared to rest its future, its hope, on direct government action, ManOil and other things to bring about that economic development in this province. The people of Manitoba knew at least, and will be reminded. It will be our job as individual members to remind them that we had an alternative to that kind of development and one, Mr. Speaker, that is far from being pie in the sky. We were caught in a catch-22 position. Had we rushed to conclusion any of those agreements, you would have been the first one to scream, as would the media and as would the people with some accuracy suggested that major economic developments like that are not rushed into. The time needs to be taken to evaluate them, that appropriate economic, social and environmental studies have to be taken.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you there's no secret. Many of our adherents, many of our party supporters tell us, "Why didn't you at least sign up these deals? Why didn't you complete these deals before you went to the people?" That's the position that many conservative supporters taken. But, Mr. Speaker, that would not have been a responsible position. The truth of the matter is, there are though, enough Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, that know those projects were real. I don't have to convince anybody in the Balmoral area about the reality of Alcan, about the sincerity of Alcan coming to Manitoba. You don't have to convince anybody in the western part of the province about the reality of their potash developments, Mr. Speaker; the \$2, \$3 million worth of actual drilling that took place in the searching for the appropriate siting of the main shaft. All that work has been done and the people are aware of that.

Mr. Speaker, I must commend the government on one reasonable sense of responsibility today, is that despite their election promise, they have not rushed forward with Limestone construction, knowing that if they do that without a future for their sales, they will rocket hydro rates up to 50, 100 percent within the next few years. You cannot start Limestone without the western intertie, without Alcan. Now why in the name of all that is worthwhile in this province would this government allow such silliness as advertising, such ideology to get in the way of doing the two things — getting Limestone started and getting an Alcan plant that will provide years, thousands of man-year jobs in this province at a time when we need it desperately and when they as a government will need it desperately, to carry out the programs that they have raised a very high level of expectations in the people of Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

**MR. HENRY N. CARROLL, Q.C. (Brandon West):** Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to compliment you and congratulate you on your election as Speaker. I have known you for a long time. I have known you as a hard worker and there was really never any doubt in my mind that you would make a good Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I saw what perhaps is a seed of greatness that you can turn into. You can turn into perhaps a great Speaker. I hope you appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that you were out of this House for a period of only five minutes and during that five-minute period, the only point of order of the day was brought up. Well done.

I would like to compliment the new Premier and all the new members on all sides. It's a pleasure having met all of you. I would like to congratulate the member from The Pas and the member for Burrows on their excellent speeches. I would even like to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for his entertaining, if not enlightening, speech. I was going to compliment the previous Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside and then I . . .

**A MEMBER:** He hits and runs.

**MR. CARROLL:** He hits and runs. I was reminded of a radio program that I heard last night. They were doing a tribute to the late, great Western singer, Hank Williams, and the announcer was saying that he was so good at the height of his fame, that even the great Bob Hope was afraid to follow after him because his act was too hard to follow. I would like to suggest to the Member for Lakeside that I have no such concern.

Mr. Speaker, I am humble. I feel that I have a great tradition to carry on. Brandon has regularly sent excellent members to this House and I would like to pay a tribute to Ed McGill. He represented Brandon well. He understood its people and its people loved him, people from all political stripes. You can walk down Rosser Avenue in Brandon today and you still won't see anyone, who will have a bad word to say about Ed McGill.

I'd also like to commend the Honourable Leonard Evans who represents the east end of Brandon. He is part of the same tradition. Ed McGill is a statesman, was a statesman, and as far as Brandon is concerned, the Honourable Leonard Evans is a statesman as well.

Mr. Speaker, having said that I can't deny that I'm very pleased that both of the Brandon seats are now New Democratic seats. I am very proud indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the day after the last election, the Free Press published a full page, coloured map of the Province of Manitoba and in blue and in, thank goodness, an awful lot of orange.

I'd like to describe Brandon to you. If you leave Winnipeg and you travel down No. 1 Highway, you travel through a path of blue, a sea of blue, until you come to that orange island of enlightenment which we call Brandon. The "Island in the Sun" indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I left home at six or six-thirty yesterday morning and I was listening to the news and since it was part of the news media, of course, I believed every word it said and it commented about the Honourable Leader of the Opposition making some remarks about the Crow rate and that he was not in agreement with the rate as it stands and that he wanted some changes.

The same news broadcast also mentioned that the Honourable Member for Arthur, in his public statements, had not come out quite as forcibly; this news broadcast indicated that, to use an excellent word, that Mr. Downey had "waffled" somewhat.

Well, this reminded me of another story, and this took place in that fine town of Souris, or so it's alleged, and again this story may be apocryphal; on the other hand, maybe not. Apparently, there was a debate on a matter at a meeting and the issue was as tough as the one we're faced with in the Crow and there was an awful lot of debate going both ways and finally the Chairman of the meeting turned to my member of parliament, the Honourable Walter Dinsdale and asked him for his opinion; and Walter, who as usual is very adept with words said, "Mr. Chairman, I have friends on one side and I have friends on the other side and I'm for my friends."

This is a wonderful year for Brandon. This is Brandon Centennial and the City of Brandon is celebrating with more activities than you can shake a stick at. There is parties and galas; there is sleigh rides; there is receptions. You name it. There's the Brier coming up this week and I hope that many of you will be out there for it. We're very proud of our city. It's a jewel of a city in the West. It's the heart of the Great Southwest. I am sure that my friends across can't disagree that Brandon sits in the middle of some wonderful territory. We're physically located in a beautiful valley. We have the lovely Assiniboine River. I should point out it's much more lovely in Brandon than it is in Winnipeg, it seems to deteriorate on the way in. We have this great Assiniboine River going through Brandon and as a backdrop we have the blue hills of Brandon; I think my learned friend who is just entering the room will appreciate that these blue hills of Brandon are in his constituency and we thank him for them. Brandon is a magnificent service center. It's got a fine university. It's got great hospitals. It services the whole of this great southwest and best of all the City of Brandon has the finest people you will find anywhere.

Again I'd like to thank my friends opposite because so many of the fine citizens of Brandon have moved into our city from the surrounding areas, Souris, Melita, Deloraine, you name it, some of these citizens live in Brandon and make up the fine component of our city.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, some of these citizens are even learning something and becoming a bit more educated, a bit more sophisticated; some of them even vote New Democrat.

I should like to add, Mr. Speaker, about our City of Brandon. We are tied very very strongly to the agricultural community. Winnipeg, of course, is also tied but not quite as directly. When the farmers surrounding around Brandon are not having a good year, we don't have a good year and we know it immediately. When the farmers have a good year things boom in Brandon. Even in my own law practise, if you looked at the books of the practise, the years that the farmers made money, I made money, and the years that the farmers didn't make money, I didn't make as much money.

Mr. Speaker, I was very very troubled yesterday by one of the remarks made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He made a comment, a partisan comment, about the Shell Plant not coming to Bran-

don. This disturbs me very greatly. He wasn't speaking from knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I have been very personally involved with this Shell Plant coming to Brandon. I have worked very hard at it indeed, but I didn't work nearly as hard as our Mayor and as our Industrial Commissioner, most of whom are members of the Conservative Party; we worked together because we felt it was for the common good of everyone in Brandon. The Minister, Muriel Smith, was available to all of us. She was as close as a telephone call away. We even found a Liberal to phone in Ottawa. The whole of the City of Brandon was working on this particular project. It's bipartisan and I don't like it being brought into the political arena. We need this program. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to help the City of Brandon, the best way he can do it is to keep his nose out of Brandon's business.

I am reliably informed that the reason that Shell is not building a plant in Brandon is that a directive came down from the national level that they are withdrawing from all areas of agriculture for the present time and it had nothing to do with the situation in Manitoba or in the West.

Mr. Speaker, occasionally I like to relax and one of my favourite forms of relaxation is to read fairy tales. I recently read some Milton Freedman and a little bit of Howard Ruff, one of the finest conservatives, with a small "c," the United States has ever produced. Mr. Ruff in one of his books, I should tell you about him, he's always preaching gloom and doom. He's always saying civil war is imminent and we should hit for the hills. Then he gave a description of what the ideal perfect place to be. He said you didn't want to go anywhere terribly remote; you didn't want to go into a large city and then he went into a description, and Mr. Speaker, lo and behold he was describing Brandon, Manitoba, even though he's never been there.

Again, dealing a little bit with my ideological friend, Howard Ruff, and his subject of gloom and doom; you know, Mr. Speaker, there are times that he's right. During the election campaign as I was going door to door, I saw no end of people that were frightened and depressed. There was a feeling of gloom and doom and there still is.

The fears of the citizens of Brandon first were of the local economy. They're worried about their interest rates, their mortgage rates, the unemployment, but, Mr. Speaker, there is a deeper fear and you know they're right, there's much to be frightened of. The world economy is a disaster, in Poland communism isn't working, in South America fascism isn't working, in the US Reaganomics isn't working; none of these old easy answers are working. Mr. Speaker, there is wars in Afghanistan and Iran and Iraq and El Salvador; the Middle East is a tinderbox; there's nuclear wars and famine; we have Pierre Trudeau in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, we can't blame people for being worried and depressed. What can we as politicians do about it? There are two choices. First one, we can do as the Tories did in their four years in office and that's do nothing or secondly, we can do something, and that's what we intend to do.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne was our blueprint of what we can do. The Speech from the Throne presents a positive activist approach to government. It's a start; a beginning to assuage the fears of

the citizens of Manitoba. As someone once said, and I shall misquote him badly, "a journey of a thousand miles begins with one first step." We are taking that first step, the step necessary. The Speech from the Throne is our map. We will rekindle hope, Mr. Speaker. It can be done because it must be done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by relating an incident that happened on Thursday afternoon just after the opening of the House. I was walking down the corridor and a new constituent of mine walked up to me; he's just moved into my constituency. Many of you may know him, he's a gentleman by the name of Morris McGregor. Morris said to me "Henry, do you know you are sitting in the very same seat that I sat when I entered the House in 1962?" Then he said to me, he wished me as much success as he had and I don't know whether I've been cursed or blessed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden):** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to enter debate at this time. It has been some time since I have had the opportunity to take part in debate in this Chamber, and I look forward to it. One of the reasons I look forward to it is, having had the opportunity for four years to look at debate from both sides of the Chamber, to see the viewpoints expressed by one side as opposed to the other and to sit and reflect on the progress, if you want to call it progress, that does eventually occur when debate occurs in this Chamber.

It gives me the opportunity, Sir, to express to you my good wishes for the next four years or less, if it could be less, in your job of presiding over the debates that occur in this Chamber. It's a very onerous task, at times it's going to be rather boring, at times it's going to be very difficult, but I can assure you, Sir, that if you do your job properly, this Chamber will support you and I would be one of the first to offer that support.

You are indeed privileged, Sir, to have at your assistance the present officers of the Table of this Assembly whom I consider to be some of the finest in the Dominion of Canada. They are indeed an asset to you, Sir; they are men who are dedicated, that know their business and their advice is always yours should you choose to ask for it. I wish you well and I am sure with their assistance the affairs of this Chamber will be carried out in a proper and orderly manner.

Well, we're into a new Legislature, there are many new faces. Some of the members I have not yet personally met. I look forward to the opportunity and I am sure that opportunity will surface to meet with them individually and to find out a little more about their own personal affairs, their constituency and their concerns because, Mr. Speaker, every member of this Assembly regardless of his political affiliation is here to do a job to represent the people of Manitoba and their concerns are identical to see that the Province of Manitoba is a better province after their tenure of office than it was when they took office. I think that is the ideal of every member of this Assembly. Where they differ is in the manner in which they set out to do it.

I am sure that we are going to have many, many

debates on the manner in which the business of Manitoba is conducted; what the priorities are and the ability of the people of Manitoba to pay the cost of the services that are provided. I think it is important that the new members of the Treasury Bench, and roughly half of them are new members, will have to wrestle with that problem very seriously. The desirability of implementing the promises that they have made, the urgency of making progress in their own particular field of responsibility is going to be significant, but eventually the argument is going to come down to a very simple one and that is the amount of money that is available to carry out the programs that are desirable and there will have to be some very soul searching decisions made, because I am sure that all of the promises and the desires of this new government cannot be met in the current fiscal year with the amount of taxes that are desirable to pay for the programs that they will be announcing. It seems to me that at the present time the problem is going to increase daily and I am sure the Minister of Finance is going to have to advise his colleagues repeatedly of the importance of his responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, so far I have heard very limited debate on this Address. The Member for The Pas I thought made a very good presentation and I congratulate him for it. The Member for Burrows made a rather spirited address when he seconded the Motion.

I took the opportunity to reread the speech that the Honourable Member for Burrows made and I commend it for every member of this Assembly especially to members opposite. I thought that for a new member coming into this Chamber to dare, and I use that word in a congratulatory sense, to raise the issues that he has raised about responsibility and morality, well to me is a lesson that everyone of us can reread from time to time as this Session goes on.

I think in particular the First Minister should have listened when he talks about his gentle way of handling the affairs of the province. I think in particular of the First Minister and his insistence that the Secretary to a person as yet unnamed as Speaker be removed before the Speaker even takes office, I suggest is not a very moral issue.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon):** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. PAWLEY:** On a matter of privilege, I am not quite sure whether I heard the honourable member correctly and if I did, then I am quite amazed at what the honourable member has said and I would ask his withdrawal, there has been no insistence by the First Minister in respect to the removal of the former Secretary to the Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say that a person, who was employed in the Speaker's office, is no longer there, was asked to hand in her resignation. There was no Speaker; the decision must have been made at the Executive Council level because there was no other place for it to be made.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Now, Mr. Speaker, it becomes increasingly difficult because the person that was placed in there . . .

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** The honourable member ought to withdraw because there was no dismissal of the secretary on the part of the Executive Council.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, one of the principles that this government must accept is they must accept the responsibility. If there is no Speaker, then the decision had to be made by someone and there is only one Executive Council. This Assembly had not met. It is only the Executive Council that is in charge at that time. Now I don't know whether the Premier . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

**MR. PENNER:** The statement has been made that the Executive Council played no part whatsoever in what is now imputed to it and it is wrong for the honourable member to insist having heard that information, that is a fact unless that person is able to substantiate that charge, and you cannot substantiate that charge and you shouldn't. As a gentleman, and we know him to be a gentleman, he should withdraw. All of us will make mistakes, he has made a mistake; let him recognize it, let him withdraw.

**MR. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, I only state the facts that there was no Speaker; this Assembly had not met. Prior to the meeting of this Assembly all decisions have been made by Executive Council. They are the only ones in charge. Now if some member of the Executive Council may be unaware of it, that is entirely possible, but the Executive Council must accept the responsibility because there is no other authority. Until this Assembly met, there is no other authority. So, Mr. Speaker, it does cause me some concern because it indicates that this First Minister wants to control the Office of the Speaker and the Office of the Speaker belongs to this Assembly, not to Executive Council at all.

Mr. Speaker, we realize the importance of your position in this Chamber and you cannot defend yourself. It is the Assembly's job —(Interjection)— to defend your position. I will accept the question at the end of my time. So, Mr. Speaker, I am now rising to defend your position, that your position must be defended and must be independent in this Chamber. There is a big difference between the Legislative Assembly and the Executive Council.

The Executive Council is the government of the Province of Manitoba. The Legislative Assembly is the Council Chamber for every member that has been elected in the Province of Manitoba, and it is the responsibility of the Legislature to hold the Executive Council responsible for its actions, and that is the purpose of calling this Legislative Assembly into Session.

Now, if members opposite don't understand that, then I suggest they should study it and the Honourable Member for Burrows knows that; that is why I pay tribute to the manner in which he spoke in this Assembly. He knows the difference between the Executive Council and the Legislative Assembly and I commend him for it. Now it does cause me a little concern if perhaps members on the other side also knew that, and that is why he is sitting in the position where he is now. I don't know if that's the case or not, but I do commend him for the Address that he gave to this Assembly because I thought it was very timely.

Well, Mr. Speaker, yesterday we heard the Honourable Minister of Health explaining his position in his bargaining with the doctors in the Province of Manitoba, and his reluctance to accept compulsory arbitration. Perhaps it should be pointed out the Manitoba Medical Association has put forward their various arguments and have suggested that this is a first contract for them and, if necessary, they accept binding arbitration. I wonder where they got the idea from. I wonder if they were talking at all to the workers at Boeing who were also attempting to get a first contract, and it was suggested — in fact I believe it was promised — that there would be legislation brought forward at this Session to force first contract and compulsory arbitration. That was a promise of this government to the workers at Boeing but it's something this government has rejected when talking to another group in society. So I wonder how many more double standards we will see come forward during the course of this Session. So once again I recommend to members to read carefully the remarks of the Honourable Member for Burrows who talks about morality and responsibility.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that's enough Mr. Speaker, I think that is enough of my time I spent on that.

I want to talk a little bit about the new constituency that I have the pleasure of representing and in particular I want to pay tribute to the former Member for Virden, a friend and colleague of mine of many years standing, who in his twenty years in this Assembly served his constituency extremely well to his credit, to the credit of the party that he represented, and to the credit of the people who consistently re-elected him. I think that the former Member for Virden, Mr. Morris MacGregor, is a man who is well respected by all the political parties, by all members of this Assembly who have sat with him and certainly by all members in Western Manitoba.

The Constituency of Virden is one that is not going to be the easiest to represent at the present time given the stated policy of the present administration, but I want to point out to members of the Assembly that this year the town of Virden will, like the City of Brandon, be celebrating its 100th Birthday and that will occur the first week in July. Likewise, the village of Elkhorn will be holding their centennial celebrations and that will be from July 16th to July 20th. Not to be outdone, the hamlet of Crandall is having a homecoming, July 31st and August 1st, so there will be celebrations occurring in Virden in that constituency this coming year. We are approaching, and in some cases have passed, the 100th birthdays in Western Manitoba. As Western Manitoba developed, it developed very rapidly, so that there are going to be many communities cele-

brating their centennials simultaneously.

At this time I want to pay tribute to the former Minister of Agriculture who recognized the importance of centennaries and adopted a policy of recognizing family farms that had stayed within the family name for a hundred years and I want to also credit the present Minister of Agriculture for continuing that policy, because I think it is important that we recognize the stability of the agricultural community in Manitoba and it's evidenced by the number of family farms that have stayed within that family for one-hundred years or more. It shows you the stability of the agricultural community, the perseverance of the early pioneers and the stability of the communities in which they lived, because generation after generation wanted to stay within that community to grow up where their fathers had grown up, where their grandfathers and their greatgrandfathers, and to carry on a time honoured tradition of farming, which is still the number industry in the Province of Manitoba. So I wanted to raise that at this time because we have had in Virden constituency many family farms that have had that privilege of staying within the family for one-hundred years.

Mr. Speaker, one of the items mentioned in the Throne Speech is the fact that the government is promising to bring in a resolution on the Crow rate, which will be debated during this coming Session. It seems rather useless to enter that debate at the present time until we see that resolution, but I do want to raise it for one reason only and that was that not very long ago there were other debates held in this Chamber on numerous times dealing with rail line abandonment, which was part and parcel of the whole grain transportation picture and the Crow is only one part of the whole argument on grain transportation. At the time both CN and CP removed branch lines from the Virden constituency, so my constituency has been adversely affected by the rail line abandonment program of the last decade.

One of the arguments that came forward at that time was the assurance of the Federal Government that where rail line abandonment adversely affected a community that there would be assistance to provide an upgrading of the road system that was necessary to get the grain to the main lines of the railways, to the closest delivery point on those main lines.

I know in Virden constituency there have been new elevators built; Manitoba Pool Elevators spent over a million dollars building a grain handling facility at Quadra. In order to utilize that elevator it is necessary for certain roads to be built and upgraded, and while I realize the Minister of Highways is not here, I would like to at this particular time to draw to his attention P.R. Nos. 474, 355 and 254 which do facilitate the grain handling at that particular point, roads which do need to be upgraded and I would urge the minister to once again press the Federal Government for the necessary funds that were promised several years ago and up to this time still have not been forthcoming. So, before we get into the argument on the Crow, let's clean up some of the unfinished business that has still not been resolved and carry it one step at a time.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that my time is somewhat limited, but I do want to raise one or two issues, especially for the benefit of new members of the Assembly

and it deals with the role of this Legislature and the responsibilities that we have. During the coming Session and in fact in between Sessions, if it becomes necessary, we do have a Committee dealing with Public Accounts. That is the opportunity that we have to examine in great detail the public spending of the government for the fiscal year that has passed. We do have an opportunity to examine the Estimates of Expenditure in great detail for the coming fiscal year, but we have very little elbow room to examine the current activity of government other than through the Oral Question period, the daily question period in the House.

May I suggest to you, gentlemen, there is another avenue and that is a standing committee of this Assembly, a Committee called Statutory Regulations and Orders, whose responsibility it is to review, to examine, they have the power to call witnesses, to take testimony under oath, but to review and examine all regulations that have been passed by Executive Council, to examine all order, Orders-in-Council, or other statutory instruments that have been passed by Executive Council. That is the legislative responsibility to do that. So I would urge members to consider carefully the work of that Committee. It is the main Committee that has the opportunity to examine, on a current basis, the activity of government. Public Accounts look at the past year, Estimates look at next year, but Statutory Regulations and Orders, if it works properly, can examine Current and that is the Legislative Committee - a parliamentary committee that does give you the opportunity to properly fulfill the role that you were elected to do — that is, to hold the Executive Council responsible for their activity. I know many of you are members of the New Democratic Party; the New Democratic Party is not the government. The government are those select few members who form the Executive Council and you have just as great a responsibility as we do on this side to hold them accountable for the spending of taxpayers' dollars because the indebtedness of today is not diminishing.

The accountability for taxpayers expenditure is becoming increasingly important as every year passes. The servicing of the Public Debt will in the foreseeable future become the major item in the Estimates of government spending unless habits of government change. It is our responsibility in this Assembly to try and impress on the Executive Council that importance, because when we do that, we are fulfilling the role that the constituents throughout the Province of Manitoba elect you to do. I will do my share and I hope that many others will do theirs. Thank you very much.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Thompson.

**MR. STEVE ASHTON (Thompson):** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask that you convey my congratulations to the Speaker on his election to the position of the Speaker of this Assembly. He has served the House and his constituents well over the past 10 years. I must say that I look forward personally to the experienced guidance that he will now be giving this Assembly in the position as Speaker. I would also like to congratulate the new First Minister of this province. I had the privilege as a rank and file member of the New Democratic Party of working towards Mr. Paw-

ley's election as the Leader of the Manitoba NDP. I had every confidence at the time that Mr. Pawley would be the next Premier of Manitoba and I was right. I also had every confidence that once elected, the First Minister would provide Manitoba with a competent, yet compassionate leadership it needs. I can say that after the first three months of this government's term that my expectations are well on their way to being fulfilled.

I would also like to congratulate my fellow MLA's on their election to this Assembly. The effort put out by members on both sides of the House during the election and by those who were not elected is, I think, a testament to the health of our democratic system here in Manitoba. I would also like to pay tribute to those who have served this House in the past. In particular, I would like to pay tribute to those who served the constituency of Thompson in the past. Too often, Mr. Speaker, party differences get in the way of giving recognition to such service. I have no intention of allowing these differences to prevent me from paying tribute to my predecessor, Ken MacMaster, who while of a different party affiliation actively represented this constituency during his term in office.

I would also like to pay tribute to his predecessor, Ken Dillon, of the NDP, who also worked hard on behalf of the Thompson constituency and of course to Joe Borowski who also represented this constituency prior to him.

Finally, by way of preliminary remarks, I would like to thank my constituents for the confidence they have expressed on November 17 in my ability to represent them in this Assembly.

To begin today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few things about the constituency of Thompson. For those of you who are not aware, the boundaries of the Thompson constituency have changed dramatically since the last Session. Whereas, the constituency previously consisted of the City of Thompson and a number of surrounding communities now consists of only the city itself. The boundaries of the new constituency make it somewhat unique. It is in fact the only single community constituency where the constituency encompasses all of that community. It is also somewhat unique that it is both urban and that it represents the third-largest city in the province; rural, in that it shares very much in common with other rural centres in terms of its lifestyle and experiences; and it is, of course, northern in that it is located north of the 55th parallel right at the hub of Manitoba's northland.

While the boundary changes may lead to a change in the emphasis of the concerns of my constituency, it will be a change in degree, not in kind, as Thompson remains very much a part of the north as a whole and continues to share in its overall concerns. Thompson is, first of all, very much the centre of the north in terms of geography and transportation, Mr. Speaker. Secondly, Thompson is also a vital part of the entire northern economy and its infrastructure and is both an economic and administrative centre of major importance. We, in Thompson, like to describe Thompson as the hub of the North and I think that statement is very accurate, Mr. Speaker.

At the same time, Thompson is also very reflective of Manitoba as a whole. One need only look at the diversity of the population in Manitoba as it is located

here in Thompson, to see that the diversity is very similar in both Thompson and in Manitoba. In Thompson we have many of our original people, the native people. We have many second, third and fourth generation Canadians from the length and breadth of this country. Finally, we have many recent immigrants to Canada from literally dozens of countries from around the world.

Despite its seeming geographic isolation, Thompson is pretty much a cosmopolitan city. This is perhaps one of the reasons why our community groups are so active, why Thompsonites work so hard to maintain communications and cultural links with the rest of the country.

Another notable characteristic of Thompson, Mr. Speaker, is its relative youth as a city. Last year, we in fact celebrated our 25th anniversary as a city, considerably younger perhaps than some of the other communities which are now celebrating centennaries but certainly a testament to what has been happening in Thompson over the past few years. Perhaps because of its relative youth as a city, Thompson is also a relatively young community in terms of population. My predecessor in his first speech in this Assembly noted that according to the last census the average age in Thompson was 26. He also noted that the opportunity for people of all ages exists to participate in community affairs. To a certain extent my presence here today, as someone who is 26 years of age, reflects how real that opportunity is.

I look forward to bringing to this Assembly the viewpoint of yet another generation of Manitobans. I have been fortunate enough to have seen Thompson grow personally. In the fifteen years that I have been a resident of Thompson, I've seen it grow from a small isolated town to a large city with many fine facilities. Thompson may be young as a city but has already achieved a lot.

As an example, I would note the expansion of the local high school. R. D. Parker Collegiate has expanded in terms of enrolment, facilities and programs in recent years. And I should add, Mr. Speaker, that R. D. Parker Collegiate is celebrating its 20th anniversary this year. As one of its former graduates, I would like to congratulate all those who have made it what it is today.

I have already noted some of my background which has been tied of course closely to Thompson, but just as my educational background has been tied to Thompson, so has much of my work experience. In the past, I've worked in the Departments of Transportation, Process Technology, Refinery Maintenance, Smelter Maintenance, Refinery Operations and just prior to the election at Inco's T-1 Mine. I've worked both staff and hourly, full and part-time at Inco in the past, and I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if at this point I did not pay tribute to my fellow surface underground workers at Inco who undertake the often backbreaking and risky work that is at the heart, not just at the Thompson economy, but the Manitoba economy as well.

As many of the Members of this House, and particularly those opposite are aware, my activities have not been restricted solely to the City of Thompson. I was, in particular, formerly the President of the University of Manitoba Students' Union and an active member of

the University of Manitoba Board of Governors and Senate while at university. To a certain extent, Mr. Speaker, however, my involvement at the University of Manitoba was merely an extension of my background in Thompson, because the University of Manitoba is very much a provincial university and affects everybody in this province, including the people of Thompson.

In keeping with the background of both myself and the constituency, I will in the next few years be speaking on a wide variety of issues, but I will be putting Thompson first. Mr. Speaker, Thompson is not like Winnipeg; it does not have 30 or more MLAs. It's not in the situation that Winnipeggers are in. If your MLA doesn't speak up in Winnipeg, there's always somebody else. In Thompson we have only one MLA. There is only one voice and I plan on making that voice count.

I would like now to take a few minutes to outline some of the issues of concern to my constituents. At the present time, the issues of concern in Thompson are largely, I think, centred on the economy, much as is the situation elsewhere in the province. In Thompson, however, the concern is much more immediate. Over the last four years, we have probably been hit harder than any other community by both mining and government cutbacks. As a result, our population has dropped from over 22,000 to less than 14,000. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the people of my constituency see the need to obtain a second industry for the city to prevent the kind of instability we have experienced over the past four years. I might add, they also saw fit to elect a new government to prevent the kind of cutbacks we've had over the last four years as well. It may take quite a while to get a second industry for Thompson, but unless the process is not started now, we will never get one. One of the reasons I was elected on November 17 was to fight for Thompson on this and other issues.

Another issue of concern to Thompsonites is the satellite TV issue. We feel that we should have access to American signals. Southern Canadians have this access and we feel — (Interjection) — I would note, Mr. Speaker, that some feedback was received from the opposition benches about this particular issue. I note that the Conservative Party is not unanimous as is this side of the House in supporting the right of northerners to have access to American T.V. just the same as Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, this symbolizes the second rate treatment we have received in the north, and I think the views expressed by the member opposite show his complete disregard for the depth of feeling that Thompsonites and other northerners have on this issue. Really, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the honourable member to withdraw his rather, I suppose, attempted humorous remarks on this particular issue, because this issue is of concern to Thompsonites, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Does the Honourable Member for Lakeside have a point of order? Does the Honourable Member for Lakeside have a point of order?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I did hear . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. We can have only one member speaking at a time. Does the Honourable Member for Lakeside have a point of order.

**MR. ENNS:** On a point of order, I distinctly heard the honourable member for Thompson request a withdrawal coming from me. I want to assure the honourable member that I am delighted and heartened by the fact that he endorses the open sky policy with respect to the reception of a signal, which I was very pleased to take the time that I was responsible for telecommunications that we had unanimity on.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson may proceed.

**MR. ASHTON:** I thank the honourable member opposite for clarifying his position on this issue.

As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, this is a symbolic issue for Thompsonites in many ways because it represents our feeling that we have often been ignored in the past by people in the south, and I think, Mr. Speaker, to summarize the feeling of my constituents I would say this, we are sick and tired of being cut back, we're sick and tired of being laid off and we're sick and tired of being ignored. I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see many of the concerns of my constituents reflected in both the actions of this government over the past three months and in the Throne Speech itself. In this regard, I would like to highlight a number of points that have been noted by my constituents in regards to our programs and in regards to the Throne Speech.

My constituents are pleased that this government is recognizing the serious economic problems we are facing and that it is committing itself to do what it can to overcome it. My constituents are pleased that this government will be undertaking comprehensive review of so-called mega projects. They are particularly pleased that the government will be raising the possibility of locating the Alcan Smelter in other regions of the province and in particular in the Thompson region. In this discussion with Alcan officials we feel that we at least serve a chance at the Alcan Smelter.

My constituents are pleased that this government will be helping those small businessman, farmers and homeowners who are being hardest hit by high interest rates. They recognize the limits of the program that stem from our limited finances; they recognize too that the Federal Government should have taken action in this area. They appreciate the fact, however, that we are doing something in this area at the provincial level. My constituents are pleased also that rent controls are being reintroduced in Manitoba and specifically they will apply to Thompson.

I should note in this regard that the need for such controls is shown by the fact that despite a vacancy rate of over 30 percent, Mr. Speaker, rents are continuing to climb in Thompson.

My constituents are also pleased to see that the areas of the cyclical nature of the mining industry, the Port of Churchill and the Workplace Safety and Health Committees have also, amongst others, been noted in the Throne Speech. These are all areas of particular concern to Thompsonites.

In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I would add

that many people in Thompson are pleased to see that tuition fees will be kept down. Students in Thompson already face enough financial barriers in getting a post-secondary education. My constituents appreciate the fact that this government is trying to lower these barriers.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would note that this Throne Speech marks the beginning of a new era in Manitobapolitics. First and foremost, it marks the end of an arrogant, do-nothing government and it marks the beginning of an era of concerned and active government in Manitoba. Nowhere, Mr. Speaker, is this more true than in the area of the economy. The Speech indicates clearly that this government rejects the disastrous economic policies of right wing monetarist dogma that the previous government followed. It indicates clearly that this government will be following a moderate cost course of active involvement economically. At the same time, this applies to other areas and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I would note that in this Throne Speech some 70 areas are mentioned in all. It comprehensively and clearly covers the social, economic and regional concerns of Manitobans.

There is, however, another reason why a new era is upon us. It is reflected in the fact that the NDP defeated the previous government after only one term in office, an historical first in Manitoba. It is also reflected in the convincing nature of our victory, but above all it's reflected in the fact that the return of the NDP to power in Manitoba is being viewed as not unexpected event in this province. The surprise of our election in 1969 is gone. The new era, Mr. Speaker, is one in which there is a government which is competent, compassionate and open. The new era is one in which the government truly represents the new majority of Manitoba. They are here today, Mr. Speaker, representing northern, rural and urban areas; representing all groups of this province, from our original people to our most recent immigrants. The new majority party, Mr. Speaker, is the New Democratic Party and I look forward to serving as a member of this government in the next four years.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My first words are of congratulations to you, Sir, on your election to the position of arbiter of this Chamber and indeed the highest office that it is in the power of this Chamber to give.

I had the privilege in 1976 and 1977, along with the First Minister, the Honourable Member for Selkirk and a number of others in this Chamber, of serving under your commanding chairmanship, Sir, on a committee of this House that dealt with the first efforts at Family Law Reform. It was an intensive and exhaustive exercise that lasted some months and I must say, as I think I said to you at that time, Mr. Speaker, that your chairmanship and leadership of that committee was distinguished to say the least, and all of us appreciated it. So I take a particular interest in being present at your elevation to an even higher chairmanship at this time, Sir.

My second words of congratulations are, of course,

to the Honourable First Minister and all the members of his government including, in particular, the Honourable Minister of Health who returns to an office which I trust he will find in good shape, good spirit and reasonable comfort. I extend my congratulations to all re-elected members of this House; I believe those in that category number some 34, Mr. Speaker, of the 57 members. I think that is correct. Thirty-four who were re-elected and 23 who are new members and, of course, I am delighted, as many of my colleagues and my adversaries across the Chamber have already indicated, to welcome all those new members on both sides of the House—19 on the government side and the 4 on the Benches of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker.

I also want to extend my congratulations to the Mover and the Seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Honourable Members for The Pas, and for Burrows, respectively. I think they have made auspicious starts in this Chamber and I would risk suggesting, Sir, that the Province will benefit to a considerable extent in the next four years from their contributions to debate in this House.

I'd like to say for the record, Mr. Speaker, since this is the first opportunity that I have had to speak in this House since my change in status from Treasury Benches to Opposition Benches, that I wish good fortune to those dedicated personnel in the Department of Health across this province with whom I had the honour to serve as their Minister from October, 1977 to November, 1981. I am indebted to those men and women in the Minister's Office in the Manitoba Health Services Commission, in all the divisions of the department, and in the Alcoholism Foundation who served me so faithfully and assisted me so greatly in my four years in office. I thank them and I wish them well. In participating in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state at the outset that it is not my intention to deal with last Thursday's Speech from the Throne in its full context but rather to deal with one specific aspect of it and one specific area of interest namely the field of health. In that respect, Sir, I intend to refer to notes because I do not wish to risk my statements for the record in this important connection, namely the health field in an informal and an extemporaneous format. I, therefore, want to make some remarks that are prepared in a formal way but I will attempt to keep with the conventions of the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, to deliver them in as informal a manner as possible.

It was my ambition during the period 1977 to 1981, Mr. Speaker, to be one of the best Health Ministers that Manitoba ever had. I am not sure that I achieved that objective, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say that now that my status in this Chamber has changed, it is my ambition to be one of the best health critics that Manitoba ever had. In this respect, I want to assure the new Minister, my successor, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that he is not going to get an unfairly hard time from me. I do not intend to nit-pick the new Minister to death on such subjects as bedsheets, the number of times they are changed, and the number of bacon strips in hospital menus or even the fact that someone's elderly relative is waiting somewhere for admission to a personal care home. These are not, in my view, Mr. Speaker, for the most part, subjects that should be piled at the door of the Minister of Health. They are administrative details that should be dealt

with by administrators of hospitals and other health facilities and health programs.

The Minister of Health in any Canadian Province today, whoever he is or whoever she, is faces very great questions that go far beyond such individual operational items, Mr. Speaker, and deserve all his or her attention and all his or her energy. Those questions go right to the heart, in my view, of viability and perhaps even the survival of Medicare and the universally-insured Canadian health care system. They are the issues that have to be addressed at this stage of our history by Health Ministers and Health critics in every province in this land and they are the issues that I intend to deal with, Sir, in this Legislature.

In this context I address the Throne Speech and its component part on health care and I must say it left me with seriously mixed emotions. I am pleased, of course that the new government is intending to follow through with the scheduled 1982-83 phase of the physical side of many of the major health initiatives launched by the Progressive Conservative Government between 1977 and 1981. In this category are such notable undertakings as the \$138 million redevelopment of the Health Sciences Centre, the construction of an adolescent psychiatric facility, the five year redevelopment plans for the main provincial mental centres, the addition of a free standing adult psychiatric institute at the Grace Hospital and a number of other programs and projects of that kind.

I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the Throne Speech offers no indication whatsoever that the new government is prepared to grapple with the real challenges now closing in on our Health care system or that it even recognizes. Where are the initiatives on which our government was started, particularly during the past two years, the initiatives to shift the system from its conventional obsolescent model to a pragmatic and a contemporary posture that will enable it and us to make the most and to meet the most of the medical, social, demographic and fiscal realities of the 1980's, the 1990's and beyond? Where is the recognition of the need for a long term planning capability on which we were started? Where is the reference to gerontology and geriatrics, to day hospitals to enrich the elderly persons housing, to changes in emphasis from active treatment beds to home support services and chronic care beds to medical research, to solutions to the crisis in Medicare? Where is the reference to youth programming in the field of alcohol and drug addiction on which we were started at the Alcoholism Foundation? Where is the reference to ambulance programming and training to upgrade the capabilities of those in both rural and urban ambulance services to integration of ambulance and fire departments in the City of Winnipeg notwithstanding the municipal difficulties that we face in that connection, and I recognize them?

Where is the reference to lifestyle improvement? Where is the reference to insured medical programs that do not cost significant dollars but that would meet specific needs that have been raised in recent years and have been addressed by the previous government and addressed by me, Sir, and were being worked on at the time that we left office?

They may be there. It may well be that the Minister is intending to unveil a great many of these concepts

and programs when he introduces his Estimates and I am prepared to give him the benefit of that doubt. But, I want to put the questions on the record, because unless we get at some of those challenges and issues and a few others that I intend to mention in the next few minutes, Sir, we are not going to be able to stay on top of the health care challenges that face us in Manitoba and in every Province of Canada in the latter two decades of the Twentieth Century.

There are a myriad of things that need to be done to make our system responsive, responsible and viable for the challenges upon us. No Minister of Health can do them alone. It is extremely difficult for politicians by themselves to shift the health system even one degree or two degrees off course from that in which it has been established over the past many decades. But I believe hopefully that we have reached a stage in Canada, at least in Manitoba, where a Health Minister and a Health critic can do some of them together. I shall be pressing the Minister to undertake some of them and I shall be offering my co-operation if he does undertake them, because there are things that have got to be done, not only in Manitoba but in every part of Canada.

The primary challenge facing the health care system, Mr. Speaker, is of course the challenge of resources versus demands. One could be cynical and say that demands are infinite and resources are finite and you'll never match the two. The only way to stay on top of the system is not to do too much. The only way to avoid a waiting list is not to introduce the program in the first place. But those are negative and cynical approaches and we are not engaged on this challenge either in government or opposition where health care is concerned to wallow in that kind of self pity. We should be about the business of resolving such challenges, and so let us look at the question of resources versus demands in health care.

What are demands anyways in a health care sense? They are simply, Mr. Speaker, the legitimate offspring of expectations. They are the children of attitudes, impressions and perceptions that for the most part have been created by governments of all stripes and hues in Canada over the past forty years and offered to the public to embrace.

I do not believe that it is either practical or even ethical to attack the resources versus demands dilemma in medicine in the health care field by attacking the demands or by attacking the demanders. I believe rather that the attack should be directed on the resources side of the question and when the resources problem is resolved the demands will take care of themselves.

This is most emphatically not to suggest, Sir, that the resources problem is one of greater or lesser dollars. There aren't any more dollars, forget the dollars. The resources problem in health care and medicine is the problem in my view of enlightened use and allocation of all our health resources including the available limited dollars, including talents, including manpower and womenpower and including imagination.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare is a Canadian endangered species. It is not yet facing extinction in the manner of the passenger pigeon, but it is endangered. In this decade, not the 21st Century, not the 1990's but in these next five to seven years, decisions made in this

House and in the nine other provincial Houses in Canada, or decisions evaded in this House and the nine other provincial Houses in Canada will prove crucial to the shape and the future of Medicare.

The truth is that as our insured health care system heads towards the midway point in its third decade of existence, this great Canadian initiative faces a very clear challenge. Change and get in shape or deteriorate and decline. It can't continue indefinitely in its current outdated form. The Canadian health care system is one of the most inspired, well-motivated and compassionate creations in the world, but for all its greatness, Mr. Speaker, it has its downsides, and to ignore them is foolish.

Thesedownsidesarethree: One, there is the obvious direct cost to the public treasury, i.e. the taxpayer, of providing insured hospital and medical services anywhere, anytime, to everyone on demand. Well that's all right, that is a given and we are all battling to maintain that, but let's not ignore it, let us not operate under the illusions that Medicare is free.

Second, and this is very important in my view, there is the debilitating cost and it is not so obvious at first, but it is clearly apparent after a dozen or so years. The debilitating cost of disenchantment within the country's medical profession, and I am going to come back to that before I run out of time, Mr. Speaker.

The third cost is the cost that is to be found in the inert state of Public Health in most provincial jurisdictions since Medicare inception and combination with universal hospitalization. Public Health has virtually become non-existent, certainly from the point of view from interest and attention because it does not have the glamour of the Medicare and hospitalization coin.

Unless these costs are faced and rationalized, all three of them the system will face an ever-widening sea of troubles and the fragile guarantee of that protection for the individual that is the entire rationale for Medicare will be undermined.

Mr. Speaker, the greatness of our health care system lies in that protection, but its weakness lies in the aura that surrounds that protection. It has become so institutionalized that although every government in Canada can see the leakage, few health care decision makers are prepared to rock the system sufficiently to determine where the leak is, how bad it is, and what it will take to fix it.

Some doctors have tried, but their motives are generally unfairly suspect. Too many health care managers and professionals, including in particular many in the conventional teaching hospital stream have been disinclined to disturb a familiar and comfortable status quo. Most of the public is unpersuaded that there is any danger. Most politicians, as a consequence, recognize the system for precisely what it is, heart-sacred cow, heart-raging bull, and treat it with the discretion that both those conditions command.

What it comes down to across Canada, Mr. Speaker, is a set of dynamics that are at work and a juggernaut that is rolling that make it almost impossible to change the health care system, or at least make it impossible to introduce much in the way of innovative management and no Health Minister can do much about changing that system alone, but a Health Minister with a government behind him or her, with an Opposition who understands something about the problem and is

willing to work on the problem with that government can, I believe, must, I believe, start to do something about it or the great social institution that we have prided ourselves on in this country, universal medicare and universal hospitalization is going to be in serious jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first things that needs to be done is that government has got to take a stand to ensure that it eliminates what I call the schizophrenia of the system. That schizophrenia develops from the vacillation of behaviour practised by government, and I think all governments have been guilty of it, in its role as a major source of funding. On the one hand government extols the virtues of the health care system as a social program, on the other hand it imposes various constraints and strictures on the system and demands better business management from that favourite protegee.

Most of those suggestions and invocations are executed pretty haphazardly, and as result we have confusion at the management end of the hospital and health care system itself.

Government has got to take the initiative in my view and state openly that like Canada as a whole the health care system is a mixed economy, it is both a social program and an industry. The palmy days of openhanded social programming mixed with limitless funding are over, but Canadians can also be reassured that there will be no return of that kind of marketplace where serious illness wiped out life savings or was treated in a pauper's hospital.

The third challenge is for productivity improvement and planned or measured change and that has to come through the kind of innovation in programming and funding administration by government and encouragement by government that will provide the opportunity to revise and repriorize and reorder the use and allocation of resources in the hospital and health system itself, but in addition to that we have to focus on reviving the morale of our health care professionals. Without the kind of rationalization and reordering that I'm talking about I think there will be nothing but further demoralization of those health care professionals and in the end we'll wind up, not with a rational system but with a rationed system where resources both human and physical, facilities, jobs, services, will be rationed throughout the health care spectrum and in short supply.

A scenario of such short supply would be bad enough if the age distribution of the population were to remain static but day by day, of course, the numbers and proportions of those in higher age groups increase. Without better resource allocation and use, Mr. Speaker, individuals could find themselves or their aged relatives faced with inadequate facilities, programs and health.

None of this need happen. Governments, communities, facilities and agencies can take steps now to prevent its happening. There have to be directions in policy making clearly articulated and laid down. There has to be the statement by government that the nations health care system is a mixed economy and that the traditional adding on of new programs and facilities without adjustment and realignment of those already in existence is no longer acceptable.

There should not be haphazard interference with

local resources but there must be central policy guidelines and parameters for health services, institutions and agencies. These would include, Mr. Speaker, unless there is overwhelming local contraindication, substantial rationalizations of programs, beds and bed designations.

I believe, Sir, that active treatment beds must be reduced in number, accompanied by offsetting increases in chronic care facilities, nursing-home beds, enriched elderly persons housing, enriched home care, preventive medicine programs and lifestyle improvement programs. Obstetrical units must be reduced in number and rationalized; duplication of high-cost high-technology glamour programs among competing hospitals in the same localities must be vigorously questioned; the day-hospital concept must be embraced and expanded; enrolments at the nations' medical schools must be candidly scrutinized and perhaps scaled down; consideration must be given to a system of designated internships and residencies as a possible means of meeting manpower shortages in a number of medical specialties; leadership and encouragement must be offered in the specialty of geriatric medicine; chairs should be established in geriatrics at this medical school and other medical schools; attitudes must be recast to permit fuller exploitation of our nursing manpower.

The Minister of Health can't say this, Mr. Speaker, I know that, but the health critic can and I'm prepared to help him work towards that to save the system.

Governments must provide increasing scope and incentives for better management practices and productivity in hospitals. We've got to get rid of the archaic and anomalous system whereby hospital administrators and managers are actually penalized for exercising efficient fiscal management.

They have got to be given incentives for staying within their budgets and I would go so far as to suggest that the measure undertaken recently in the Province of Ontario should be considered here, where the province refuses to pick up any hospital deficits, but on the other side of the coin the province offers incentives for good management practices by administrators in those facilities.

There's been no incentive for that kind of practice or activity under the existing system where they know that if they're over-budget the excess will be picked up and they also know that if they're under-budget they'll probably be cut back in next year's Estimates. That is an incongruous system that bedevils the whole health care modus operandi, Mr. Speaker.

So, these are the things that I think have to be looked at, have to be done, that must be undertaken as challenges by Health Ministers here and across this country. It can't be done federally because the worst thing that can happen is for federal tacticians and strategists and theorists, operating from some Olympian heights in Ottawa that are totally unrelated to local conditions, to try to arbitrarily impose their views on the Health Minister or any other Minister who has to go out into the trenches and meet the events and the activities and the challenges that occur on his or her ground every day of the week and which that Federal Minister knows nothing whatsoever about. It's got to be done by the provinces and it's got to be done by this Health Minister and it's got to be done by the

next Health Minister who hopefully will come from this side of the House.

None of this, Mr. Speaker, none of this can be achieved without considerable political initiative and professional co-operation.

One of the biggest jobs to be undertaken in order to preserve a healthy Medicare is the job of galvanizing our own selves to action and getting the professionals on side.

I have not been critical of the position that the Minister has taken with respect to his current situation vis-a-vis the Manitoba Medical Association and I do not intend to be critical provided there are meaningful negotiations at some point in the month or the next few weeks that will produce a settlement that keeps everybody reasonably happy and ensures that the province doesn't go broke in the process.

I don't believe that the concept of compulsory or binding arbitration in the Medicare fee schedule field is the answer to the problems. It's certainly not the answer to the problems for the taxpayer, but beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it's the answer for the doctors or the patients. I believe that a great many medical personnel, thinking it through, appreciate that the bottom line of that concept is trade union medicine. Now, there's nothing wrong with trade union medicine, if that's what they want, but I don't believe that the medical profession wants that. I believe that they think that this is the kind of tactic and strategy that can be very effective in dealing with a tough minded or bloody minded government when it comes to negotiations, but they must look beyond that to what it's going to do to the practice of medicine, to the privilege of opting in or opting out, to the fee for service concept as against the salary position concept, and to the whole style and nature of medicine and medical practice. I'm not sure that it's even democratic. It's certainly not responsible to go into binding arbitration on an issue such as that.

Why should this Minister, or why should I when I was Minister, turn over to a disinterested third party, who doesn't have to come into this House and account for, the decision as to where tens of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money is going to be spent? How can you do that, Mr. Speaker? It's simply boggles the mind to think that any government could accept that kind of suggestion very quickly. I'm not saying we won't come to it. I'm sure the Minister is prepared to sit down and look at it. I was prepared to sit down and look at it. But it requires a very long, hard look. It's not something that somebody can accept in the month of February and decide that's the way it's going to be from this day forward. I don't think it's sound medicine in any event, as I've already suggested. I don't think it will either make for good doctors or for good patients and that, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the conclusion of my remarks.

The final point that I want to make is that one of the major costs or down sides of Medicare is the cost that it has affected in terms of the attitudes and pride and satisfaction of our medical profession. It has, unfortunately, generated a climate of disenchantment in the medical profession, much of which stems not from the fee schedule as such or from the tactics that are necessary to produce fee schedule agreement, but from the perception that many doctors have of the

subtle influence that Medicare has had on the style and nature of medical practice in this country. Many of them do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it makes for very good medicine or very good professionalism. They believe that it produces a type of treadmill medicine that leaves both the physician and the patient feeling unfulfilled and unrewarded, professionally and medically unrewarded, and that is what is at the Medicare problem and the Medicare crisis. Jacking up the fee schedule isn't going to solve the problem. It's going to get the doctors off the Minister's back for the spring of 1982 as it got them off the former Minister's back. It's going to keep the problem contained temporarily. It's going to postpone the evil day when the majority of medical practitioners in this country tell governments what they can do with their fee schedules. It's going to postpone that day. That's all that jacking up the fee schedule is going to do. Increases in the fee schedule do not get at the root of the problem.

The Medicare crisis is a crisis of the spirit, as much as it is a crisis of the pocketbook or the bank account. It's a crisis of the professional soul, the sense that the medical practitioner has that he or she is a professional and a scientist and an autonomous, independent person battling the forces of death and disease and deserving and I think legitimately so of some considerable love and recognition from their fellowman, including those who belong to the assorted governments across this country. That whole spirit, that whole sense of pride and professionalism and professional reward and gratitude has been compromised for many medical practitioners by the Medicare system, by the institution of Medicare.

Now, having said all that, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that Medicare is a crucially important institution and I want to preserve it and see it preserved as much as does anyone in this Chamber and beyond, across the length of this province and this country, but we're not going to preserve it by ignoring the problem. We're not going to preserve it by pretending that all you have to do is ban extra billing or increase the fee schedule. All that's going to do is exacerbate the problem. What is necessary is for people to come to grips with the fact that there is more involved in the so-called "Medicare crisis" than just how much you get for a house call or how much you get for an appendectomy, far more than that involved. But the centre point has been obscured so that the reflex action, the easy answer that says, well all you have to do is ban extra billing and the problems are over; all you have to do is increase the fee schedule; all you have to do is unionize; all you have to do is get binding arbitration and the problems are over. That's nonsense, Mr. Speaker. Those simplistic solutions don't even address the problem.

I urge the Minister of Health, in concert with his colleagues in the other nine provinces across this land, to induce health professionals, administrators, thinkers, commentators, participants, patients, consumers to address that problem.

The Health critic for Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in the Province of Manitoba will be with them in that search, Mr. Speaker. I wish him well. I also warn him, perhaps, to worry somewhat about my next speech in this Chamber.

My contribution today, Mr. Speaker, was deliberately designed to pursue what I think are the main issues that we have to address ourselves to in health care in the next few years. It was in somewhat contradictory style to some of my earlier contributions in this Chamber. I most readily admit that I decided today to take the high road rather than the middle road, Mr. Speaker, but I may get back to the middle road before this Session is very much older. But I do want to start off on this level because I think that this is one of the most important social, political and fiscal problems facing all Canadians today, Manitobans and all Canadians. I urge the Minister to take and demonstrate what leadership he can in this field and I know that the opportunities for meaningful leadership in this field are somewhat limited because of the set piece nature of the health care system itself, and because of the kind of inviolable sanctity that it enjoys in the public mind. But together Health Ministers, Health critics and interested Health commentators across this land can get at some of those problems, Mr. Speaker, I urge the new Minister to do his best to do so.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. PHIL EYLER (River East):** I would like to address a few comments to the Speech from the Throne, but in view of the late hour, Mr. Speaker, and the necessity of my breaking up my comments into two parts, I wonder if I might ask the indulgence of this House in declaring the present time to be 5:30.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it agreed that it will be called 5:30 p.m.? If that is agreed by the members, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening. (Agreed)