



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 109 - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 18 JULY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 18 July, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement. Mr. Speaker, there was a Cabinet meeting just a little while ago and we had this statement prepared, but it's prepared more as a press statement, and I hate like heck to talk about what the Honourable Minister of Health, Mr. Desjardins, did and so on, so it's not written. If this is accepted . . . Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: "Following discussions with health officials and a meeting of Cabinet" - I might as well read it the way it is - "Health Minister, L.L. Desjardins has announced that conditions regarding Western Equine Encephalitis do not warrant the declaration of an emergency situation at this time, but the situation is being monitored closely.

"The Health Minister emphasized that although the *Culex tarsalis* mosquitoes continue to be high, and viral activity has been identified in chicken flocks, there is not sufficient evidence at this time to warrant a health emergency.

"Mr. Desjardins said that a subcommittee of Cabinet composed of the Minister of Environment, Government Services and myself has been given a mandate to take any actions which are deemed necessary.

"The Health Minister emphasized, 'We are still considering an aerial spraying program as a last resort,' and restated that the City of Winnipeg will be expanding its larviciding program to an area 15 miles beyond the perimeter.

"Mr. Desjardins said that the warning issued to Manitobans last week to take protective measures against the disease is continued. These measures include" - and I have repeated this quite often, Mr. Speaker, because I think I want to emphasize that if this is done we probably wouldn't need the spraying and this is certainly the most important thing to do and every individual should take note of that - "where possible, avoid being outdoors during the sunset hours when mosquitoes are more active.

"People should wear long pants and long-sleeved clothing to minimize skin exposure. Light coloured clothing is less attractive to mosquitoes. The use of insect repellent is strongly recommended. Infants transported in carriages should be protected by netting and the use of well-maintained screens on doors and windows.

"Mr. Desjardins said that a public information campaign is being developed immediately and a telephone information centre is being established through Emergency Measures Organization to answer questions and concerns the public may have. These services are expected to be in place early this week."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his statement. I would say that if the officials of the Department of Health have assured the Minister that there is no public health emergency or incipient public health emergency at the present time, then we on this side have no quarrel with or criticism of this statement and this position that he has just articulated.

Sir, if there is difference of opinion in the ranks of the Executive Council and the government over the efficacy of using the one known proven weapon to protect the public health and safety and that is an aerial spray campaign against the vector mosquito, then we would reject this kind of a position and regard it as highly equivocal and highly unfortunate.

I do not know that there is that difficulty in the ranks of the Executive Council, but I must say to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, that there seems to be current intelligence to that effect, to the effect that the government is split on whether to engage in aerial spraying or not and certainly to engage in the use of the proven insecticide Baygon. If that's the case, Sir, then this position is not acceptable.

The protection of the safety and health of the public must be paramount in this situation; that must come first. When the Minister says that he and his colleagues are still considering an aerial spraying program as a last resort, I have to ask the question, Sir, why a last resort? If there is clear evidence that there is a threat to public health and safety, an aerial spraying protection program is not a last resort; it's virtually a first resort and I would hope that the government has ordered the spray aircraft and has ordered the insecticide and is ready to go; and when they talk about monitoring the situation, I trust they are monitoring on an hourly basis.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have another statement?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I have. Whilst this is being distributed I hope that I will be asked this question or I can treat that statement as a question because there were direct questions to me that I should have the right to answer — (Interjection) — I'll take it as asked if you wish.

There is another statement that had been promised to the House, a request of the members of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1983, I advised the House of recommendations that I had endorsed following a

preliminary investigation into the events surrounding the death of Mr. Alvin Nystrom while being transferred from the Hospital in Flin Flon to Winnipeg.

A full review of staffing in the nursing department of the hospital with special reference to the Intensive Care Unit and Casualty Department, has now being made by Nursing Standards Officers from the Manitoba Health Services Commission and a report, with recommendations, has been forwarded to the Governing Board of the Hospital. I understand the Commission is currently awaiting a response from the Hospital following this report.

I would like to point out, contrary to suggestions made in the media, there was no evidence, from the review that was made, to indicate any lack of professionalism by the nursing staff in the hospital. Staff of the Intensive Care Unit and Emergency Department in Flin Flon have a justifiable pride in the care they provide, and it is felt they have been very unfairly treated by statements suggesting that they had a laissez-faire attitude to the hospital's call for assistance on the night of March 12th.

One important issue that arose, has been the identification for the need for a formal course on Critical Care Nursing designed specifically for nurses working in Intensive Care Units in rural and Northern areas of the Province. This, Mr. Speaker, is presently being actively examined by a committee comprising of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses, two teaching hospitals and representatives from all rural hospitals with active Intensive Care Units. I anticipate a report from this committee later this year apprising me of the viability of a specific training course for these nurses working in these areas by providing ongoing education programs for these nurses.

Mr. Speaker, I've been advised by the Registrar of the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba, that they have completed a preliminary investigation into the medical practice concerning this case. However, in view of an impending inquest into this matter by the Chief Medical Examiner for the Province, a full report in this investigation will not be released to me until the public inquest has been held.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister for this statement and to assure him that we will be awaiting the results of the public inquest into this incident with a great deal of interest. Until then, we would simply want to urge the Minister to move with all haste in developing the critical care nursing course that he is talking about in the statement delivered to the House this afternoon.

I might just say on that point, Sir, that it's my understanding that here at the Health Sciences Centre in Winnipeg, we have one of the two or three best critical care, intensive care nursing courses in North America. As a matter of fact the course at that hospital is, in my understanding, recognized as a North American standard for training in Intensive Care Nursing. One would hope that it would not be a massive quantum leap to move from Intensive Care Nurse Training for urban hospitals to Intensive Care Nurse training for Northern hospitals, so we would encourage the Minister to move very quickly on that.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 50 foreign exchange students from Mexico, Finland and Germany, and 30 Canadian students. They are hosted by the Winnipeg Rotary Club and they are under the direction of Mrs. Shewchuk.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Strike - Safeway Stores

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Today there have been public statements made by Mr. Bernard Christophe, the President of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union, announcing that his union will be striking the Safeway Company starting next week and then adding gratuitously that "The public," said he, "should not patronize Safeway stores when they are on strike in order to avoid any disorder in crossing the picket lines;" or indeed, "The possibility," said he, Mr. Speaker, "of physical harm coming to the public as a result of private citizens crossing the picket lines."

My question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, is this, will he instruct the Attorney-General and the Minister of Labour to advise this union president, and any other union presidents that need the advice in this province, that the law of Canada and the law of Manitoba will be upheld; and that citizens, who wish to gain entrance or to leave premises whether they are struck or not struck, will do so without harassment or without threat or intimidation of physical violence to their person?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it goes without saying, that in fact in 1976 I can recall a circumstance while I was Attorney-General in which it had to be assured that people had right of access and right of departure without physical interference and I don't think that the Attorney-General, indeed, has to issue any instructions insofar as any police force is concerned, to assure that there be the right of access, the right of departure without interference.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that we welcome that kind of reassurance from the First Minister of what his intention would be, but in view of the fact that this union leader was heard to make these forms of threat of an intimidation nature to the people of Manitoba this morning, would he not agree that it would be in the public interest that this particular union leader be brought in or be told that that kind of petty despotism will not be tolerated in this province even though a government of his stripe, the NDP stripe, is in office?

I know the First Minister would be happy to advise him personally of that because I take reassurance from the First Minister's statement that he would not permit this kind of petty despotism to be rampant in Manitoba.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am certain that no one need be called in in order to receive clear advice insofar as the law and the right of access, the right of departure that is, indeed, a very clear law. It was applied in 1976 while I was the Attorney-General pertaining to another labour-management dispute and I'm certain that the same application of the law would take place in 1983.

Mosquitoes

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and I would ask him whether he can confirm that he is encountering opposition to a possible aerial spraying program to combat western equine encephalitis in Manitoba from members of his Executive Council and caucus colleagues and, in particular, the Minister of the Environment?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with this question at all. I might say, yes, in caucus there are some that question the advisability of spraying. In Cabinet, the motion that was made was passed unanimously today, the motion in Cabinet — (Interjection) — in Cabinet, definitely - this one was anyway. You would know. You've had experience in Cabinet and I don't know . . .

A MEMBER: Not in that kind of Cabinet.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, thank God.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I don't know if they could agree that the Member for Fort Garry would like an answer. Could you agree? Maybe I can sit down and you can have a meeting and vote on that and, if so, would you let me answer it? — (Interjection) — Well, we could do that over a glass of beer tonight. Right now I'm not here to talk about that but to try to answer the question. — (Interjection) — You will let me answer it?

Now I forgot the question. Mr. Speaker, at no time did I say we were not spraying. I said that, as of now, the situation is not an emergency. At no time in Manitoba was there any spraying before the virus in the mosquitoes was identified. We are now - and I'll let the Minister of Government Services go into detail - in a state of alert. We're getting the information; we'll know exactly when we can get a plane if we decide to spray — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I thought this was a serious enough problem that they would want to hear the information and I'm trying to give it to them, Mr. Speaker. The situation is that we will know exactly . . . I think that now it will be a question within 72 hours; we can have the proper plane and the chemical if we go ahead. We're going ahead with the information package to the public and that's very important and also the answering service we're setting up through EMO and, as I say, the Minister can explain more what EMO is doing; there's the committee meeting and this is being monitored very closely. It could be that the conditions and the situation change fairly fast. I want to make that clear, that as far as the surveillance committee, we do not get the resolution of that, was not that we move immediately, that we inform the public, that we give them the steps to take immediately. We are asking them to meet daily on that and it could be that the situation will change very fast. But as we said previously, if it comes to that and if we must go ahead with the spraying, the members of the Cabinet unanimously will approve that decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of statements made late last week to the effect that the level of risk, the danger, was as high or higher than was the danger and the level of risk when the government of which I was a member, began spraying in 1981, and in view of the current intelligence to the effect that the level of risk now is higher than it was then, can the Minister identify that level of risk for us? Can he confirm that the risk of western equine encephalitis, in terms of a public health emergency in Manitoba is higher today than it was when the emergency was declared in 1981?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I could confirm that the element of risk is worse. If my honourable friend remembers well, he did not order a state of emergency until well after the information that horses had been contaminated. This has not been the case.

It is true that the offending mosquitoes are in greater number and this is why we're monitoring that very closely and there's other information that we are seeking that we should have fairly soon. As I say, it could change fairly fast, but as of this time, this is the situation.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the reports and monitoring that have been done up to this point in time, tend to indicate a level of risk higher today than was the case in 1981 when the emergency was declared.

Can the Minister confirm to this House that he has a plan, and his colleagues have a plan calling for aerial spraying to go into effect immediately with the necessary equipment and material on hand, and that they intend to pursue that course in the interests of public health and safety notwithstanding the criticisms that will come from various elements of the community, who will be opposed to that particular action for a multitude of reasons; notwithstanding that they intend to proceed and can proceed immediately once they're advised by

their officials that a public health emergency exists? Can the Minister confirm that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I want to make sure that I understand the question correctly. The member is saying that when a state of emergency is called, could we proceed very fast. Yes, if need be. This is being - not discussed - but the arrangement is now, it might be that we will even have a plane on standby, but there is certain information that we were asking that we should have fairly soon, then we'll make a decision. When that decision is made there will be good co-operation from everybody, we'll be going ahead. As I say we're in a state of alert and all these things are ready. It is one of the alternatives. It is not the only thing.

Now I did not say that there's more risk in certain weather. There's more mosquitoes, but no horses or no human beings have been affected, and all the other times when they were spraying, that it was done only after there had been horses and human beings in all cases, affected. This is not the case at this time. As I say it could change fairly fast, but right now the delay is not being caused by that because we're getting everything ready in case we go in that direction, to get the proper chemical and the proper plane and to get everything in motion. That is being done now without delay.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise the House whether the committee monitoring the situation and advising him is the same committee, that it consists of the same personnel and the same expertise that advised the government in the summer of 1981?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't check every day to see if the same people advised us in '72, '73 and '75. I would imagine that most of them are the same. There is that surveillance committee, and I can say very very clearly, that the recommendation from this committee was that the Minister of Health be informed immediately because if you remember not long ago they said things looked good, that there wouldn't be any problem, but the weather changed so fast that things are completely different.

They stated that the public should be informed as soon as possible, and that the most important thing would be for the public to take precautions. Even the people that have always been in favour of spraying tell me that if the public would take care of themselves and heed the recommendation, the advice, then there wouldn't be any necessity to spray. We know that not all people will take that care, but we can't emphasize too much the fact that this is very important.

Now the thing is that the committee, up to this point, has only made that recommendation; that I be informed; that we inform the public. In fact, we went further than that and we've got everything in a state of alert that we could move very very fast. As I say, things are being monitored, not by the week or the day even, but by the hour, and things could change very fast.

Dominion Store Employees

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour, and it is this: What action is she and the government taking in order to prevent the closing of four Dominion Stores and its Distribution Centre and to guarantee that some 200 jobs will not be lost?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, the number of employees mentioned by the honourable member is the highest I have heard so far, although I have heard several different numbers of employees. We have no notification that I am aware of, of this closing. It is my assumption that Dominion Stores is planning to pay those employees the proper amount of money, since they did not notify us, and there certainly seems to be well over 100 employees that will be affected.

I, of course, am not in any way pleased that this situation is taking place. It seems to be a trend in this particular business. The stores that are closing, if the member would check them out, are all within a few blocks of a Safeway store. I don't know whether that means anything, but it seems that the business either is not there to support both stores, or there has been a determination made to rationalize the existence of these various groups. I think that it does bear some looking into and will be approaching my colleagues with the problem shortly.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1981, the New Democratic Party said, in spite of the gains made by working people, many Manitobans still live under the threat posed by plant shutdowns. The present Premier of the province promised to turn the economy around and to build a great future.

In view of the promise, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba New Democrats would provide security from layoffs, would the Minister of Labour indicate what action is going to be taken to prevent the loss of another large amount of jobs - 200 jobs in this case - that has occurred under the NDP?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, if the people who run Dominion Stores or any of these other places that are closing down wish to share with us some of the information which they keep to themselves, I'm sure that we could assist to keep stores open or we could assist to find alternative solutions to the problem. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: It would be premature for me to give an answer as to what we are doing on this particular situation before I discuss it with my colleagues.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Labour consider withdrawing the payroll tax, reducing the sales tax, deferring the increase in Manitoba Hydro rates, deferring the increase in assessments by the Workers Compensation Board from 9 to 27 percent, or any of the other impositions which this government has put upon the cost of doing business on Manitoba?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is not my prerogative to do any of the things suggested by the

member opposite, and I to this date, know of no company that has left this province or closed its doors because of the Health and Education Levy.

I also know that I have received through people that I have talked to in the Chambers of Commerce, compliments on the Workers Compensation situation as it exists now, the changes that have been made and I do not believe that they are the slightest bit unhappy with it. In fact, I believe quite the opposite.

So I would suggest that it is not any of these reasons that the opposition would most shortsightedly like to blame, but the fact that employers across this country, and in fact across most of the Western civilization, are rationalizing their existence. It's a technological change, it's a difference in society that we are talking about. — (Interjection) — A member opposite refers to Swifts and it's exactly that, the rationalization of a plant without consultation with the government - whatever that government is - without suggestions for alternatives, but decisions taken in isolation which do not help anyone in this province and certainly do not help the workers involved.

A MEMBER: That's right.

Wayside Parks - Mafeking Community

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, last week the Honourable Member for Swan River asked me some questions in respect to the Wayside Park at Mafeking and I am pleased to provide the House with further information that we have now heard formally from the community indicating its interest in maintaining responsibility for the site and, accordingly, we have provided two new picnic tables to the park, two steel fireplaces — (Interjection) — and for the edification for the honourable members who sound like they need to use them, we now have two pit privies that are operational.

Highway Construction

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm - bearing in mind that we are well aware of the very substantial reduction in his Highways Program this year - can the Minister confirm that he has, or can today or within the next few days, let out the tenders for upwards to \$8 million worth of work very readily?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Lakeside is asking whether the department has the capacity to put out additional work, I would have to say yes to that question.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Chairman of the Jobs Fund or the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I like most other Manitobans have been exposed to that final line in the thousands of dollars worth of advertising that advertises the Jobs Fund, that jobs don't just happen, they are created. I ask the First Minister, Chairman of the Jobs Fund, will he not consider, having just heard from his Minister of Transportation that the Ministry of Highways and Transportation could in effect, within a very few days, provide at least some \$8 million worth of construction for the heavy construction industry, would the First Minister not take that as an urgent priority and make that happen so that many hundreds, indeed, if not thousands of construction workers could find employment for the remainder of the summer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly we will be looking at various areas by which we can ascertain whether or not we can assist the heavy construction industry.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, there is some urgency to this matter. Firstly, many of these people that are employed in the construction industry are in jeopardy of not being able to get in their qualifying weeks of work, so that in an industry that has already traditionally been beset with seasonal work, that they can at least qualify for Unemployment Insurance benefits, will the Minister not today regroup his Cabinet and give the Minister of Highways the necessary authority to expend these dollars to put people, Manitobans, back to work?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asked a second question which is very similar to the first question that he asked and my answer therefore is the same as the first question's response.

MR. H. ENNS: I'll make a deal with the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Many of us in the opposition have called that Jobs Fund a "fraud" fund. I personally — (Interjection) — I'll stop calling it a "fraud" fund if you let us start building some roads in this province. I'll stop calling it a "fraud" fund, I can't speak for the rest of them. But the Minister has the capacity to provide — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. If the honourable member has a question, will he please pose it?

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: My question is to the Chairman of the Manitoba Jobs Fund. Mr. Speaker, I believe he has been made aware of the fact that upwards to 50 percent of the heavy construction workers in Manitoba are out of work as well as their equipment. There is an urgency with respect to workers qualifying for unemployment insurance. The Minister of Highways has the jobs on his desk. My question to the Chairman of the Jobs Fund is, will he not reconvene the committee that he heads as Chairman of the Jobs Fund and start those machines and those men working today?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I find it rather strange that the honourable member refers to a fund as having

been the "fraud" fund when his colleagues stood up and supported, one by one unanimously but one week ago, the passage of that legislation, third reading in this House.

MR. H. ENNS: A final question to the Chairman of the Jobs Fund. Although we expressed some skepticism as to the actual jobs created, I ask the Minister whether he will not now demonstrate some integrity with respect to the Jobs Fund, and create these jobs - that's my question to the Minister - and he can do it today.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I know that the honourable member is grandstanding for reasons that are quite apparent to most of us in this Chamber at the present time. Mr. Speaker, the facts are that Manitoba has reached the second lowest rate of unemployment in Canada, that since the first of the year the number of actual unemployed in Manitoba has decreased from 54,000 January, 1983, actual to 46,000 actual, a decrease of some 8,000. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as bankruptcies are concerned, I would like to just inform honourable members that I've just received information that the percentage decrease in bankruptcies insofar as May '83 to June '83, 33.3 percent decrease, the second best rank of any province in Canada.

Unlike honourable members across the way who prefer to grandstand, who indeed were paralyzed for four years when they had opportunity to provide government in this province, this government, Mr. Speaker, has proceeded by way of the establishment of a Jobs Fund. This government is still concerned, vitally concerned about — (Interjection) —

HON. S. LYON: Incompetent fools.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, clearly, the leader of the Conservative Party, we've touched on some wrong nerves because he's shouting "incompetent fools" across the way.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite . . .

HON. S. LYON: That's what you are, a bunch of incompetent fools.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the honourable members across the way received such a shellacking on November 17, 1981, when that's the extent of the thinking that we must measure by honourable members across the way?

Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.
The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the decorum of the House, it is a shame that, with all of those representatives of students from other countries in this House, it sounds like a zoo. It sounds as if this is not a triumph but a failure of democracy. It sounds

as if that group over there doesn't know how to obey the rules, doesn't know how to give a courtesy to someone answering a question. If they can't do it, Sir, I call upon you to demonstrate that democracy does work in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the same point.

HON. S. LYON: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think because the Leader of the House has made reference to the students in the gallery, I think it's important for the students in the gallery to know that this is the only left-wing Marxist government in Canada. They will understand that, Mr. Speaker, better than my honourable friend, the House Leader, who came from that bunch himself and who in most of his life has been less concerned about decorum in the House, he's been trying to subvert this kind of a House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General to the same point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I will not lower myself to that dredging morass that he would oull this House into. I would simply say this, Sir, that the students being as they are, students, will know to judge people by their actions, not by empty rhetoric of that kind.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope all members will bear in mind that this is a question period and will allow some members to ask their questions and other members to answer them.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, brief reference to the uninvited comment by the Leader of the Conservative Party. I don't intend to lower myself to the same kind of name-calling but it would make more sense indeed, to refer to honourable members across the way as being the party of fascists in this province as to refer to this party as the party of Marxist-Leninists. That's about the extent to which the Leader of the Conservative Party unfortunately has lowered himself in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated our concern about the continuation of 46,000 unemployed in the Province of Manitoba, even though our record is the second best in Canada. I understand the concerns, indeed, of those that are in the heavy construction industry in the Province of Manitoba and that is why I am going to be further meeting with the representatives of the heavy construction industry in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, remarks and rhetoric like we have heard from the Honourable Member for Lakeside do not assist in dealing with the problems of unemployed in this province.

HON. S. LYON: Have you and Christophe been talking, or what?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, as concerned as I am about the education of foreign students, I don't mind admitting that my greater concern is for unemployed construction workers in the Province of Manitoba right now. My

simple question to the Honourable Minister is, would he consider restoring the \$20 million that he took out of the Highways budget?

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

Translation of Statutes

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I took as notice on July 5th a number of questions from the Member for Elmwood with respect to cost of translation services. The question was the cost of translating — (Interjection) —

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: I have been sitting but seven feet from the Minister of Cultural Affairs. Only a few moments ago it was pointed out that if democracy, indeed, is to thrive as it ought in this Chamber, that surely we should be given the courtesy and opportunity to hear fellow members when they are speaking in this Chamber.

HON. S. LYON: What do you Marxists know about democracy?

A MEMBER: You're sick, real sick.

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

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as I was attempting to indicate, I took as notice a number of questions on July 5th with respect to the costs of translation; I was asked the cost of translating one page of a statute. The present cost of translating one page of a statute varies between \$75 and \$110 per page depending on the complexity of the text that has to be translated, Mr. Speaker. I was also asked to state the amount of money that's been spent to date on the costs of translation services and the answer to that is the same.

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

MR. G. FILMON: The members opposite have been referring to common courtesies in the House. It has been courtesy in the past for a Minister when he brings an answer to a question, to bring it when the member is here to hear the response. The Minister has taken questions from the Member for Elmwood and the Member for Elmwood is not here. I would suggest the Minister wait until he is here to hear the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General to the same point.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. There is a presumption, I admit, easily rebuttable in this case, that members can read Hansard. If the particular member is not here, surely he can read the

answer in Hansard. If he's incapable, he can get assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Tuxedo might have been referring to a matter of courtesy but he did not have a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the Rules of the House is that the question is answered to the House and not to a particular member in the House, and I would assume that all members would be interested in responses to questions - and if I can continue.

The second question was related to the cost of translating statutes to date. The answer to that question is not the \$2 million figure that was suggested by the member, rather the total amount of money that has been expended to date is approximately \$690,000, which is a net cost to the province; approximately \$500,000 after one deducts the federal assistance that has been provided over the period that translation has been translated.

Jobs Fund - unemployed

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable First Minister in his capacity as responsible for the Jobs Fund. In view of the critical lack of employment opportunities for technical and engineering graduates in Manitoba today, will the government consider approving more highway construction projects so that there may be some legitimate full-time opportunities for these engineering and technical graduates in the heavy construction industry where they can be employed in such things as design, construction, supervision in other fields?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further response to the same question which is just about on the same length as the question from the Member for Lakeside, I indicated that we would be taking that under careful review.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it has been demonstrated that the government has cut out large sums of money from line departments in the government in order to divert this money into the make-work projects of the Jobs Fund, will the government not consider putting this money back into these legitimate endeavours so that people can be employed in technical fields, in construction fields where there are jobs that can be created immediately?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be just as silly as those who are asking questions and repeat the same answer seven times because this is No. 7 - the same question has been asked with somewhat different wording seven times by honourable members across the way - for the seventh time, I respond that we are carefully looking at the concerns of the heavy construction industry.

Mosquitoes

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, thank you. A question for the Minister responsible for the Environment and flowing from the questions asked by the Member for Fort Garry.

I consulted Friday's Hansard in which the Minister of the Environment indicated a willingness to proceed with an aerial spray program and yet the questions which flowed this morning and the comments of the Minister of Health indicated that the opposition felt there was some division between the two Ministers; and I'm wondering if the Minister of Environment can confirm if he still has a commitment to an aerial spray program if there is a health emergency declared.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I can only thank the Member for Springfield for that question, in that there seemed to be an attempt on the part of opposition members to imply that there may have been a change of heart in respect to my own commitment in regard to a spray program if, in fact, it is found to be necessary.

I want the record to be very clear and I will draw upon Friday's Hansard for an indication of what I have said consistently in that regard, and I quote, "Should it be determined that there is an epidemic situation, a public health threat, and that there is a need for an aerial spray program, certainly I would support that decision and be prepared to authorize the use of those substances."

To the Member for Springfield and to members of the House, my position has not changed and I made that position known on Friday and will continue to make it known. We will support such programs if, in fact, they have been determined to be necessary to protect the public health of the people of this province; let there be no mistake about that on the part of anyone in this House.

MR. A. ANSETT: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the same Minister. In view of the difficulties that some members have had, both this year and two years ago, in identifying when there should be a public health emergency declared, I'm wondering if the Minister can confirm whether or not there have been to date, any confirmed cases of Western Equine Encephalitis, either in Manitoba or in Saskatchewan.

HON. J. COWAN: The member indicated that he has referenced his question and specific to cases in horses. Of course it is a matter for the Health Department and the Minister of Health to determine as to whether or not there is a public health emergency, but I can confirm to him that to my knowledge, there have been no confirmed cases of Western Equine Encephalitis in horses to this date or in humans to this date in the Province of Manitoba for the current year.

A MEMBER: Only chickens have got it.

MTX Employees

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

Have MTX employees, currently working with MTX subsidiary in Saudi Arabia, been charged with an offence under Saudi Arabian law?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, there have been no charges that I am aware of, or the Telephone System is aware of for any MTX employees.

There was an incident that occurred - I believe, April 21st - with regard to working during prayer time in that country and I believe that this was taking place by the members that are working there - by Canadians, by Manitobans who are working in Saudi Arabia inadvertently - and I have not received a full report on that up to this time, nor has the Telephone System. So I will be asking for that full report and if there is any further information that the honourable member would like to know, I would certainly provide it to him.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat strange that the Minister is in regular communication with the senior management of MTX. I would like the Minister to answer the simple question as to how it took from April 21st until now and the Minister still has no information as to the alleged laying of charges by Saudi Arabian officials against MTX employees. And a further question to the Minister, could he confirm for the House whether any disciplinary action was undertaken pursuant to those charges?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I don't know what charges the member is referring to. I understand that there was a warning by Saudi Arabian officials, according to the newspaper article. I don't have further information, Mr. Speaker. I have discussed it with senior management of the MTS and there's a 12-hour time difference and you cannot get information that quickly.

Certainly, if it was a serious matter it would have been reported earlier. I don't know that there's been any disciplinary action that was required. I know there was a warning by Saudi officials, according to the information that I have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, in view of the fact that the incident occurred some three months ago, would the Minister undertake to provide the House with an update as to whether charges were laid, as to whether disciplinary action were undertaken by the Saudi Government and report, posthaste, to this House on this matter?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, my information is that this was an isolated incident; there were no charges laid. I want to just bring this information to the honourable members opposite, that all employees of the Manitoba Telephone System - before they undertook this assignment - were thoroughly briefed on the

customs of the country and of course are fully aware that they have to obey the laws of the country that they are working on and that's what we expect.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: I have some committee changes, Mr. Speaker. On Law Amendments, the Member for Fort Rouge will be substituting for the Member for Lac du Bonnet; the Member for Osborne substituting for the Member for Rossmere; and the Member for Logan substituting for the Member for St. Johns.

On Statutory Regulations and Orders, the Member for Brandon substituting for the Member for Riel.

On Private Bills, we have the Member for Concordia substituting for the Member for Ste. Rose; and Radisson for Thompson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I have two changes on committees. On the Standing Committee of Law Amendments, Mercier for Driedger; and on the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, Mercier for Driedger.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, some committee announcements. With respect to the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs meeting tomorrow morning, should it be the case that it's unable to complete its work because of delegations and so on tomorrow morning, scheduling the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs for Wednesday of this week, July 20th at 8:00 p.m.

With respect to Law Amendments, and there is a note in the Order Paper that Law Amendments would be meeting on the 28th and still will be meeting on the 28th, but the note is to consider Bill 2.

With respect to the hearing of delegations, and any delegations on other legislation which may be referred to Law Amendments, there will be another meeting of Law Amendments a week from today, Monday, June 25th at 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Just an inquiry, Mr. Speaker, of the House Leader. Did I hear him to say that there would be a meeting of the Committee of the House on Wednesday evening?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Municipal Affairs.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we're not operating, are we, under Speed-up Motions? Then I would think that

under the Rules there would have to be unanimous consent to that.

HON. R. PENNER: I don't believe that is right with respect to committee meetings.

HON. S. LYON: The Committee of the House is the same as the House and the rules that apply to the House apply to the committee; and the Rules say that the House shall not sit on Wednesday evenings and that means Committee, unless there is unanimous consent.

HON. R. PENNER: There is no such a rule, of course, and the Leader of the Opposition is flying by the seat of his pants. The committees have been meeting regularly as announced through this Session, previous Sessions, Tuesday mornings, Thursday mornings. There are no Sessions of the House on Tuesday mornings and Thursday mornings. We can call a meeting of the committee of the House for Friday afternoon, for Saturday morning.

HON. S. LYON: This side of the House has never had any objection to working. It's my honourable friends who seem to have the predilection against bringing in Speed-up. If my honourable friends want to bring in Speed-up, the House and committees can sit morning, afternoon and evening and there will be no objection from us. Until they're prepared to do that instead of observing their sort of lackadaisical 9-to-5 hours then they have to obey the rules.

My honourable friend, the House Leader, was not consulted about that and I suggest that the point at issue is whether or not a Committee of the House can sit on a Wednesday night when the House is not allowed to sit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, clearly, to the same point of order, if anyone has been working 9-to-5 hours it must be the Leader of the Opposition because the rest of us have certainly been here burning the midnight oil for some months.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no requirement in our rules with respect to the hours of committee sittings. Our committees normally meet Tuesday and Thursday mornings which are mornings on which the House does not sit. This spring, the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs and the Standing Committee on Agriculture both met at times other than Tuesday or Thursday morning and at times when the House was not sitting. That's a fairly common procedure. I would certainly be the first to concede to this comment from his seat by the Member for Minnedosa that normally standing committees have not met Wednesday nights; there's no question about that. But the House Leader has the right to call those committees at any time he sees fit to conduct the business of the House.

I would be the first to concede that it would be more beneficial if the opposition were consulted and agreed, but the Business of the House must be conducted and if the opposition doesn't want to sit in committee, for

example, this Friday afternoon, or Friday evening, or all day Saturday just because the speed-up motion hasn't been passed, Mr. Speaker, that would be ludicrous. I submit to you that the rules do not require that all the Rules of the House sitting be suspended before committees can sit and carry on their extra workload, that they must carry on to be able to complete the Business of the House.

So I would submit, Mr. Speaker, a committee meeting this Wednesday, committee meetings Friday or Saturday of this week are perfectly in order at the call of the House Leader.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to this matter, I want to point out for the record I had an opportunity to consult with the Government House Leader last Thursday as a result of which I think some improvements were made to the order of the Business of the House. We were able to add a number of committee meetings to this week's work which I think will expedite the Business of the House. I must say for the record that the Government House Leader did not consult me at all with respect to a committee sitting on Wednesday night. He should be aware that Members of the House make plans for Wednesday nights, Mr. Speaker, when the Speed-up Motion is not in effect, and I would ask him to be courteous enough to withdraw that for the time being and at least allow our caucus an opportunity to consider the matter further and then all of the members plan.

HON. R. PENNER: . . . to do that, I had hoped to make it possible for members to schedule sufficiently advanced by making that announcement today, but I am perfectly content to see how the committee works tomorrow morning and what's left over. The committee may wish to discuss among themselves a follow-up meeting. By all means, let's leave it at that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the same point.

HON. S. LYON: Yes, to the same point, Mr. Speaker. The original point that I raised I think is still before us and the Attorney-General may say, let's leave it at that, but that's a matter for you and the House, Sir - not him.

In my time in this House, I do not recall a committee of the House ever sitting on a Wednesday evening without prior consent, while the regular rules were enforced. There is no tradition of the House that permits the House to sit in committee on Wednesday evenings without permission. I've been in the House, Mr. Speaker, from a time when my honourable friend was running for even a different political party than the one he professes to support now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Since no honourable members have quoted our rules, or Beauchesne, on this matter, I assume that there is no rule that would prevent the House from meeting in committee on a Wednesday evening. — (Interjection) — Pardon me. Order please. Order please.

It has been my experience that it has been the practice of this House that the two House Leaders will co-operate with each other as a matter of courtesy and decide these things.

I would hope that if there has been some lack of consultation on this matter, that it would be rectified by a meeting of the two House Leaders and the matter resolved in that manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call first of all the second readings on Bills 105, 107, 110; followed by the Adjourned Debate on the Constitutional Amendment with respect to Official Languages; followed by the Adjourned Debate on Bill 55; and followed, if time permits, Sir, by the Adjourned Debate on Bill 3.

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 105 - THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT ACT (2)

HON. A. ADAM presented Bill No. 105, An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act (2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a copy of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Member for Morris have a point of order?

MR. C. MANNES: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. Was it your intention to call for the air conditioner at all this afternoon?

MR. SPEAKER: Indeed it was. The Honourable Minister may proceed.

HON. A. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of explanatory notes for the critic from the official opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill which will commence the process of assessment of reform in Manitoba. Our own review and the comments of the public, as received by the Municipal Affairs Committee, have indicated the merit of several of the major principles put forward in the report of the Manitoba Assessment Weir Committee.

Although a considerable amount of work will be required before implementation of these principles is feasible, a commitment to the concept of a property classification system and the establishment of the portions of value by property class is being made at this time.

Three main issues are dealt with in this bill. The first, as I have just mentioned, is a commitment through enabling legislation whereby the Lieutenant-Governor-

in-Council can implement the classification of property and portioning systems as proposed as the basic tenets of the Weir Committee. As we heard at the public hearings, additional research is required before the respective portions of value by property class can be defined accurately and it is not our intention that this section be proclaimed until such time as that research has been completed.

The second item in the proposed legislation has to do with maintaining a current intermunicipal relationship in the equalized assessment. The Weir Committee recognized that large-scale shifts in assessment from one property class to another would be undesirable at a time when the assessment system was under review. Bill 100 was brought in to prevent such shifts from occurring. The public hearings recently conducted by Municipal Affairs Committee of the Legislature heard further comments about preventing major shifts in assessment between property classes or from one area of the province to another.

In the report of this committee to the Legislature, it was again recommended that steps be taken to maintain the status quo until such time as the detailed information required for implementations can be obtained. Although Bill 100 prevented shifts in the actual assessment base, it did not take into account that shifts in the equalized assessment might still occur. Accordingly, this bill proposes to maintain the intermunicipal relationships in equalized assessment which specified exceptions to allow for new construction, demolition or other changes in the same degree as those relationships existed in the 1983 equalized assessment. Since school taxes are directly related to a municipality's equalized assessment, we have therefore extended the logic of Bill 100 to ensure that no major shifts occur in this assessment at this time.

The third provision is that this legislation concerns the validation of the assessment role. A provision in the current Assessment Act which validates the assessment role is scheduled to expire as of December 31, 1983. Provision is made herein to extend that validation so as to safeguard the integrity of these roles and the related real property taxation system. I have prepared a section-by-section explanation of the draft legislation and I have distributed a copy to the critic for the official opposition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I move, seconded by the Member for Emerson, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 107 - THE CHILD WELFARE ACT (2)

HON. L. EVANS presented Bill 107, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act (2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I believe, are familiar somewhat with the

content of the amendment to the Child Welfare Act contained in Bill 107 which will enable governments to replace Boards of Directors of Children's Aid Societies. We believe that this is a responsible action on the part of government given the fact that the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers, virtually pay 100 percent of the operations of the Children's Aid Society.

At present, there is virtually no accountability by Children's Aid Society Boards to government for the spending of monies provided by the province and further, government's ability to ensure this policy direction is carried out, is limited. We recognize that the powers the government is seeking are a serious responsibility but I can assure members, Mr. Speaker, that we would use this legislation only after every avenue of co-operation with the society has been exhausted. In effect, Mr. Speaker, what we are seeking here is legislation that in effect is permissive. It gives the government a tool, an instrument, if that authority, that instrument is needed.

I would emphasize that this legislation is very similar to that which exists in Ontario and Nova Scotia in respect to the boards of Children's Aid Societies for the very reasons that I have outlined. Furthermore, both provinces have greater authority in their child welfare directorates to intervene directly in the activities of the Children's Aid Society. Of the three provinces remaining in Canada that have Children's Aid Society, Manitoba by far has the weakest legislation to be able to affect the activities and policy directions of Children's Aid Societies.

I reject the notion, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is a threat to the future of child and family child-caring institutions in our province and to the volunteerism in the social services field. We are committed to the delivery of services by the private non-profit sector and I've stated that unequivocally on other occasions as well. I'm convinced that this bill will not discourage people from volunteering their services. On the contrary, I think ultimately it might invite more community participation and I can advise, Mr. Speaker, since we've announced our intentions, we've had numerous calls from Manitobans concerned about the situation at CAS Winnipeg and who are willing to serve on a new Board of Directors of CAS Winnipeg, if such should be the case.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation to enable the government to replace Boards of Directors of the Children's Aid Society is an interim measure. The point is that above all else we must protect the children in care so that the services provided are not allowed to break down. This amendment will support the government in its efforts to achieve this goal.

Let me briefly refer to the policy direction in which we wish to go and that is to establish a regional delivery approach in the City of Winnipeg. Our objective is to strengthen the care services for children in need and certainly we want to see a first-rate system put in place. We are following three basic principles to implement this policy: (1) services must emphasize prevention and the involvement of the family as a unit in resolving its problems; (2) services must satisfy the cultural, linguistic and social needs and aspirations of children in their families; (3) services will continue to be provided by the non-profit private sector.

These principles reflect our primary responsibility to develop a delivery system which will be more responsive

to children and the families it serves. The regional approach that I refer to, Mr. Speaker, will be a system that emphasizes prevention-oriented family services with activity taking place in the home.

Let me say a word about the historical development of child welfare services in Winnipeg. Our proposal of regionalization in many ways will correct historical wrong. The present child welfare system developed from a time when provincial financial responsibility was limited; rather churches, and municipalities funded child welfare services in the province. In the early 1940s, the decision was taken to develop the present regional delivery system through the province with government assuming responsibility for child welfare services where no Children's Aid Societies existed. Out of this development, governments assumed greater financial responsibility, and in all this time the organization of services in Winnipeg has never been rationalized, so what we have in the city is three agencies, CAS Eastern, CAS Winnipeg, and indeed, the regional child welfare office of my own department delivering similar services.

We are suggesting that we need a system that will be very sensitive to local needs, and as I've suggested before, Mr. Speaker, it is our belief through experience that smaller agencies have operated more effectively in the province. They've tended to place greater reliance on foster care and adoption which is a much less expensive and more effective means of handling case loads. Also where agencies have emphasized group-home and institutional care, costs have been greater and the quality of service has not been effective. We believe smaller is better and why a regional delivery approach is desirable for Winnipeg.

I want to refer also, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that regionalization was recommended in a study commissioned by the government, by the department, back in 1977. A regional delivery, as it applies to child welfare services, has also been endorsed by two Family Court judges, namely Edwin Kimelman and Judge Robert Carr in reports prepared for the province. The concept has also been endorsed by a provincial planning and review committee made up of senior child welfare representatives from the child caring agencies and institutions, including CAS Winnipeg. As well, we have been encouraged to adopt a regional delivery model by various social service professionals who are experienced and knowledgeable in the field. Clearly, it is the best way to go.

I want to emphasize that we're not attempting to single out any particular Children's Aid Society. What we are doing is looking at the City of Winnipeg as a whole in this approach to see if we can have a more rational, more effective system, a system that is more able to cope with the need of children and families who are requiring some assistance.

As I've indicated, we'll be naming an implementation steering committee to oversee the proposed reorganization and to work out on a consultative basis the mechanics of a new structure. That committee will include representatives from the agencies involved, CAS Eastern, CAS Winnipeg, as well as staff from my own department, community representatives, officials of the Native community as well as union or staff representatives.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this is a participatory process. We anticipate and look forward

to co-operative and participation of CAS of Winnipeg. There's an urgent need to get on with the job. The issues at stake go well beyond jurisdictional bounds. I repeat, our main concern is and must be the care of children in the City of Winnipeg. Our primary responsibility is for children in the child welfare system in Winnipeg, and indeed the whole province.

We believe that only by reforming the present delivery system can we strengthen the child and family services of Winnipeg. It is imperative that we move ahead, Mr. Speaker, with a stronger, more supportive and prevention-oriented child and family service for Manitobans, which at the same time has community involvement.

I seek the co-operation, Mr. Speaker, of the agencies involved as well as the members of this Assembly. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 110 - THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK presented Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill, Bill 110, proposes amendments to several aspects of The Consumer Protection Act and proposes a new part to the act respecting consumer deposits on the retail sale of goods.

The Consumer Protection Act requires disclosure of certain aspects of the advertising of loans or credit such as the cash price, the cost of borrowing expressed in dollars, as well as the percentage rate per annum, and a number and amount of monthly or periodic payments. An amendment is proposed that would require that advertisements made through the medium of television provide sufficient opportunity for consumers to be made aware of the time of the items required to be disposed and that print size, regardless of the medium, would be of sufficient size to be easily readable. The principle is to ensure that effective disclosure results from advertisements subject to the act.

The Consumer Protection Act currently provides for the licensing and bonding of direct sellers. Certain types of direct sellers who enter the province from time to time have challenged the provisions on the basis that there is no personal communication between buyer and seller prior to the time of delivery of goods or services. In such cases, the consumer may be without redress if a problem develops with the goods or services after

the vendor has left the province. The bill amending the act would provide that licensing and bonding is required and therefore provide some redress if such becomes necessary.

The Consumers Bureau has the obligation to investigate complaints and the right to obtain access to documents. Without the relevant documents, the Bureau cannot properly investigate matters brought to its attention. The bill proposes, therefore, that credit granters maintain records for a period of three years.

The Consumers Bureau currently licenses direct sellers, vendors and collection agents. As part of the licensing provisions, the Bureau may condition the licence of direct sellers and vendors, but not at the present time, the licence of a collection agent. Conditioning of licences is an important feature of the Bureau's responsibility as it provides substantial flexibility in dealing with particular cases.

I am proposing an amendment which would allow the Bureau to condition the licence of a collection agent. Other amendments affecting collection agents are designed to increase their accountability to those from whom goods have been seized, those who hire collection agents and to the Consumers Bureau.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Bill 110 proposes limitation on the size of deposits, trust provisions for deposits and liability for deposits given to a seller by a consumer respecting the retail sale of goods. There are two basic principles involved in bringing forward these provisions. The first is consumer confidence and the second is the use of deposits for general cash flow purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is generally acknowledged that the economy is showing signs of growth and that consumer spending is a key factor in maintaining and increasing the possibility of further economic expansion. By providing trust provisions for deposits made for the purchase of goods, I believe that consumer confidence will be enhanced.

I further believe it is wrong in principle, that deposits be used for general cash flow purposes by a business entity. The greatest danger of the consumer losing his/her deposit is where a firm requires deposits to keep one step ahead of its most pressing financial obligation. Such apparent cases of undercapitalization should not be rectified, in whole or in part, by third persons who have no knowledge of possible financial difficulties of a particular firm.

I, therefore, recommend this bill to the honourable members for their consideration, comments and adoption.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned on this bill.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, with respect to the

Constitutional Amendment regarding Official Languages, standing in the name of the Member for The Pas.

The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak on the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, 1870. At the outset I believe it will be useful to reinforce certain issues that were raised by the Attorney-General in his opening address, and to elaborate on other perspectives that are pertinent to my ministerial responsibilities.

My comments, while touching on some of the legal and constitutional events discussed by the Attorney-General, are intended to express the issue from a cultural and historical context.

Most Manitobans are aware of the fact that The British North America Act of 1867 represents the legal cornerstone upon which this nation was formed. Not only was it a legal cornerstone, however, it was also a statement of the founding principals of this nation, written based on century-old practices, recognized the necessity to bargain in good faith with the habitants of this land.

Culture, peoples way of life, their lands and traditions were recognized as rights to be bargained for in good faith in exchange for the right to settle. Those who believed that these issues should be settled on the principle of "to the victor go the spoils" have forgotten that the country was founded on vastly different principles. The rights of the country's Francophones, our Native people and, in fact, all minorities are in danger whenever the ground is left fertile for such a thought.

Section 133 of The British North America Act made for Canada a promise that either the English or the French language could be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of Parliament of Canada. It also provided assurances that either language could be used in any court in Canada, and that the acts of the Legislature were specifically required to be printed and published in both languages.

In 1870, three years after Confederation, Manitoba joined Canada under the provisions of The Manitoba Act. Section 23 of Manitoba's own Constitutional Act repeated the same language guarantee. Manitobans had entered Confederation participating in the 1867 dream of a country which could protect minority rights of those who had chosen to overcome their language, cultural, educational and religious differences in forming a nation.

In 1870, of course, Anglophones represented the minority in Manitoba and the language, cultural, educational and religious guarantees took a different meaning than they do in today's context. After only 20 years, with massive immigration into the province, Francophones soon represented the minority in the province, at that time some 30 percent of the population.

In 1890, the Legislature of Manitoba enacted an Official Languages Act which effectively made the province unilingual. That act was finally challenged in 1979 before the Supreme Court of Canada and declared invalid on the grounds that provincial Legislatures could not unilaterally alter their Constitutions.

While those on both sides of the constitutional debate will argue whether the courts would ever cause legal

chaos by rendering our statutes invalid, we forget that the issue is not just one of whether they could or whether they would, the issue is whether the country's minorities, those here at that time, as well as those who have arrived later, can be guaranteed the right to retain and to be educated in the language, the culture and the religion of one's heritage.

Manitobans must recognize that this province, with its Constitution only 113 years old, and its population constantly evolving, takes its very shape, and certainly its character and strength, from the diversity of its people. Canada's Constitutional Act of 1982, and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, do not in any way diminish our obligation to ensure that we honour the principles and constitutional guarantees which our founding fathers agreed upon as a basis for this province and country.

Manitoba, perhaps more than any other province in Canada, demonstrates the cultural diversity to be found within Canada. Manitoba's culture is formed from its Native peoples; the traditions of its founding nations, and the many and varied cultural traditions and perspectives which have been brought to this province through the decades of immigration.

Canada is both a bilingual and a multicultural country and our vision of ourselves cannot have validity without taking this fact into account. We cannot form a society worth living in if we do not recognize fully the contribution that each of its members make to it. Our vision of our society will be flawed if we do not dedicate ourselves to enabling all of our residents, no matter what their linguistic and cultural heritage might be, to participate fully in the formation and development of our future.

Recently I received a copy of a letter from the Chairman of the Ukrainian Community Development Committee addressed to the President of the Société Franco-Manitobaine which expressed the view of that organization with regard to the initiative before us. I would like to just take a moment to read part of the translation of that letter, Mr. Speaker.

He says, in part, "I am pleased to congratulate the SFM, as well as the entire French Canadian community of Manitoba, for having recovered Manitoban's right to be a bilingual province under the Manitoba Constitution, constitutionally determining a historic right and a reality in Manitoba, the denial of which had previously obstructed the exercise of natural rights by all groups." He goes on to say, "We are convinced that the recognition, by all Canadians, of their country's official bilingual character is a condition of its multicultural nature."

He goes on to say that in relation to the rights of both the French and the Ukrainian in Canada that we believe that the rights of these two communities are indivisible and that denying rights to one community amounts to weakening the rights of all other communities.

Just last Friday in the preamble to a question, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Elmwood suggested that another leader of a Ukrainian organization, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, Winnipeg Branch, was opposed to what the government was attempting with respect to the resolution that is before us. I can report to you, Mr. Speaker, that I met with the president of that organization last Friday

afternoon and he is not opposed. In fact, he's in favour of the position of this government.

It's significant to note that many of the representatives of the ethnic minority communities in the province, Mr. Speaker, as evidenced by the position of leadership within the Ukrainian community, as evidenced by the representation that was made to the public information meetings that were held in Winnipeg last week, all of them, that they believed that the province's bilingual character must be accepted as a premise to understanding the province and the country's multicultural nature; that to deny the rights to one community will weaken the rights to all other communities in the provinces. That's a view that's accepted by many of the leaders, in fact all that have spoken out publicly with respect to this resolution.

I also share this belief about the nature of this province and this country. It is upon this premise that I support the Constitutional Amendment. I believe that the further the expansion of service to Manitobans in either of the official languages in a practical and responsible manner is a necessary component to this trust. I feel that this commitment should be entrenched as well.

One only needs to go to the Laurier-Greenway compromise of 1896 to see why. At that time, an unconstitutional but legislative compromise was made on the schools issue. It permitted other languages than English to be used in Manitoba schools. However, with a change in government in 1916, Mr. Speaker, during a period that was not known for great cultural tolerance due to the war and the turmoil that was taking place in the world at that time, The Public Schools Act was further amended to strike that compromise. There are many Francophones in this province as well as many other citizens who can remember having to hide French textbooks or not speak their ancestral language on the arrival of the school inspector to their school. These various fears and infringements on human dignity and, in fact, rights cannot be allowed to happen to our citizens again.

As was mentioned in the Throne Speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my government is committed to preserving and developing Manitoba's cultural heritage in full recognition of the diverse backgrounds and traditions of its citizens. My government recognizes that Manitoba is a multi-ethnic society. The French language has a unique historical and constitutional position in Manitoba, a position that has been reaffirmed by rulings of the Supreme Court of Canada.

Our view is evidenced not only by our commitment to this particular resolution but also by the steps which we have taken to recognize both factors in the development of government policy. Believing that Manitoba's cultural diversity is a significant factor in contributing to understanding Manitoba and Canada, this government has over the past year taken at least four steps to demonstrate our commitment to the multicultural nature of Manitoba.

My department's Multicultural Grants Program has been increased from \$135,000 the last year of the previous administration, to over \$300,000 this year. The Linguistics Grant Support Program that provides assistance for the developing of ancestral language training in the off-school or after-school time period for our various ethnic communities, has been increased

from less than \$40,000 to some \$60,000 this year, Mr. Speaker. The Multicultural Capital Grants Program has recently been increased also under the Jobs Fund from some \$65,000 to \$100,000 this year.

The fourth and perhaps the most significant initiative was this government's belief in the need to establish an intercultural council formed from and by the community. It is my belief that the community itself holds the expertise and experience to find solutions for confronting the various problems which face Manitoba's cultural minority groups.

It is for this reason that this government established an Interim Liaison Committee on Multiculturalism in May of last year. The purpose of this committee was to make recommendations to government on a formula for representation, organizational structure and draft by-laws for a provincial intercultural council. The committee members were community volunteers chosen because of their interest and knowledge of the task to be done. This was necessary, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in order to be objective in doing a full-scale review of multicultural policies throughout Canada and participating in an extensive community consultation process in various regions of the province, as well as reviewing some 92 presentations, both written and oral.

It is on the basis of the recommendations of that committee that the principles of an intercultural council were formed. Following receipt of that committee's report on January 20th of this year, a planning and implementation committee was established whose work resulted in a conference last April entitled "The First Ethnocultural Assembly" held for the purposes of founding the Manitoba Intercultural Council. This council will enable the community to make recommendations to this and future governments of Manitoba on ethnocultural matters in the province including education, human rights, immigration settlement, media, communications and cultural heritage.

It was the belief that this co-ordinating role had to be placed in legislation that caused the government on April 11th of this year to introduce Bill No. 50, The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act. This government's position on French language services and on the value of our ethnocultural organizations can reinforce the concept that cultural pluralism breeds a willingness to accept cultural differences and a feeling of comfort and pride in expressing our being Manitobans and Canadians within our own ethnicity.

My government has also recognized that our ancestral languages are the very soul of our being. Our language is what gives us spirit, our unique way of being who we are, of embracing our past, enriching our present and sharing our future. As people who cherish human beings we cannot deny this spirit from anyone, because it takes away from all of us. Those of us who have lost this component really feel a void and I have personally experienced this myself. It is this feeling and this conviction that has seen such a growth in the various bilingual language programs in our province. Gone are the fears of individuals who have felt that somehow children will be inadequately educated.

There have been numerous studies and research programs completed that show that children not only have more positive self-concepts rising out of this training but they do as well or better in academic, in English, than do children in unilingual programs. We

must also take time to examine very seriously how each of us would feel if some very important right that we hold very dear was a right only by circumstance and not by some legal guarantee. Let us respect each other, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I concur with those in the ethnocultural community who believe that without the entrenching of Francophone rights and services in Manitoba's Constitution, no ethnic minority can be assured that governments and, in fact, the entire population will have the tolerance necessary to ensure that all of us continue to have available to us the very essence of the makeup of this province, that being its ethnocultural diversity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make my contribution to this resolution at this time. Mr. Speaker, I do so because I feel capable of addressing this resolution from the heart and without a great deal of prepared notes. It's not slipped our attention on this side that most honourable members addressing this resolution have stayed to very carefully prepared text. I voice that not as a criticism but perhaps as an appropriate caution about the subject matter that is under discussion and the need for caution in debating the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I speak to the resolution coming from a background of one of the other groups of people other than the founding nations - to use that phrase - other than those people that were present in Canada when this nation decided to build themselves into a nation under a constitution, under a British North America Act, as it was then called, in the year 1867. I refer, of course, to our Native brothers who were here, with whom Canada and prior to that the Crown entered into various agreements, treaties that set out rights that we respect and honour today and, of course, the accommodation, the compromise, the agreed-to modus operandi, if you like, of the two fundamental groups of people that were in this country at that time of French-speaking background and of English-speaking background.

Mr. Speaker, those of us that came after that date, my parents included, including those of Ukrainian or Polish, Portuguese or Italian, very many numbers of people that have come to this country - and came to this country by choice - knew what kind of a country they were coming to, knew what kind of constitutional arrangements they were being asked to accept in becoming citizens of this country, not only just of Canada but also of the province itself. Therefore I never shared the view that is expressed very often, indeed, even expressed by some of my own colleagues from time to time and I heard it from none other than the Minister of Culture just a few moments ago, that being of - for want of a better phrase - third ethnic groups, I've never assumed nor have any of the people that I'm associated with, that I need entrenchment of my minority rights in any Constitution or that I need entrenchment on the part of some other minority group. The things that minorities under the kind of system of governments that we have, under the kind of approach

that we take to minorities enables the various groupings of peoples to the extent that they wish to, engage in the furtherance of education, heritage of their specific minority.

The suggestion that people of Ukrainian background, people of Jewish background, people of German background or Italian background or Portuguese background can't continue to further the culture of the community that they are part of in some cases by distant ancestry, that that somehow is jeopardized because a minority group has not got some specific rights entrenched in the Constitution, it just simply escapes me. Surely no one is suggesting in this Chamber that the myriad of other ethnic groups are to follow suit in the next Session and the Session thereafter and have their specific rights, which I never accept as rights, I think it's a blessing that we have in this country that I can still speak a reasonably fluent German language, although I would have to go back some five generations to the time that I could trace some ancestry back to the country now known as Germany. That was never a question of having constitutional entrenchment safeguard those rights for me. It was a question and a matter of choice as, indeed, it should be. Mr. Speaker, I have never doubted for a moment, I have no difficulty in accepting the French fact in Canada and the French fact in Manitoba as it was specified, as it was written into law at the time that Manitoba joined the Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, nobody on this side has in any way denied the fact that those same rights, particularly the French linguistic rights, that were written into the bill that brought Manitoba into Confederation with Canada, that those rights were severely curtailed, denied, tramped upon if you like, for some 90 years. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be part of a government that had to respond and had to react appropriately too, when that was restored by virtue of a Supreme Court case in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, I can only recall that there was unanimity in this Chamber, where unanimity isn't always that easily accomplished, by the actions taken by my Premier, the now Member for Charleswood, the Leader of the Opposition. We adopted, not with any foot dragging, the necessary positions that the Provincial Government, any provincial government believing in law and order would have to adopt when, indeed, a Supreme Court decision has been arrived at and, Mr. Speaker, from the then opposition there was little, or no - in fact, Mr. Speaker, I qualified that, I shouldn't qualify it - there was no opposition other than a general endorsement in support for the actions taken by the then Premier Lyon and the Progressive Conservative Government in acknowledging that 90 years of wrong had, indeed, been righted by a Supreme Court decision; and that we were prepared to move with prudence and diligence in seeing that the spirit of that Supreme Court decision was, indeed, carried out.

The speech of the Attorney-General, some few days ago, did better than what I could do in putting on the record the sincerity and the willingness with which the then Progressive Conservative Administration moved to accommodate the Supreme Court's decision to acknowledge the French fact in Manitoba, as it was initially agreed upon, as it was stated in law in the statute that made Manitoba part of Canada; which said

that French services, the French language, shall be available in the Legislature, shall be available in the courts, and the statutes shall be available in that language. That, Mr. Speaker, is what the original conditions of Manitoba joining an existing Canada stated.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is a confederation, always has been. Under the present Trudeau Liberal Government, of course, that confederation has been severely tested, because he is a centralist and he really does not harbour the same feelings, and for the same need, for a federal state as do many others but, nonetheless, Canada is a federal state. The conditions for being part of that federal state vary from province to province. Ontario is different than Manitoba; Quebec is different than Ontario; Manitoba is different than either of those provinces. That is the way the country was put together. Saskatchewan and Alberta are different than Manitoba. Saskatchewan and Alberta entered Confederation under different conditions than Manitoba did. Anybody that denies that simply is refuting history. I'm simply taking issue with the fact that what is now being perceived as necessary, as a right, is not in fact the case. The opposition is totally supportive of redressing a 90-year wrong, and in supporting the Supreme Court's decision in the Forest case.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not even prepared to argue with you, or with members opposite, that what the present agreement and resolution now proposes should not be considered by this Legislature, or by the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I resent it being represented as the only way of preventing chaos in the province and, indeed, as being part and parcel of the original conditions under which Manitoba entered Confederation in 1870. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker, and it's going to take a lot of time and a lot of education to properly get that information out to the people.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, the very legitimate request for having this matter referred to an inter-session committee makes so much good sense. Mr. Speaker, if you want to avoid the kind of mindless emotional reaction to this resolution that's before us, and surely if you realize this, as my leader has said, being the first substantive amendment as being considered to our Constitution - I say "our," I refer to Manitoba - then any measure of objectivity would say that cannot be done in the time frame that the Attorney-General, that this government, has to date indicated is their time schedule, their time frame for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there have, of course, been changes since those original documents of Confederation of Canada, of Manitoba's entry into that Confederation in 1870. Since that time other major pieces of legislation have been passed that dwell on this matter, principally, of course, The Official Languages Act that arose out of the 3 - 4 year deliberation of the B & B Commission, the language act that was passed pertaining to federal institutions, to the Federal Government, the Federal Civil Service, federal provision of federal services that were all laid out in The Official Languages of 1968-69, I believe it was, have in my judgment, in the case of the particular debate on this resolution, made it difficult to sort out for the ordinary person, the ordinary Manitoban, what is relatively new legislation that was passed in our time, that pertains specifically to the

Federal Government and its institutions, as compared to the recognition and the desire to right past wrongs, if you like, with respect to the French minority in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the position taken by the official opposition, with respect to restoring the original conditions of Confederation when Manitoba joined Canada, the position taken by the then government under my then Leader and Premier, Premier Lyon, I believe was correct and appropriate and certainly in keeping with the spirit of the Supreme Court's decision, and one that was generally applauded to doing all those things by members opposite when they were in opposition, and by the Francophone community of Manitoba at that time.

The position that we are being asked to consider under this resolution is one that may well be considered by this House and may well, in the greater context of nation-building, be appropriate if properly understood and if appropriate time is taken to allow the kind of study and the kind of scrutiny that this very important resolution requires.

If, within the short period of time that this resolution was introduced and the discussion period that we've had on it, important organizations such as the Manitoba Government Employees Association can raise a number of pertinent and serious concerns, would it not be natural, Mr. Speaker, to expect that the municipal organizations that have been arbitrarily designated by this government as bilingual, who have yet to hear from this government as to what it entails?

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General shakes his head, but certainly our information and the information that we received - not just that we've received - but the information that's been publicly expressed by different reeves and mayors who have learned from the media that they are a designated municipality or community, express not shock or outrage, but just express concern about the fact that all they have learned about it is from what they read in the newspapers. They have not heard, they have not sat down with any secretariat responsible for delivery of French services as to what that could possibly mean in their municipality, in their community, in their town, in their village, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the members opposite that there is no case made in this Chamber for the indecent haste that this resolution is being pushed through this House. I think the goodwill of the people of Manitoba is being jeopardized as to their relations between the various races and cultures, if what is being done appears to be done with undue haste.

Mr. Speaker, I share, although not being learned in the law, but certainly share the view just as a simple layman. It's inconceivable, as my leader has said and others have said, that any court in the land would create the kind of chaos that the Attorney-General keeps suggesting would happen if, in fact, we allowed the Bilodeau case to proceed. Mr. Speaker, common sense prevails. One doesn't have to be learned in the law just to have a deep understanding for that.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Attorney-General and to the government members opposite, and I remind them, the heat on this issue is of their making because most of it is caused, not by the subject matter itself as to the process, but the manner and way in which they're handling it; the idea of arriving at an agreement

with a private citizen, Mr. Bilodeau, in this case, that will affect a fundamental constitutional change. Mr. Speaker, really - the idea of arriving at, with one segment of the society, admittedly the one directly affected, the Franco-Manitoban Society, but again, without any further or broader consultation, that will affect a constitutional change that will impact on all Manitobans.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this government that prides itself on having some sensitivity toward minorities in the province and speaks a great deal of the need for recognizing the cultural contributions of the many minority groups within this province, should have greater sensitivity, should have greater appreciation that, the very process, the very way that they're approaching this problem is what is creating the biggest part of the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been very proud of the fact that in my constituency, I have a significant Francophone vote; communities such as Elie, St. Eustache, St. Ambroise, St. Laurent, always been particularly proud of the fact that to date I've received substantial majority of their vote come voting time. I have not received any mail, any pressure on this issue. I have not received one letter telling me that I should talk to my leader about his position on this matter, not one, Mr. Speaker, and 18 to 20 percent of my constituency is Francophone. No, Mr. Speaker, they are fearful of the kind of climate that is capable of being created by a government acting foolishly, with indecent haste and, more importantly, with a total lack of sensitivity to what constitutes Manitoba, 1983.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: If there is no other member wishing to speak to this motion, it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas.

(English Translation of Mr. G. Lecuyer's speech in Vol. XXXI, No. 108, 15 July, 1983, 10:00 a.m.)

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House I am, indeed, happy to speak in this debate concerning an amendment to the Canadian Constitution. This whole matter is obviously of personal importance to me and a concern to all Franco-Manitobans, since they are the most directly concerned. However, in giving the matter careful thought, this affects all minority groups in Manitoba and, in fact, all minority groups in Canada. It will have major consequences for generations to come. All Canadian parties, regardless of their political stand, be they New Democratic, Parti Québécois, Conservative or Liberal, are following this matter and awaiting its outcome. Just how Manitoba treats the official minority of this province will have far-reaching implications for all other minority groups. The way this province respects the rights of French-speaking Manitobans will have a significant bearing on the respect of minorities, whether they be Ukrainian, German, Chinese or other. By adopting the resolution before us, Manitoba is remaking history and undertaking a new phase in a more united Canada.

At the outset of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to review the past events which lead us to this day. Then I wish to briefly explain the components of the resolution and the impact of its approval. Last, I wish to refute the arguments of those who refuse to understand the good basis of this resolution.

A rapid look backwards in our history enables us to reject the statements of those who say that this country has only one language and that all debate on the matter was settled on the Plains of Abraham. I would like to remind you that the Treaty of Paris marking the end of the conflict between England and France guaranteed to Francophones of New France their language and religion. Moreover, The Quebec Act of 1774 guaranteed the linguistic rights of Anglophones giving them political control, notwithstanding the fact that they constituted only 1 percent of the population at that time.

From the beginning of colonization, therefore, Mr. Speaker, it became clear that the way in which those defeated in the conflict were treated, and the extent to which their right to exist and maintain their identity were recognized, would play a vital role in creating a harmonious and peaceful society. And were not these people the first to come from Europe to settle permanently in this part of the new world, to colonize and to develop the resources of the country? And then, the support of all colonizers, Francophone and Anglophone, were required to oppose and to resist the intrusions of groups from the United States.

At the time of Confederation in 1867, Section 133 of The British North America Act guaranteed parity of French and English in the Parliament of Canada and of Quebec, as well as in the Courts and, Mr. Speaker, the language and rights of the minority in Quebec were protected. Was it not normal to do the same thing for Francophones of Manitoba under the pressure of the provisional government of Louis Riel, particularly since the Francophones and/or Métis, the first colonizers of Manitoba, constituted more than 50 percent of the population at the time this province joined Confederation in 1870?

Since the minority rights of Anglophones in Quebec were guaranteed, a minority which was able to develop with total control over its institutions, school boards, schools, hospitals, universities, libraries, museums, etc., was it not normal and logical that equal linguistic rights be given in 1870 to Manitoba Francophones, who were then in a majority? We had then, and we still have today, the same rights enshrined in The Manitoba Act. This is why I cannot understand the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition when he said the other day, and I quote from page 4162 of Hansard: ". . . This is a very important matter, one that will bind this province for generations to come. . . ." Why then, Mr. Speaker, were the rights of Franco-Manitobans thrown aside? Why were injurious and illegal laws passed in 1890 and 1916? And why not today, redress the wrongs and the injustices of the past, for it is never too late to do justice?

Mr. Speaker, in 1908 in a resolution adopted in council, the City of St. Boniface voluntarily declared itself bilingual, even though there were only several Anglophone families within its jurisdiction. History shows that Anglophone minorities have been treated with justice. It is time that Francophones be treated the same way. Mr. Speaker, this is all they are asking.

But what are the components of this resolution? Is it going to re-establish bilingualism in this province? The answer to that clearly is, no. This resolution will not bilingualize all sectors of the province. Of course, it requires the province to translate statutes and laws and the official records of this Legislature, and gives

the right to use French in this House, as granted in 1870 and reaffirmed by a decision of the Supreme Court in 1979. This resolution will also allow the Manitoba public to communicate in French, or in English, with the following government agencies or institutions, and receive services from same:

1. The headquarters or central administration of government departments;
2. The headquarters of central administration of the following agencies: courts, quasi-judicial jurisdictions, Crown corporations, and agencies of the provincial government;
3. The office of the Chief Electoral Officer;
4. The Office of the Ombudsman.

Mr. Speaker, these are, therefore, necessarily the specific and limited rights which are granted in this resolution concerning the use of French. We have to ensure that these limited rights are a part of an amendment to the Canadian Constitution in order that persons like the Leader of the Opposition do not, again, bring down upon us such setbacks as we had in 1980 and 1916, in order that our rights are not diminished to privileges which oblige us to live in fear and conflict — (Interjection) — let me finish my sentence first — nor that our rights be subject to the political moods of the day.

To answer the concern of the Member from St. Norbert, I did not accuse the Leader of the Opposition, I said that in order that such a thing does not happen, either through the Leader of the Opposition or by anyone else in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I quote here some words from the editorial page of the weekly paper, *La Liberté*, of June 24, 1983:

"It seems the sense of justice of a society can be measured by the place that the majority is ready to give to a minority. Sterling Lyon cannot bring a rational person to believe that his "courtesy" type approach towards Franco-Manitobans shows tolerance and comprehension." (Translation)

Does this resolution go too far, as is claimed by some who are blinded and obsessed by their own ignorance and/or bigotry? In my opinion, this resolution is a fair compromise which meets the reasonable expectations of a minority which has always shown remarkable patience and tolerance. After all, we did have guarantees in The Manitoba Act, but these were illegally taken away from us for 90 years, while in Quebec, these guarantees were ensured without interruption for Anglophones. It is impossible for us to recreate the situation which prevailed in Manitoba at the time these pernicious laws were passed, nor is this resolution intended to turn the clock back. It is rather a step forward, demonstrating a greater openness of attitude and a greater sense of justice for the future.

(English section of Mr. Lecuyer's speech was spoken here)

Mr. Speaker, people of French expression in Manitoba have no unreasonable expectations. They are not demanding the letter of the law but simply that which is important for them to be able to live in French as equals.

Had they wished to push this matter to the limit they could have stubbornly insisted that all the laws and statutes previously adopted be translated; they could have demanded that all government institutions provide them with complete services in both languages, as is the case in Quebec, or in New Brunswick. Rather, the Francophone collectivity of Manitoba has negotiated in good faith for a reasonable compromise. Should we not, today, as the government, show an equal amount of good faith and be reasonable as well?

Personally I cannot, in all fairness, accept for the generations to come less than that which is provided for in this resolution. Francophones of Manitoba have already lived one hundred years of injustice. Never, never will they give up the struggle. If they do not receive justice from today's government they will not hesitate to continue the struggle to ensure that their rights are respected.

As a parenthesis here, Mr. Speaker, I will say that it is this struggle that divides us, that divides the parties of Canada, and that by adopting this amendment we will, at last, be able to achieve unity in this country. If this House does not give the last word on this question it will obviously have to be settled elsewhere, and in all likelihood at the risk of greater embarrassment for all of us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL 55 - THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjourned debates on second reading, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill 55, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill, as previous speakers have indicated, does not deal with any one principle. It involves a series of amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act, some of which, as my colleagues have indicated, attract no objection from this side of the House, others of which attract serious objection from this side of the House because they represent, as I shall attempt to point out, Mr. Speaker, an attempt by the NDP to purloin the public purse and to use taxpayers' money for their own partisan political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, let me deal with some of the less contentious matters before we engage ourselves in a discussion of the matters that are not in the public interest, namely, those which involve the NDP in yet another attempt to get the public involuntarily to pay for their election propaganda and other socialist publications that they would like to push around to the people of Manitoba, especially if the people of Manitoba will pay for them in advance. It's, Mr. Speaker, such a highly irregular process that I fail to understand how a government of any integrity could bring forward a proposition of this kind in a year when they tell the people of Manitoba they're going to be running a deficit in excess of \$600 million, and in a year in which they have already inflicted a 1 percent increase on the sales

tax on Manitobans and so on. Yet, Mr. Speaker, these socialists across the way, with the brass of 18 monkeys, say not only are we going we going to do that Mr. and Mrs. public of Manitoba, but we're going to get you to pay for our political propaganda that we will be able to send into the constituencies at your expense so that we can try to prop up our disintegrating government politically and, hopefully, with the use of your money maybe save ourselves from the almost inevitable result of abject defeat when the next election comes around. It can't come, Mr. Speaker, too soon. Well, I perhaps have given sufficient indication of where the bulk of my comments will reside when we get to that point.

The bill starts out by the kind of political tinkering that could only come from the rather disordered minds, if I may so, Mr. Speaker, of people who tinker before they know whereof they are tinkering. The constituency allowance that heretofore has been given to members over a good number years, \$1,500, a general constituency allowance which members are allowed to spend in whatever way they see fit with respect to their own legitimate expenses as members of the House, is to be done away with. That allowance of \$1,500 is to be raised to \$2,500. The only difference is, Mr. Speaker, that the \$2,500 allowance will be payable to a member only on voucher where he or she can demonstrate that they have used that money for constituency expenses such as constituency offices.

The minute I mention constituency offices, Mr. Speaker, you will be the first to realize that we come to one of the NDP playthings, one of the knee jerks of the left movement in Manitoba, that they must have the public pay for their offices in each of the constituencies. It's not good enough to have the office and to have the \$1,500 allowance out of which members if they so choose can pay for it today, but \$1,000 more has to be added so that the NDP can be sure that the taxpayers are paying for their constituency offices.

Mr. Speaker, Socialists, Conservatives, Liberals provincially have all been known from time to time to have constituency offices; the extent to which if any, they were paid for out of public funds is up to the individual member out of that \$1,500 allowance that the individual member has been getting for many, many years. But that's not good enough for the NDP, Mr. Speaker. First of all, they are saying by this act that they haven't scooped enough out of the taxpayers' pocket. They want to scoop another thousand dollars from the taxpayers' pocket into their pocket so that they can have their beloved constituency offices.

This kind of a knee-jerk, left-wing response, Mr. Speaker, in a province that is in a state of financial degradation brought about largely by the NDP is hardly the kind of action that a government of integrity should be bringing forward at a time when it is asking all other people to notch their belts a bit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, why doesn't the NDP notch its belt a bit? Why does the NDP insist on gouging the taxpayers for another thousand dollars to pay for their pet constituency offices? Why does the NDP insist on gouging the taxpayer for an unlimited sum that we have provided for in this bill for the printing of their annual propaganda material? Why does the NDP want to gouge the taxpayer for that? In a third bill, Mr. Speaker, why does the NDP want to further gouge the taxpayer in The Election Expenses Act to pay, if you can imagine,

half of their election expenses in the next election? Why, Mr. Speaker, would the NDP want to do that, commit those three actions this year, each of which is contrary to the public interest, each of which should be and will be objected to and fought in this House? Such wanton greed, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a political party has seldom been seen in one Session in this House - wanton greed, there is no other word for it - trying to tell the taxpayers that it's in their interest to pay for their political propaganda, to pay for their constituency offices and in another bill, Mr. Speaker, the worst of the three, to pay for half of their election expenses when the next election rolls around. We'll be talking about the election expenses bill, I'm sure, in due course, Mr. Speaker.

So the first thing they do, the first gouge they make is with respect to the constituency allowance. The second, Mr. Speaker, is a gouge which works the other way. They're attempting to save the people of Manitoba a little bit of money and, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to speak of this in as frank and delicate a way as I can because the amendment refers, Sir, to the per-diem allowance that is granted to Mr. Speaker under the present legislation, a per-diem allowance of \$50 per day when the House is not sitting. That provision is to be struck out by virtue of this amendment and a fixed figure of \$3,500 is being replaced as the maximum which any Speaker can draw with respect to per-diem allowances.

Mr. Speaker, when we were in committee with respect to the Estimates of the Minister of Government Services, I believe it was, on Pages 3660 to 3666 of Hansard of Tuesday, June 14, 1983, there was some considerable discussion amongst the Minister of Government Services, the Minister of Health, myself, the Member for Springfield about the reason for this amendment being brought about. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the government has found it necessary to bring this amendment about. I regret the implication that was left in the course of that debate that it was brought about for cause, because it was felt that the per-diem payments that had been awarded to the present Speaker or applied for and paid to the present Speaker had been excessive. For that reason the government was bringing in a ceiling on the amount that any Speaker from here on would be enabled to receive, in lieu of, the full per diem allowances which heretofore have applied.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that that section is being brought in. I think the other section was probably a section under which previous presiding officers of this Chamber had found it possible to work. The fact remains, Sir, that with the present occupant of the Chair, there was drawn last year an amount that was considered by the government - and I must say by this side of the House as well - as being excessive and this is the action that results from it.

I regret that it has taken place but it is a matter of record; it's on the record in Hansard; and I merely comment that while we regret that it is taking place that we see no alternative, given the present circumstances, but to accede to that amendment. It is not the kind of commentary, however, that we would wish to see with respect to the office of the presiding officer of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, new travel allowances are provided for some 40 trips maximum. This is not a matter of any

great moment. I realize that one of the reasons for this amendment is to accommodate members from Northern Manitoba some of whom, particularly the Member for Rupertsland, must use privately-chartered aircraft to get into his constituency and, Mr. Speaker, you will find no serious objection on this side of the House to that kind of provision for members to service their constituency because of the problems brought about by geography and lack of available transportation services. The member is facing an undue cost in order to get into his constituency to see his people.

My only suggestion would be, Sir, that that kind of chartering of aircraft, that kind of use of the Manitoba Government Air Service aircraft needs to be constantly monitored in order to ensure that it is not abused in any way at all. I sometimes think that the arrangement that has been made with respect to Members of Parliament using aircraft of the chartered airlines in Canada to reach their constituencies is one that might offer, someday down the road, some kind of precedent that would be useful for Northern members, but for the present certainly we see no fundamental objection to that change that is being proposed.

The constituency allowance that I spoke of earlier, Mr. Speaker, is being expanded to \$2,500 and I've spoken briefly about what, in our estimation, we regard as the unnecessary expansion of this amount of money - from \$1,500 to \$2,500 - and the specific mention that is being made in that section of constituency offices being one of the purposes for which this gouging of the public is going forward.

Mr. Speaker, other speakers have observed that the \$1,500 allowance that is now presently paid to members is computed as part of their income and in a good many cases perhaps up to half of that \$1,500 goes back into the tax coffers of the Federal and the Provincial Government.

Under the expanded gouging that this government purports to enable by this bill, with voucher systems being provided for their pet constituency offices and God knows what other expenditures they will dream up in the course of getting their hands on this increased purloined money, that money will not be going; it will not be treated as money capable of being taxed by the Federal and Provincial Government, so there's a double loss on it, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the bottom line for the taxpayer of Canada and the taxpayer of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier the provision that was placed in The Legislative Assembly Act by the Schreyer Government some years ago, permitted members to have one mailing of election material to their constituencies each year; the post office charges to be at the expense of the taxpayers of Manitoba. In other words it was a form of provincial frank that was offered to the MLAs, by the Schreyer government, in order to permit them to send out one mailing piece of their own choice in years gone by.

We, Sir, on this side of the House in government and in opposition have used that and have not felt that it was any great abuse of the provincial taxpayer because letters, other communications that all MLAs can make as MLAs from this building, do go out on a provincial frank at the present time. While this was an extension of that it was not an extension that got into the quality of the propaganda that was going out but rather enabled

the member to have one mailing a year at the postal expense, to put it that way, of the taxpayers of Manitoba.

But, Mr. Speaker, we come along in this amendment and not only is the mailing provision repealed but then the substituted section is going to provide that in addition to any other privileges a member has in respect to the printing of written matter at the expense of the government and, Mr. Speaker, may I pause for a moment to mention those words, at the expense of the government. Mr. Speaker, the government doesn't pay any expenses except as a trustee on behalf of the taxpayers. Why don't we say in the bill at the expense of the taxpayer? The government is merely a strong or a weak reed acting as a trustee for the taxpayer. It's not the government out of its goodness of heart that is providing this money; it's the taxpayers, the working people of Manitoba, who are providing this money.

I know the NDP like to think that the government is the be-all and the end-all and that government is the only source and fount of all good because they don't pay too much attention to the spiritual or, may I say, the moral side of life, that government is the fount of all good. But, Mr. Speaker, most of the people in Manitoba don't believe that and this unfortunate drafting that is in the act, I think, should be cleaned up. It's not at the expense of the government at all.

It's a bill that can be submitted to the government to be paid by the government with money given to the government by the taxpayers. That's the way it should be expressed in bills of this sort where the NDP are attempting to gouge the public for even further money hoping that the public will never hear of them, hoping that the opposition will say nothing about it, hoping that some of their backbenchers who masterminded this, can push their petty little bureaucratic schemes through while they're temporarily in office in order that they can feather their own nests out of the public purse, and at least when they go into opposition after the next election they'll go in with constituency offices paid for by the public, with propaganda paid for by the public, and with half of their election expenses next time around paid for by the public.

Well, Mr. Speaker, not one of those three examples of gouging of the taxpayer of Manitoba is going to go unnoticed, unremarked or unfought in this Legislature and I say now, lest time prohibits me from completing the thought, that we earnestly suggest to the members of the government that they give some reconsideration to each of these matters, that they hold them back.

They tried, Mr. Speaker, last year to push through a mess of pottage like this toward the end of the Session and we said no. There were discussions that went on between the parties and we said no, we can't have that, that's not proper; and now, Mr. Speaker, they come this year, they figure this year the portcullis is going to drop this year, you see, because peoples' memories they figure are going to run from about the end of the second year of their unfortunate term of office until the election is called. They've got to rush in all of this purloinment of the public purse before the two-year period is up, in the vague hope that the public, and the opposition, will forget about this open thievery of the taxpayers' pocket to benefit the NDP, not even so much to benefit the individual member. I don't ascribe that motive to them, but to benefit, the movement, Mr.

Speaker, that's what they want. The taxpayers are going to subsidize the movement. The left movement is now going to get money from the taxpayers of Manitoba for its propaganda; for its offices - and God knows if the other bill, if they don't have the brains to withdraw it, The Election Expenses Act; for half of the left movement's election expenses everytime there's an election in Manitoba. To that last one, Mr. Speaker, I say never, never.

When we come, Mr. Speaker, to debate that bill, I'll have an interesting announcement to make about what will happen to that section when we form the government after the next election. I'll let you in on something that won't be a secret. We'll repeal it, Mr. Speaker, and we'll repeal it retroactively so that no socialist will ever get his hand on a penny of that money that they're trying to consign into the pockets of the left movement in Manitoba. We'll repeal it, repeal it retroactively.

Mr. Speaker, I won't even wait for that bill to be called. I tell my honourable friends right now that if their lack of integrity, if their lack of public morality is such that they think they can hustle this bill through on election expenses and these other purloinments that they want to subsidize the left movement on, I tell them right now, Mr. Speaker, that they're going to be repealed, and they'll be repealed retroactively. Anybody on that side of the House, or any of their candidates, under The Election Expenses Act, who takes a nickel of taxpayers' money for his election expenses will have to pay it back to the Provincial Treasury, because we will never permit the taxpayers of Manitoba to pay for the election expenses of any political party in this province.

Mr. Speaker, that's another speech for another day. I'm only dealing, Mr. Speaker, with three examples of petty theft in this bill. We'll get to the grand theft when we come to the election expenses bill as, indeed, we will come to the election expenses bill before too long.

So what does this say, Mr. Speaker, what does it say? That the government, according to their terms, the expense of government "each member may once, in respect of each Session, have printed, at the expense of government, written matter for circulation to the householders in the electoral division which the member represents; but (a) the printing of the written matter under this subsection, in respect of any session, shall be completed before the beginning of the next following session; and (b) the cost to the government" - those marvellous words, the euphemism that the socialists put in - "the cost to the taxpayer" - let me suggest the proper words - "the cost to the taxpayer of each printing of written matter requested by a member under this subsection shall not exceed the product of one-and-a-half times the cost that would be incurred by the government for a mailing of that printed matter if it were mailed for the member at the expense of the government under Subsection (1)."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is the clear example of how my honourable friends now want to get NDP propaganda printed at the expense of the public. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the double outrage that there would be, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, if this section were to go through, and the NDP were to print, at the public's expense, that maligned document, that tissue of lies that they turned out in November of 1981,

how they were going to turn around the economy, nobody was going to be laid off in Manitoba, and Limestone was going to go ahead. They weren't going to give away the resources. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the gall of a political party asking the public taxpayer to pay for that kind of a tissue of printed lies; and yet that is exactly what this bill provides for, that they will be able to print their lies at the expense of the public.

Well, we say, no they won't, Mr. Speaker. It is not in the public interest for this petty thievery of the public purse to go on, and we intend to fight these three examples of petty thievery that I have been outlining to you today.

Mr. Speaker, I'll speak briefly about one matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour. This bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I wonder, by leave, I've spoken to the Acting Opposition House Leader, if I might make one announcement about House business and move one procedural motion.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, the Standing Committee on Private Bills will not meet tomorrow morning. The two bills remaining still apparently need some work. So that's the announcement.

I would move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, by leave, that Bill No. 93, The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act be withdrawn from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments and transferred to the Committee of the Whole.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS HOURS

RESOLUTION NO. 11

MR. SPEAKER: Under Private Members' Hour the first item on the agenda is Private Members' Proposed Resolutions, Resolution No. 11, proposed by the Honourable Member for Thompson; and proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has 11 minutes remaining.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we were last dealing with this resolution, and the amendment thereto moved by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Niakwa, I was speaking in response to remarks that had been made on that particular date, the day in question being Monday, the 4th of July, by the original mover of the resolution, the Honourable Member for Thompson. I had been attempting, at that point in time, Sir, to challenge some

of the assertions that he had made in speaking to the amendment that particular day, and I want to pick up at that point in the few minutes remaining to me on the clock this afternoon.

I was — (Interjection) —

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

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, just a couple of moments ago the Leader of the Opposition walked across the floor, and he's doing it once again now, crossing the line between the Speaker and the Mace. I believe that is against House Rules, is an insult to this House, and is an insult to the Queen, Mr. Speaker, when he walks and crosses that line. It's the first time I have ever seen it done. I've never even heard of it being done in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a rule he wishes to quote to that effect?

MR. D. SCOTT: If you go back and read the role of the Mace in some of the pamphlets that are put out in the House, I have never ever seen anything. If you want to open something up, if you wish to make a ruling, Mr. Speaker, that we can walk back and forth across this House without giving any recognition to the Speaker, whether it's behind the Mace here or between you and the Mace then maybe members should start doing that, but that is an insult from anything that I have learned since I was in Youth Parliament, as a youth of 14 years of age, that one never crosses between the Speaker and the Mace.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not aware of any rule to that effect. If the honourable member has such a rule, perhaps he would quote it.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you'll find a rule in our Rules, but not all of the rulings nor all of the traditions in Parliament are found in our Rules.

HON. S. LYON: Right, like sitting on Wednesday night.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it has been tradition that no member crosses between the Speaker and the Mace. That is one of the traditions, whether it be codified in rule form I know not, but I know that is readily understood, not only in this House and in Ottawa and in London, that that is not done.

HON. S. LYON: Why don't you go to London instead of Moscow and you'd find out.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any member wish to advise the Chair on that matter?

The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: On the same point of order, having overheard this, I say this with every deference to you, Mr. Speaker but the tradition of acknowledging anything

in this Chamber is the Mace, and that's why we don't do it when the Mace is not on the table.

The acknowledgement is not to the Speaker, not to the Speaker's Chair but to the Mace, Mr. Speaker, and it's questionable whether that can be found in a Rules Book either, but it is tradition of the House.

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

MR. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reference in our Rules with regard to the Mace is not contained in the Fifth Edition of Beauchesne, the most current edition. I do recall however that it is both in the Fourth Edition of Beauchesne as well as in Erskine May and it's been a longstanding parliamentary tradition that no one crosses between the Mace and the Speaker, other than the Clerks at the table who are seated between the Speaker and the Mace.

I understand as well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member for Charleswood opposite, that that same practice, as set out in Erskine May, is the practice at the Mother of Parliaments in Westminster, that there is no traffic other than the Clerks at the table allowed between the Mace and the Speaker.

I would suggest, Sir, that in lieu of the quotation of a rule by the Member for Inkster in our current Rules Book where I know it is not contained, or in Beauchesne, that you may wish to consult the Fourth Edition of Beauchesne and Erskine May and I'm sure that it will be found in both places, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: On a piece of triviality, the foolishness of which has seldom been matched, I was at the centre table of the House consulting with the Deputy Clerk with respect to some business of the House. I had no intention to do anything offensive to the Mace or to you, Sir; you know that. Because some nouveau type who doesn't know anything about the traditions of Parliament in any event, wishes to make some case of it, let him do so, but I merely say to you, Sir, that in the Mother of Parliaments, where there aren't enough seats for members - and that, of course, would be a benefit when you have members like the Member for Inkster, because you could keep them out - the members come in and sit, Sir, in front of Mr. Speaker and move between the Mace and Mr. Speaker when the House is in one of its grand moments and people are crowding into the House. I've seen it happen at the opening of Parliament so I don't need to be read any lesson by Johnnys-come-lately, Mr. Speaker, about some of the traditions of the Mother of Parliament. I've been there; I've seen them.

I say this, my speaking to the Deputy Clerk was not meant as any form of offence to the Mace for which I feel some loyalty, or to you, Sir, and that should be sufficient for the record.

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

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I can recall that when I visited this Legislature years ago for the first time,

the guide that was accompanying us at the time told us that never does one walk between the Speaker and the Mace. If it's not in the Rules, Mr. Speaker, and it's a part of our Parliamentary traditions, it is also a fact that it is not in the Rules but apparently part of our tradition that we wear a jacket, and the other day when it was 100 degrees and I took my arms out of the sleeves, I was told that was a tradition; I had to put it back on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Niakwa to the same point.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, not to cause any great debate - but I was just wondering the intent of all of this discussion back and forward, whether it's to the good of the House or not. I've heard accusations from one side and the other, stating that the other side is doing some wrongs and possibly this is the case, Mr. Speaker, but it's like a little boy running home and tattletaling; it's of no consequence, Mr. Speaker, absolutely no consequence. For the edification of this House, there are lot of things that are going on in this House that are wrong; it's morally wrong, it is not wrong against the Rules. I've seen members give a sign of salute that is something that I would recognize as a Nazi salute, and that is wrong and I point the finger right at the man there.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things and I think it's a matter of co-operation, and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has told you his intent was not to embarrass anybody, it was a matter of just speaking to the Deputy Clerk and that was done. I can't understand it, if somebody is trying to get even because they had their jacket off and were playing the game of trying to push the Speaker to the fullest to see whether, in fact, he would rule on it, which was the case, and the Speaker ruled correctly and I can't understand why all this is going on; the weather is hot. There are many feelings back and forward, Mr. Speaker, and I think, for the sake of co-operation amongst the members, that this be dropped and I think the honourable member should just be reminded that there are other rules that are being broken that shouldn't be.

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

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, for someone who preaches in this House constantly and tries to make a case when one talks about the Constitution of Canada and the heritage of our Constitution, both to Britain and the unwritten parts of our Constitution, for him to get up in this House — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member confine his remarks to the point?

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, my remarks are to the point. You cannot talk about tradition in one instance and not talk about it in another. When you have a tradition, as the Member for Springfield says, passed down from the Mother of Parliaments, has been a longstanding tradition, it's been a tradition established right from

the very start in Parliaments, as the members do not cross the floor between the Mace when the Mace is on the table, Mr. Speaker, when it is on the table and the Speaker is in his Chair. Once again, it's an insult to the parliamentary process and shows you the kind of respect that the Leader of the Opposition has for our British parliamentary heritage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank all honourable members who have advised the Chair on this matter. I will take it under advisement.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry may continue his remarks.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, when we were last addressing the substance of this amendment and this resolution, I was attempting to make the point, Sir, that I understand the dismay of the Honourable Member for Thompson in having his resolution amended at a point in time and at a point in debate when perhaps he thought it was going to carry and clear Private Members' Hour. That's a perfectly understandable emotion on his part.

It is no justification, however, Sir, for making statements that are exaggerated and extreme, and that distort the position of the Progressive Conservative Party on this subject, and I think that, in giving bent to his disappointment and his frustration, perhaps the Honourable Member for Thompson did indulge in some flights of whim and fancy with respect to the position of the Progressive Conservative Party on universal health care and on Medicare, and I don't believe that such inaccuracies should be left on the record unchallenged, Sir.

That was where we were when we were last addressing this amendment, and I want to proceed from there in the few moments remaining at hand today. The Member for Thompson, essentially, relied very heavily, Mr. Speaker, in his remarks on July 4th on the fact that it was his view that the basic objection of the old line parties, as he called them, the Conservative and Liberal Parties, to universal health care in the 1950s and the 1960s was that Canadians could not afford it. He cited the argument that was raised, in his view, and emphasized, in his view, to a considerable degree during the Medicare and universal health care debates of the '50s and '60s and described that, or interpreted that, as a position that could best be summed up in that argument, to wit, "we can't afford it." But he claims that the Saskatchewan CCF or NDP made everybody sit up and take notice in the 1960s by bringing in a Medicare program and proving that, "we can afford it." Well, Mr. Speaker, that's precisely the point that is contained in the amendment to the resolution moved by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

The point at issue here, Sir, is that to enjoy and maintain a major and highly desirable universal social program such as universal hospitalization and universal medicare, we have to be able to afford it. So that if there were arguments raised in the 1950s, or in that period of time, and I'm not suggesting that was the basic opposition argument, but the Member for Thompson suggests that it was, if there were arguments raised at that point in time which suggested that we could not afford universal hospitalization and universal

medicare in this country, it was an attitude that was born out of pragmatism and realism with respect to the requirements that must be in place and must be met if you're going to have that kind of program. It was an argument that arose out of the real experiences of the Depression, of the real experiences of those who had seen Canada and other western industrialized nations suffer severe economic difficulties that, admittedly, came to an end during World War II, but that remained in the consciousness of many legislators and many persons. They raised the warning that we simply had to have the resources, and we had to have the private sector economic capacity and capability to maintain those kinds of program if we were going to go into them; otherwise, we would get in them, find ourselves in difficulty, and then face real trauma when revolutionary adjustments had to be made.

So that, if that argument was raised, that was the reason for that argument, Mr. Speaker. I think there is clear and demonstrable reason for raising that kind of argument. That is really the reality that is contained in the amendment moved by my colleague. It says that we want to maintain universal health care and universal medicare, with all its implicit and all its founding principles, and we intend to do that to the extent of our capacity and our ability as the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker; but we appeal to the government to understand and appreciate the basic fact of life that says that you have to have revenues, and you have to have prosperity, and you have to have production, and you have to have profits, and you have to have a healthy private economic sector in order to maintain those kinds of programs for any length of time.

Surely that is an argument that does not go over the heads of the Honourable Member for Thompson and his colleagues any longer; surely that's an argument that they can understand and appreciate when they look around at the difficulties in which many universal programs find themselves today as a consequence of the difficulties that the national economy and the provincial economy are in.

I think most Canadians and most Manitobans have long since come to recognize that simply to talk about universal programs in the social services field, universal programs in the health care field, is to engage in fancy and, to some degree, damaging rhetoric. It's not good enough simply to talk about those programs and dream about them and wish for them in an abstract idealistic way. There has to be a solid underpinning. All we're saying in this amendment is that it is the first and primary responsibility of that government opposite, if they want to maintain universal health care and universal medicare in Manitoba; it is the first and primary responsibility of that government opposite to ensure that the Province of Manitoba, i.e. the people of Manitoba, can pay for it and can afford it. The best way to be able to pay for it, the best way to be able to afford it and to maintain it is to have a healthy private sector, a healthy private economy that is producing and generating the necessary revenues that permit that kind of government programming.

That is the essence and the substance of the amendment, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that it has not missed its target. I would hope that the Member for Thompson has not failed to recognize that.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, Mr. Speaker, welcome this opportunity to address some remarks to the Member for Thompson's resolution on the health care system of Canada. I, particularly, commend to that member, Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed by my colleague, the MLA for Niakwa, that amendment truly, if passed and enacted and taken seriously by both the Provincial Government and the Federal Government, will assure the MLA for Thompson that the universal health care system will be maintained. That is the greatest assurance that we, as elected members in this House can offer the people of Manitoba and, indeed, the people of Canada that we will have a health care system that will provide for their present and future needs.

The quickest way, I might hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, to destroy that universal health care system is to carry on with the terribly wrong-headed, ineffective and backwards policies that this government has brought in in conjunction with the Federal Government, policies which have destroyed the initiative in the private sector, the sector that can provide the taxation revenues from employing people and providing profits to be taxed in the private sector to provide the necessary tax dollars to spend on health care. It is the policies of New Democratic Party Governments and Federal Liberal Governments that are doing more, Mr. Speaker, to destroy the universal health care system than any province bringing in extra billing, than any province that is allowing extra billing, it is their wrong-headed, backward policies to destroy the private sector that will cause the most grief in providing universal health care to the people of Manitoba and Canada.

The more that they do not realize that, Mr. Speaker, the greater the problem becomes and the more difficult that problem will be to resolve no matter what political stripe the government is federally or provincially. Wrong-headed policies that drive private enterprise out of this province and out of this country will kill all social programs eventually in this country because there will not be the dollars to finance them and thinking members of the New Democratic Party know that, unfortunately, newcomers like the MLA for Thompson and I presume the MLA for Wolesley and others who don't appreciate where tax dollars come from will lead to the destruction of the health care system through their wrong-headed administrations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make some comments about the health care system as we see it in Manitoba right now. Right now the Minister of Health has announced that he proposes the close of obstetrical units in a couple of hospitals in Winnipeg. He's doing it I presume, and he says, because it will save money in his department. It'll save, I believe, the figure he's used is \$1 million in yearly operating costs and if I'm wrong he'll — (Interjection) — \$700,000 - \$800,000.00.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are people who live in the areas served by those obstetric units in those hospitals who say that that is depriving me of access to a universal health care system. What does the MLA for Thompson say about those arguments by those people? There were a number of them in front of the Legislature last

week led by the husband of one of the Cabinet Ministers saying that those obstetrical units should not be closed but they are being closed, not by a Progressive Conservative Government but by a New Democratic Government, a government that said they were going to maintain the health care system. Health care, not cutbacks, they were going to restore — (Interjection) — you're right - I stand corrected by my colleague, the MLA for Lakeside. Your election promise in November of 1981 was to restore the health care system and here, on one hand we have the MLA for Thompson in the netherlands of the back bench coming in and saying that we have to protect the health care system while his Minister of Health is undertaking certain cost-cutting measures to save \$800,000 and in doing so proposes to close two obstetrical units.

Now, there are people who say that that is reducing their access to the health care system. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the MLA for Thompson says, what do you say? What does your government say? You on one hand say one thing and your government does exactly the opposite. Are you not part of the New Democratic Government, the MLA that brought this resolution in? He cannot justify this resolution in face of what his government is doing. I drew to the Minister of Health's attention several months ago about reductions in service in some of the rural hospitals that I'm familiar with. They are happening because of budget constrictions placed by this government, because of the payroll tax implemented by this government. There have been practical nurses laid off in Morden. This is going on whilst a government who promised to restore the health care system is in power. It isn't a Progressive Conservative Government that's doing that, it's a New Democratic Party Government and meanwhile one of their backbenchers brings in a resolution saying we must protect the universal health care system.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been reference made in this House to hypocritical positions taken by various members in the House and I think it is parliamentary to say that this is an example of a hypocritical resolution because on the one hand the member says one thing should be done and on the other hand his government is doing exactly the opposite. I don't know how the Member for Thompson can justify his position.

He refers in the last RESOLVED of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we, the Assembly should call on the Federal Government to maintain its financial support of Canada's health care system - that's an interesting proposition for him to make - why not blame the Federal Government for everything? After all it was only his Premier who said, shortly after assuming office that he was going to do away with this federal bashing and he was going to work co-operatively with the Federal Government. Here we have one of the backbenchers chastising the Federal Government and trying to get them to maintain financial support to the health care system. Once again, Mr. Chairman, highly questionable motivation by the MLA for Thompson and, indeed, out of touch with the reality of what his government is doing in those areas. He doesn't know what's going on obviously when he proposes this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government, in its short 18 or 19 or 20 months it's been in office, has done more to damage the fabric of the Manitoba economy than the Schreyer administration managed to do in eight

years. That's quite a record, in 20 short months to do more damage than the other New Democratic administration did in eight years, but they have succeeded. They have succeeded because they have not recognized the very important role that the private sector has to play and must play in the provincial economy to create jobs, to create new wealth and to create tax revenues that the Minister of Finance so desperately needs.

They've introduced the payroll tax, their attitude towards business in the private sector is incredibly bad, there is no Provincial Government in Canada that offers a less inviting climate to the private sector than this socialist government does in Manitoba. And it stems, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — the MLA for Wolesely is chattering from not even her own seat. If she wishes to address her comments to this resolution she might consider standing up and being recognized by the Speaker.

Now you see, Mr. Speaker, in 20 short months they have introduced the payroll tax and what does the payroll tax do for job creation in Manitoba? Absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, it has killed job creation it has been the straw that breaks the camel's back in a number of business decisions to close down their plants in Manitoba.

We have a Minister of the Environment who talks very hard and tough about protection of the environment and in no small way contributed to the loss of a refinery in Manitoba. He's talking that kind of tough talk in Brandon with a fertilizer plant, the only manufacturer in Manitoba, he's talking that kind of tough talk with Ayerst Organics in Brandon. How many more straws do those companies need in Manitoba before they abandon their investment, the jobs, and the tax revenues they pay to this government? How many more disincentives do they need before they close their doors and leave this province because of wrongheaded, misdirected, incompetent policies by the New Democratic Government?

That is why I commend the members opposite, the amendment that was made by my colleague. It addresses the issue of Medicare financing in the only way that it can be addressed. I simply draw to members' attention opposition that in this province today we now spend \$1,000 per man, woman and child in the Department of Health to provide health services to the citizenry of Manitoba. For a family of five, that's \$5,000 per year. That, Sir, is an awful lot of money. There is no other department which spends so much per capita in the Province of Manitoba, and you add on top of that considerable costs of the federal health care budget outside of the transfer of funding that's part of it, and you have a very substantial payment. The Minister of Health would probably be able to indicate per capita what the Federal Government spends outside of transfer payments, but I would suspect it could be an additional \$500 per capita. That, Sir, is an awful lot of money the taxpayers have to generate to maintain our health care system. That is why the Minister of Health today is forced to make some probably harsh decisions in the health care system in Manitoba, but he has to go against the promise that was made by his Premier of restoring the health care system and undertaking a decision of closing obstetrical units, etc., etc., in the Province of Manitoba.

He is faced very firmly and solidly with the reality of how do you finance a universal health care system with declining tax revenues. He's addressing it in a fashion which he believes is correct and which obviously his colleagues believe is correct, because they have allowed it and they have approved it.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is only one answer to attaining the goal as stated in this resolution by the MLA for Thompson of maintaining a universal health care system for the benefit of all Canadians and all Manitobans, and that is, to have a strong, vibrant, profitable private sector that's creating jobs, so that the people working for the private sector will be paying new taxes to government coffers, enabling the government to undertake needed and necessary and socially justifiable spending on the health care system, on the education system, and on the welfare system in the Province of Manitoba. Without those kind of revenues coming in from the private sector, there is no possible way that any government of any political stripe can maintain the system plus the economy. Because we've seen this government, when they're faced with tough decisions in the financing of this province, cut money from the highways program, cause unemployment in the heavy construction industry, as has been adequately demonstrated to the Cabinet today by the Heavy Construction Association, and those loss of jobs in the private sector, in the heavy construction private sector, don't only affect — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, to the Member for The Pas, I'm talking about how you afford the Medicare system. If you don't understand that, then you are more incompetent than the introducer of this resolution. — (Interjection) — If you don't understand the very basics of how you pay for services, then, my friend, you don't belong in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the job loss in the heavy construction industry is one thing. We have no taxes coming from those employees because they're not working, and, in fact, they become a drag on the system, because, no doubt, they will be collecting unemployment which other taxpayers who are working must fund. The real long-term disability dealt on the Province of Manitoba by the cutback in the highway construction budget is in the fact that the infrastructure of highways which will service the expansion of the private sector outside of the City of Winnipeg will not be there. When Manitoba goes and approaches such companies as Alcan to locate in Manitoba, they will not be able to point to the fact that we have an excellent — (Interjection) — highway infrastructure system maintained in a safe condition for the use of their employees and their firm.

Mr. Speaker, the reduction, the cutback by this government in highway construction not only causes problems immediately in loss of employment, but it causes long-term problems in making this province an attractive place to bring new industries into. If members in the government don't understand that, then they had better take a small lesson in economics, because that's what they need.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we've got this government negotiating. When they were first in office, within the first six months, two projects which would have employed thousands of Manitobans in the construction industry. One was the Power Grid which would have triggered the construction of Limestone on the Nelson River, and the other of course was the Alcan

plant. The argument they used that, oh, the aluminum industry is in over capacity right now and no new plants are needed was blown out of the water this month when the Premier of Quebec signed an agreement to build a new smelter of brand new capacity in the Province of Quebec. You see — (Interjection) — Now, we have the Minister of Finance from his seat saying, well, we're big enough idiots to have approved it.

You know, the power deal that we had struck - and he knows it very well - was a good power deal for the Province of Manitoba, and Alcan was willing to sign it, Alcan was willing to locate here, but he and his incompetent benchmate blew and fumbled that opportunity for Manitoba. What did it mean to Manitoba now? - the loss of jobs in the construction industry. Those jobs being taxpayers to contribute to the funding of this health care system. It would have meant long-term jobs, some 800 of them in the smelter. It would have meant spinoff industries being able to locate in Manitoba, to manufacture highway transportation equipment manufactured from aluminum smelted in Manitoba.

All of those things would have happened, but this government with its anti-business attitude destroyed the opportunity of Manitobans to be gainfully employed in the aluminum industry. Then they have the gall and the audacity to bring in a resolution saying that we've got to protect the medical system in Canada when they're destroying the private sector that funds the medical system, that provides the tax dollars to maintain the universal medical care system in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, these people do not understand what they are doing, and if that does one thing to Manitobans, it tells them that this government is not only incompetent, it's dangerous. This government can destroy the provincial economy, and it can do it in four short years, and it is doing it already with payroll tax, with a negative attitude to business, with complaints about advertising of Alcan in the paper. These people over here say what has that got to do with this resolution? Well, that shows their abysmal ignorance of how governments achieve the monies and the revenues necessary to fund their various services in the Province of Manitoba. Until they understand that, Mr. Speaker, indeed, the health care system and many other programs in Manitoba will be in jeopardy as long as there's a New Democratic Government in power in Manitoba with a negative attitude towards business, with an anti-private sector bent which will drive out business from Manitoba and prevent business from locating here to create jobs and to provide employment for Manitobans, not the make-work jobs of the "fraud" fund.

No, Mr. Speaker, that's what we're not talking about, because the "fraud" fund we know has \$20 million from one department alone, that being the Department of Highways and Transportation. They're causing layoffs in the private sector and the heavy construction industry because there's no road work, and they're saying in grandiose terms in advertising that we're creating with that money. The jobs were there, they took them away from one sector and they put them into another, Mr. Speaker. That's as simple as it can be put. People in Manitoba recognize that and they know the incompetence of this government because of it.

Mr. Speaker, if this government would spend as much money on promoting safety advertising, advertising

against smoking, advertising against drinking and driving, and advertising to undertake safe driving, including the use of seat belts, they wouldn't need the onerous legislation they've got before this House right now. They would save the money in the health-care system from those very advertising campaigns. But no, they don't choose to do that; they pour the money into advertising the "fraud" fund, the "fraud" fund which is taking jobs out of the private sector and allowing this government to simply transfer the jobs to temporary make-work jobs of no benefit to anybody but a government that wishes to prop up its image by a massive advertising campaign and forget about the private sector and business in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the Member for Thompson should vote for this amended resolution because it clearly demonstrates how the medical health system can be preserved in this country and this province, and not his phoney resolution that he introduced in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It certainly wasn't my intention to take part in this debate. I thought that during the Estimates and any time that I've had to make a decision that I always made clear where I stood and why we were making certain decisions.

I read, with amusement, the amendment. I guess that we can stretch things and bring in a completely different subject than that. There is no doubt that there is a difference of opinion in economic matters and in the way you treat the industry and the way you look at certain things in here. There have been a lot of debates on that; there's been talk about having the proper climate to attract industry and all that and that is something that we can discuss, but I thought it was a bit far-fetched to try and introduce this in a resolution where you're talking about preserving Medicare.

Even then, I was certainly satisfied to let it go. I thought that my views were quite well known on that. I would have been very interested in listening to the Member for Fort Garry and, unfortunately, I couldn't get his remarks; I certainly intend to read Hansard to make sure that I understand and get his message, but the statement made by the last member that spoke certainly would dictate that I should try to make some of the corrections because it certainly wasn't a factual statement. It was an irresponsible statement or irresponsible speech. There was no doubt that the members do not understand what confronts the Minister of Health or what the *raison d'être* of the Department of Health and in some areas, because I've repeated it to him many times, he is purposely trying to mislead the public of Manitoba and the members of this House.

I'd like to take a few of these issues. First of all, he said that we said that we would not reduce costs. I think that any - especially a person that feels he's such a good manager, that he comes from the elitist group, that he comes from the people that know it all, that he comes from the people in business and they have all the answers, would understand that if you're going to be successful you have to have good management.

Good management means that you review constantly the program, you prioritize and replace and then when there is something better, you replace those programs; and that it is impossible to keep all the old programs and keep adding some. When you're talking about cutting down and reducing the cost is when you look at the total cost of the department; and nobody, by any stretch of the imagination, can say that even in these two tough years, probably the two toughest that the people of Manitoba have ever had to face, that if they call what we did in this department cutting and reducing the cost, well then I'm not going to waste my time in discussing and trying to prove that.

I'd like to talk about obstetrics, because the statement that was made is that the honourable member that made a motion is saying something and the government, through the Minister of Health, is doing the exact opposite. I'd like to ask anybody, especially the good managers on the other side, if they feel that you shouldn't come with some tough decisions, especially when you know that these decisions are right when they're recommended by all the people that have the knowledge. In fact, even the former Minister - I don't know how he feels today; I didn't listen to his speech; I don't know if he covered it - but recognized that some of these things have to be done.

My honourable friend said that there was a saving and he stopped right there. There was a saving and I had to correct him that it was \$800,000 and that money, you know, the way he tried to give the impression that we wanted to save, we needed that money for something else; that money will not be saved. That money will be spent to develop a new program, a program of some work that was highly needed in Manitoba, something that hasn't been done in Manitoba in the past, not only through the Conservative administration but our previous administration; something that we were weak at and this is what we're trying to improve, and I'm talking about Maternal and Child Care, these kind of services that the Hall Commission had recommended that we provide for the people of Manitoba.

So there is a saving. That saving is not put back to try to save money in the department; it is extra money. That money will be spent on new programs, so his theory is shot out all to hell on that. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am saying, and I'm repeating, that the main reason, because the standards will be improved and because it was very poor management to keep on getting a service at the cost that we were paying and especially when we can improve the situation.

Let anybody in his right mind, let somebody here on the other side tell me that it is good management to say that you're going to keep a program where you employ 27 full-time people for .91 patient per day. There is no doubt that they're providing good services. Who wouldn't with 27 people waiting for some patient that might not be there; for .91 patient, 27 full-time people, and this is what we're talking about. That makes sense when these people on the other end that they're talking about we can't have it both ways, but they keep telling us that we are spending too much money, that we have a high deficit, but then every single one of them, that we should cut these social programs except in their own constituencies.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why there's only .91 with the good service they're giving because the people do not

want to take a chance. They want the best of service and there is some expertise at some of those other hospitals, in the two teaching hospitals, that you do not have at Seven Oaks or Concordia or Victoria and some of these other hospitals; and that is the main reason, because the service will be better.

Now they say, well you can - not the service - excuse me, I don't mean that these people are not giving the best they can and on normal births that they're not giving good service. They are and I've always stated that, but you cannot just define and say this is a normal birth and this is a complicated birth. In these cases, even after all the care in the world, and after designating it as a normal birth, 30 percent of them, at least, become complicated births and then they want the backup and they want all the services that we are now getting in other hospitals.

It is true that St. Boniface and Health Sciences Centre are crowded and they've had to send people down so even with those hospitals open but that is why we will have to improve the facilities in these hospitals because there is a demand - there's all kinds - and I can refute, I'd like the member to talk about all of the reasons, instead of trying to be on both sides of the issue, the reason why he favours that we leave these facilities open in these two hospitals because we can refute every single one of them, Mr. Speaker.

It is a tough decision, it is not an easy decision, it is not a decision that is easy for some of our members here. It is very difficult but it is that collectively as a group the Cabinet understands that we must give good management and therefore that we have to look at the dollars and especially in an area where we know that the standards will be improved, that we should go ahead. Let's not add this thing that we are cutting this thing down to save money because we are trying to save money in this department. That is not the case and the honourable member knows it.

Now, there's no doubt that he didn't know too much about this subject when he stood up but there's another subject that he knows because I gave him the information and not too long ago he called me a liar in this House and you let him get away with that, Mr. Speaker, he called me a liar in this House and on what grounds? On the thing that I refute and I gave this information — (Interjection) — What's that? — (Interjection) — No, but I did.

Mr. Speaker, the situation was that we cut down in the staffing at the Carman Hospital, the Morden Hospital

MR. D. ORCHARD: You tell the truth.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll tell the truth. He said the two hospitals, Carman and Morden and the point is, Mr. Speaker, that we looked at the staffing pattern and we increased the staffing pattern since the days of the Conservative Government was there. Now, these people went ahead, there's five hospitals in the rural area that had a deficit, there's people that they themselves decide that they're going to hire over and above the guidelines that were given, the approval that they are given by the commission and they don't consult with me every day, no more than they consulted with the former Minister of Health. This is not - they had no direction

from us at all, they're keeping with their standard, they increased the staffing pattern at these hospitals and there's one that was understaffed and we said to them, well, this is dangerous you'd better get more staff and the other one was overstaffed and the member repeats the same thing in this House that it's because we said we wouldn't cut down.

They did this without the approval, they never had the approval of the commission, of the former Minister, nor of this Minister. That, Mr. Speaker, again I challenge the honourable member to come in front of any audience and say, here, the hospitals are going to determine. you're not going to have it approved by the government, by the people, they decide and if they want to have three times or twice or two staff more than another hospital it is their business and the government should keep their mouth shut and just pay the bills. We will never do that, Mr. Speaker, and there's not a Minister of Health that will do that.

I'm not going to accuse them of lying but I'll leave it to the members of this House to see who the hell is lying on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, and we've talked about the resolution — (Interjection) — would you please shut up, I didn't say a word when you were speaking. I didn't say one word when you spoke, so shut up. Mr. Speaker, the thing is that we have a resolution here that is - all right there could be a lot of amendments that could be brought in without bringing in something about the economy and something like that, if we could have addressed this program, this service. What is stated here, it is stated that we try to protect Medicare and it's true, I wasn't a member of this party, I have no credit on that but it's true that we wouldn't have Medicare or hospitalization if it wasn't for Tommy Douglas and the people in Saskatchewan. There's no doubt about that. Anybody has to recognize that and I'm not saying he was the only one. They weren't in office federally so they certainly can't take the credit for that but they started and they were criticized and probably called Communist and Red and Marxist and all these things at the time.

This is why we have these services here, sure we needed Duff Roblin and we needed Ed Schreyer and we needed these people, there's no doubt about that, but the initial credit certainly goes, as far as I'm concerned, to Tommy Douglas and his government in Saskatchewan for these programs.

Now, what is the Federal Government doing that is so bad? I can tell you all the Ministers of Health met and the Federal Minister was talking about no extra billing and the other members refused - what did I say? I'll stand up and say exactly what I said. I said, in principle, it is not a good thing but in practice, don't rock the boat in Manitoba. We were against the principle but it is not a major concern in Manitoba because we do not have that many doctors that are extra billing. And that was an important thing. We weren't going to start making a big thing in Manitoba and then losing some of the doctors.

And I argued and I sided with some of the other Ministers on that and I told the Federal Minister also, one of the reasons that I don't think you've got too much strength because you changed the format and you've got global funding instead of cost-sharing and we always want - by the way who wanted global funding?

I'm not going to say that the former government had anything to do with it, they weren't in government but it was the Conservative Government of Alberta and Ontario especially that wanted to cut down on social service. They made that quite clear, they want to cut down, give us the money and we'll decide. We're smart enough, we'll decide what we want, and I don't think that's the nature of these universal programs and when we're talking about getting a minimum of certain services to all Canadians no matter in what region they live or what province they live in.

So, Mr. Speaker, that was the argument that took place and then the Ministers unanimously, every single provincial Minister, agreed that they should at least monitor, that they recognized that extra billing could become a problem, and that they should monitor it and they agreed that the Federal Government should monitor it.

As I say, I never made too much noise about the extra billing in Manitoba because it wasn't the biggest problem. I think the principle is wrong, I think that it isn't right especially when they are in the plan and they are being paid by the public funds but the point is that it wasn't a major issue until some of the provinces started to move in that direction and start extra billing and now - I never agreed with the former Minister before that Medicare was in real danger and now I believe that Medicare is in danger and I believe that it is only fair now - I certainly will back the Federal Minister to bring legislation. I want to see what kind of legislation it is, if it's going to be legislation that would control or monitor or at least Canadian-wide and country-wide that there will not be any extra billing because there has been some abuse and without this abuse there is no way you can bring all of the business in the world here. With the kind of billing that is done by a few of them and certainly, in no way, do I want to include the doctors in this. I think that Manitoba, I've always said that, Manitoba is very fortunate in having the type of people that we have here and the interested doctors that we have here, the medical profession that we have.

Of course, we've got a few of them that are only interested in the buck; but you'll find that in politicians, you'll find that in businessmen, you'll find that in labour, you'll find that all over the place. Nobody has a monopoly on these things, Mr. Speaker, but the point is that this was an honest resolution, to say let's get together and let's make darn sure that we keep the best Medicare service in the world, bar none. There is no doubt about that. We've talked about all the regulations. What regulations? I want the member to point out one regulation, one change in legislation that we made that we've changed in Medicare - one, even in the Schreyer years, and now in the Pawley years. Where have we stopped anything in the question of extra billing or opting out? We haven't moved at all. There has been some discussion because the medical profession, the only one in all of Canada, and by the way we agree, most of the members of the House agree on this, officially the two parties agree, that we should not have compulsory binding arbitration especially when it's binding on only one party. That's where we've had the discussion on that. We said, all right, there'll be some minimal point, but at no time did we even suggest any. I'm not saying that this is going to happen forever. I think that we'll have to look at legislation depending

of course on what kind of legislation the Federal Government would bring but they may — (Interjection) — yes, that's an easy way, you make a statement like this and try to make it stick. Well, be my guest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the situation is that this is an honest resolution to try and get the people to address, as was suggested by different members on both sides of the House, to work together on that. I don't think it is quite far - I'm not saying legally, that's something that I leave with you, but it's not something I think that we could have spent our time talking about Medicare instead of all these things that we do not agree with. Anyway, you know, my honourable friend talked about the climate for business and so on. I happen to think that we've got to give a minimum of protection for the workers and all Manitobans; I don't think the main thing. It could be that the Conservative Government talked about what trickled down, that's going to help, but I mean you take care of the neediest first. You bring in a kind of a climate, probably reinstate slavery, then we could compete with the wages in the developing countries; I don't believe in that. I'm very proud to say that I happen to go along with the statement of the Holy Father. I think that makes sense. I feel solid enough and I think convinced enough of my principle that I'm not afraid to say that I am a liberal socialist when it comes to that. I'm not afraid. They can call me communist, they can call me other names. I feel secure enough that I can look at the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this resolution is next before the House, the Honourable Minister will have two minutes remaining.

The Honourable Acting House Leader.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a committee change on Municipal Affairs - the Member for Inkster will substitute for the Member for Dauphin.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I understand that Law Amendments Committee is meeting this evening. Subject to that committee meeting, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).