

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 9 September, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - LEGISLATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** The Committee of Supply will now consider Department of Legislation.

The Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

The Department of Legislation contains the appropriations for the Assembly Expenditures, the Leader of the Official Opposition Party's Expenditures, the Independent Members' Expenditures, the Assembly, the Provincial Auditor and Ombudsman, Elections Manitoba and the Hansard Division. Most of the detail of the Legislation Estimates are discussed on an ongoing basis through an inter-party mechanism called the Legislative Assembly Management Commission and the expenditures are dealt with on an all-party basis throughout the year.

So, if there are any specific questions, I'd be pleased to try and answer them this evening. But most of the material is dealt with on an ongoing basis with Opposition members through the commission meetings.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could the Government House Leader indicate where we would find provision for the Executive Assistant to the Speaker? Is that in Legislation or is that in Executive Council?

**HON. J. COWAN:** It would normally be an item that would be found in the Speaker's appropriation which is a part of this particular Estimates.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** So it is in here?

**HON. J. COWAN:** It would normally be found in this particular area given that it is a new item, one that is initiated this year. It'll show up next year in the Estimates in a line in the Speaker's Office which will be under this appropriation.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I appreciate where it would normally be, but where would we deal with it this year?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I'm told that it would be normally Resolution 1, Appropriation 4, but it will not show up this year. It will first show up in next year's Estimates. Resolution No. 1, Appropriation No. 4, is where it would normally show up. It does not show up this being a new position. It will show up in next year's Estimates under that particular line. This year it will be dealt with by way of Supplementary Supply.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Under No. 4. Other Assembly Expenditures?

**HON. J. COWAN:** That's correct.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Are we going through it one at a time, so you want to come back to it?

**HON. J. COWAN:** We can do it all at once.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, where would it be? Would it be under Salaries or Other Expenditures in Item 4?

**HON. J. COWAN:** It would be under Item 4.(c) which is listed as Assembly, Salaries. But to be clear, it does not show up in the particular Estimates that are in front of us now. It will be dealt with this year by way of Supplementary Supply - in the next year's Estimates it will show up - because it was not a position at the time the Estimates were being developed.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Minister could give a rationale then, why this is so important that it has to be dealt with by Supplementary supply?

**HON. J. COWAN:** Quite often, when positions are brought on stream during the course of a year and they have not been considered in the context of the Estimates process, they are dealt with through Supplementary Supply. That's a normal procedure, so I don't think the fact that it's being dealt with through Supplementary Supply is an indication of any extreme importance. There may be important reasons for having the position, but that is not because it shows up in Supplementary Supply. That is a normal way to deal with additional staff that come on during the course of the year. There are other ways that it can be dealt with, but that is one of the more commonly accepted ways.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Government House Leader - House Opposition Leader - the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Third time right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There are too many leaders around here.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Too many who wish they were.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, was the provision of the Executive Assistant a condition of the Member for Wolseley accepting the position?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I think you'd have to - and I'm not certain of the forum in which you can do it - perhaps privately. We'd have to address that issue directly to

the Speaker, or perhaps, through the Legislative Assembly Management Commission and your representation there, you could address that question directly to the Speaker.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Premier, in his desire for openness, since he is probably involved in that whole decision, would be able to indicate the answer to that?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I did indicate to the Speaker at the time I interviewed the Speaker, that the Speaker should have an Executive Assistant.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, based on what precedent did the Premier indicate that it was his view that the Speaker should have an Executive Assistant?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, we did a number of checks and I could get the provinces in which there are Executive Assistants to the Speakers. There are a number I know, and it's not uncommon. There has been a problem in the past insofar as the service in the constituency of the Speaker, but it is not an uncommon practice and we can obtain the provinces.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Premier or the Government House Leader indicate who is the Executive Assistant to the Speaker?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I can get the full name of the individual and report back. I don't know the full name myself at this time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What is the salary of the Executive Assistant to the Speaker?

**HON. J. COWAN:** It's a salary that's equivalent to other Executive Assistants. We believe it's in the area of \$32,000, but we can provide the exact detail to the Opposition House Leader at a later time, but it would be in that general area.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Was the appointment of the Executive Assistant an Order-in-Council appointment?

**HON. J. COWAN:** That person would be appointed under The Legislative Assembly Act, and not through an Order-in-Council, I understand.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Was that position bulletined?

**HON. J. COWAN:** No, that position would not normally be bulletined, and is not bulletined in this particular instance.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Is the Executive Assistant a former member of the Civil Service, or the former occupant of an O/C appointment?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I will have to find out exactly what her employment status with the province was, whether it was through the regular Civil Service or otherwise. I'll attempt to get that information quickly, and respond back to the Opposition House Leader.

I might also add that I believe the Executive Assistant for the Leader of the Opposition is appointed in much the similar fashion through The Legislative Assembly Act. So, that is the way in which those individuals are hired and are responsible to the parties which hire them.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Was the Executive Assistant formerly in the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology?

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, I believe she was. I can get the exact detail as to dates of employment, if required, for the Opposition House Leader at a later time, as soon as possible.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** What was her position in her former department of Industry and Trade?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I will obtain that information as well.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, was the person who is now employed as Executive Assistant to the Speaker formerly assigned or permitted to perform political functions for the Speaker when she was the Member for Wolseley in the last Session?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I would have to find that information. I can't give you too much information because I'm not familiar with the Speaker's Executive Assistant to any degree, nor am I familiar with the Leader of the Opposition's Executive Assistant, and you've asked me questions - if you asked me similar questions about the Leader of the Opposition's Executive Assistant, I wouldn't be able to give you those answers either. I would have to obtain them for you and report back. I will attempt to do so. To show you that we can provide some information at present, the name is Davida, D-a-v-i-d-a, Sarson, S-a-r-s-o-n, and I believe the salary - I may stand corrected on that - is in the neighbourhood of \$30,000, just under \$30,000 at present. It would probably show up as \$32,000 in next year's Estimates, given the increases.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, it just disturbs me a little bit that the Government House Leader should keep paralleling the position of the Speaker, and support staff for the position of Speaker, with that of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition carries out a political role in this House. The Speaker of the House does not. In the same vein, I might ask the Government House Leader -(Interjection)- Perhaps my remarks don't always reflect things as they are, Mr. Chairman, and reflect as I wish they could be sometimes.

I'd like to ask the Government House Leader, on that same point, and respecting the non-political nature of the Speaker's Office and the fact that, as I understand the tradition of the office, both the appointment of the Speaker and other matters relevant to the Speaker's Office are a matter of some consultation between the parties in a Legislative regime, and I wonder if - I

suppose I could ask my own Leader this, but I'm asking the Government House Leader - whether there was any consultation with any other parties in this House, both respecting the appointment of the Speaker and respecting the appointment of the Speaker's staff.

**HON. J. COWAN:** I'd let my leader, the Premier, indicate as to what consultation there may have been in respect to the appointment of the Speaker. In regard to staff, I don't think it would be appropriate, quite frankly.

I don't think one should suggest that because the Speaker is provided with support staff, that is necessarily politicizing the office. A Speaker has to spend a fair amount of time - probably more time than any of us during the Session - in this building, to be on call at all times, to be dealing with the business of the House. There are duties that the Speaker must perform, as a Speaker, outside of the Session. The assistant, which the Speaker is provided with, I understand, is to enable the Speaker to maintain contact with the constituency in much the same way as we, as Members of the Legislative Assembly, must maintain contact with our constituents.

They come to us with problems; they come to us with questions; they come to us requiring help, and we have a responsibility and a duty to respond to those requests for assistance. We have a responsibility and a duty to respond to our constituents, and if a Speaker is not able to respond to those requests in a normal fashion, as would other members who do not hold portfolios or positions such as the Leader of the Opposition holds, then I believe that Speaker should have support staff available to him or her, whomever it may be at the time, in order to allow them to provide that sort of support service and that sort of contact with their constituents.

Now, we are elected, we have a responsibility to them and I believe that this individual who is now occupying this position provides that sort of assistance and maintains that sort of contact with the constituency. It does not in any way, in my opinion, reflect upon the office or politicize the office.

I would hope that members opposite would not suggest that because we provide that sort of support, as do other provinces in similar circumstances provide that sort of support, that we are doing anything untoward or we are doing anything to politicize the office of the Speaker, because that is not the case.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I just make the point, Mr. Chairman, wouldn't it have been better for the First Minister or the Government House Leader, who makes all these points now, wouldn't it have been better to have made those points before the decision was made and to have made those points in consultation with the Leader of the Opposition and perhaps with the Leader of the Liberal Party in this House? I just leave that question for the Minister to think about. But I also remind him that certainly as far as I know in Manitoba's history, this is the first time that a Speaker has had this type of assistance and I remind the Minister also that, as I understand it, the Speaker does have a full-time secretary as it is which is something other members in this House don't have as individual members.

I also take, I suppose, offence or I'll just remind the Minister that a lot of members are in this House a lot, all week long, those members of us who are from great distances away from the city have to be here all week long throughout the Session and I can't say that for the rest of the Session. But I can certainly say that for the time when the House is sitting, that members like myself don't have a home to go to at night, and I'm not able to go to Brandon every night. If I need to get away for a special occasion, it's like pulling hen's teeth, or out of respect for our Speaker, pulling rooster's teeth to get permission from my Whip to get away and I'm sure that the same thing is true of government members.

So the point about the Speaker being in the House all the time really doesn't cut much ice with me, Mr. Chairman, because I have to be here all week too. So I just say that it would have been a lot better and would have made a lot of difference to a decision if there had been prior consultation.

Now it may be that members on this side and other members may still not have agreed, but at least we wouldn't be standing here tonight complaining that there had been no consultation on the matter.

**HON. J. COWAN:** So the record is clear. I'm not certain that I agree, as a matter of fact I do not agree with the member who just spoke that there should be consultation on the appointment of that staff. I think that is a decision that government has to take. There are decisions that governments take onto themselves and they stand or fall by those decisions. This decision was taken because we believe it is in the best interests of those individuals who elect whomever it might be, that as appointed Speaker of this House, to have that sort of support service available to them so that they can maintain the contact with their constituency that they are required to maintain.

I don't accept the analogy that the member draws, that because he is from out of the city and has to be here, that the duties he has to perform are the same duties as the Speaker has to perform. The Speaker has a role unto that position that none of the rest of us have and members without portfolios, members outside of the Leader of the Opposition, who has a role to perform as well and has an executive assistant placed in that office, other members have far more opportunity to do the type of constituency work that is required, and I think demanded by our constituents. If, from time to time we need support service because the duties of the House are such that we cannot always get to those concerns as quickly as we would be if we didn't have those duties, then so be it. That's a decision that the government has to make.

In this instance, the government felt that the role of the Speaker is changing to the extent, and the role of this whole House is changing to the extent where more support services should be made available to that individual. We took that decision knowing that it was a change, knowing that it was without precedent, believing that it is for the betterment of the House, the betterment of the position of the Speaker, and the betterment of the constituents whom that Speaker has been elected to represent.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister has said that decisions like this of necessity in his opinion - and

**Tuesday, 9 September, 1986**

---

I respectfully disagree with him - have to be the government's decision and the government will stand or fall on them. I will ask the Minister, whose servant is the Speaker, the government's or the Legislature's?

**HON. J. COWAN:** The Speaker is certainly a servant of the House in the responsibilities that the Speaker plays in regard to the House, and those are very specific responsibilities that the rest of us don't have. The Speaker has to undertake activities that the rest of us don't have to undertake. The Speaker is elected by a group of constituents who expect service from that individual, just in the way as we are all expected to serve our constituencies.

And if, by the fact that we have given that person added responsibilities, just as we have given the Leader of the Opposition added responsibilities, or the Leader of the Opposition has taken on added responsibilities in his role as a leader; we provide support for Cabinet Ministers, we provide support to those individuals to allow them to better serve their constituencies.

I will stand on every occasion that I have the opportunity to do so in this House and defend the increase in whatever it takes, whether it's staff or financial services, to the extent required, so that we can provide better service to our constituents, because while we have our battles in here back and forth, and while we have our philosophical debates and dialogues, we also have constituents whom we have to represent. That is what that individual is helping the Speaker do, and I think that is probably one of the most honourable responsibilities and perhaps one of the most demanding requirements that we have as elected officials.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm delighted in the way in which this discussion has gone. I would ask the Government House Leader if the government is in fact considering the possibility of designating the Legislative Assembly as a constituency, and in the future electing a Speaker who would in fact not represent a physical constituency other than the House here.

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, that proposal has been made and I appreciate and respect those who have made that proposal at various times in the last few years, including the former Speaker, and Mr. Knowles.

But it has been the view of members of this Chamber that the Speaker ought not to be relegated to a Civil Service type of role, but the Speaker should be chosen from the ranks of those elected. It's not been our desire to duplicate what has been the system apparently in Westminster.

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

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is to either the Government House Leader or to the First Minister. Perhaps he could advise as to whether

or not the previous Speaker, the Member for St. Vital, recommended to the government that they hire an executive assistant for the Speaker's Office.

**HON. J. COWAN:** I know of no official recommendation of that sort by the previous Speaker.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Mr. Chairman, I've listened to the Government House Leader with great interest as to the amount of work that a Speaker must do, especially the present Speaker, and the role that an elected Speaker must perform, and I'm wondering: what is the difference of the present Speaker and her function that makes it mandatory that she has an executive assistant that is so different than the prior occupant, the Member for St. Vital, when he occupied the Chair?

Because, as I understand it, and seeing the functions of the former Speaker in the last Session, and the present Speaker, we have now been in Session some five months, the last Session was some four-and-a-half months, and I can appreciate that there are perhaps some official functions that one is involved in, but I'm wondering what has made the dramatic difference in the inability of this occupant of the Speaker's Chair to service the constituents of Wolseley that the prior member could not or was able to serve in St. Vital. I would like to know what the difference is that has warranted spending some \$30,000 or \$32,000 to justify a new executive assistant in the Speaker's Office.

**HON. J. COWAN:** It always amazes me how resilient the Conservative Party is to change of any sort, even when that change is in the best interest of the people whom we are elected to represent, and I believe this change is.

The question that the member put forward was: what is the difference? I think, if the member reflects back as to what the previous Speaker was saying, particularly towards the end of his tenure as Speaker, he was saying that there was difficulty for a Speaker in providing service to that constituency that is represented by a Speaker, that there were some difficulties involved in the role of Speaker and providing that sort of service to his or her constituents.

Those constituents deserve all the service that we can provide to them as elected officials and as an Assembly. If we asked one of our members to undertake special duties as a Speaker, and they are duties above and beyond what the rest of us do as MLA's, then I think it is right and proper that if that individual feels it is required to provide support and assistance to that individual to be able to perform those duties that they might not be able to provide because of the service we have asked them to do on our behalf, I see nothing wrong with that.

I also know, and I'm getting the detailed information, I hope, that I can present to you either this evening or later, that many other jurisdictions at one time or another in their history took it upon themselves to make a change. That change was to provide assistance to a Speaker, because the role we all play changes from time to time, evolves. Hopefully, it evolves, and we provide better service and more service. I believe that as MLA's, the demands that the general public and particularly our constituency makes on us now, is

greater than the demand was 10 years ago. I believe that's because of a more informed electorate, a more informed general public and a general public that, rightfully so, expects more out of their elected officials. That change which is evolving generally places different demands on us from time to time.

It's my understanding that when the now Premier was first elected Leader of the Opposition there was no executive assistant for the Leader of the Opposition. It's my understanding - and I may stand corrected on this - that when the previous Leader of the Opposition, when Ed Schreyer was Premier of the province, held the office of Leader of the Opposition, there was no executive assistant.

At one point in time, someone said, the role of the Leader of the Opposition is changing to the extent where they require support personnel to help them. At that time, they said we are going to add a position. It may be over a period of time that more positions need be added. It may be over a period of time that, as individual MLA's, we need more support. We did some of that already. Certainly, we did, and we've done it on a number of different occasions. We've changed the system because the system makes different demands upon us.

So don't try to read into the fact that the Speaker has an assistant and didn't have an assistant before that there is anything partisan in that move, that there is anything Machiavellian in that move or that there is anything sinister in that move. It is not the case.

What is the case is our role and our responsibilities and the demands upon us as elected representatives is evolving, and I believe that it is evolving to the better because the more demands that are placed on us to maintain that contact with our constituencies, the better we are at representing the people who elected us here to represent them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader will admit or recognize that we are breaking new ground by hiring assistants for Speakers in this province. I wonder if it was felt that a full-time, year-round assistant was required, and why the suggestion wasn't made or why we haven't decided to go with perhaps a part-time executive assistant during the time of the Session or whenever the time is the busiest for the Speaker. Why do we have a full time? Why not just part time?

Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General seems to want to make the point from his seat that we're now getting into the really big items. There are some items in matters of government spending, Mr. Chairman, that really have a tendency to make people angry. This is one of them, and the Attorney-General, if he was watching and listening to what goes on in his constituency, he might find out that this makes people very angry that their money is spent this way.

These questions are legitimate and they should not be ridiculed by the Attorney-General. Mind your manners.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Certainly, we respect the fact that the questions are legitimate. I'm sorry that they angered the members opposite, but I do not accept the premise

that they anger members outside of this House and, particularly, I do not accept the premise that they anger the individuals in Wolseley who elected a representative who is now honoured by the position of Speaker and who is providing service to them not only through her own work but also through the assistance of an assistant.

I had indicated earlier that I would share some detail as to what is provided to Speakers by way of support staff in the other provinces. In British Columbia, the Speaker has two secretaries - a receptionist and a secretary - and a Speaker's secretary which is classified as an executive assistant. In the constituency in British Columbia, the Speaker has one executive assistant.

In Alberta, the Speaker has an executive assistant and two secretaries classified as a ministerial secretary and a ministerial stenographer, respectively. I hope that you don't suggest that's politicizing the office because they're classified in that way. They perform functions relating to both the Speaker's duties as a Speaker and constituency duties.

In the constituency, the previous Speaker used a constituency allowance to engage a part-time helper. In Saskatchewan, at the Speaker's Office, there are two senior secretaries and the more senior one performs a role comparable to that of an executive assistant. Both of those individuals perform duties relating to the Speaker's duties and constituency duties and in the constituency that Speaker has the same arrangements which apply to all Saskatchewan MLA's which, I believe, includes an individual in the constituency.

So, those are the Western Provinces which we are most similar and they have, in fact, a process in place and a staffing level in place that is very similar to what we have here. They have had it in place for some time. I imagine at one time they had to make the change and, perhaps, they were accused of politicizing the office or perhaps they were accused of misspending the public's money, but I don't think that was the case.

I don't know, but I would imagine that it was probably not the case, because it was determined that, in fact, the Speaker has an extra role to play, outside of Session as well, and that's why the Speaker is provided with an intersessional indemnity, an extra amount between the Sessions, because they are performing work on behalf of all of us representing us, doing work on our behalf, the Assembly's behalf outside of the Session as well.

We acknowledge that fact by giving them an extra stipend. I believe it's \$3,500 for intersessional work. They're working all year round for us and they're preparing for a Session as we move toward the Session and they're tying up a Session as we move out of a Session, so I don't accept the notion that the Speaker's job is a part-time job anymore than I accept the notion that the Leader of the Opposition's job or any of our jobs as MLA's are part-time jobs.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, in several of the Estimates we've been discussing, I've raised the question in each one whether performance appraisals were a part of the annual operations of the various departments, and I think most of the Ministers responded that, yes, that was it.

Are assistants like this also the subject of performance appraisals annually?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I imagine to the same extent that executive assistants and special assistants to Cabinet Ministers and the executive assistant and staff of the Leader of the Opposition and the staff of the caucus offices are assessed, appraised, their work and performance is appraised on an annual basis and an ongoing basis perhaps, and probably so, in the same way.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** As all members are familiar with Item Nos. 1, 2, and 3 are statutory items and they are open for discussion, but there are no votes.

Item No. 4.(a)(1) Other Assembly Expenditures, Leader of the Official Opposition Party; 4.(a)(2) Salaries; 4.(a)(3) Other Expenditures—pass - the Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** You were on Item 4.(d).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No, it's just 4.(a)(1), 4.(a)(2) and 4.(a)(3). We passed all those three items.

4.(b) Leader of the Second Opposition Party. There is no item there, no money.

4.(c) Salaries—pass.

4.(d) Other Expenditures - the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I take it from the Minister's comments that the sum of \$307,200 does not include provision for the Speaker's Executive Assistant at this time? Is that correct?

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, that would be essentially correct.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(d) - the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I think it's apparent that members of this side of the House do not wish to support provision of \$30,000 or \$32,000 for the appointment of an executive assistant to the Speaker, that it's felt by members on this side of the House that is not a necessary expenditure.- (Interjection)- Does the Minister of the Environment have something to say? -(Interjection)- Well, in view of the fact that money for the executive assistant is not included in this item, it would appear that the only way for members of the Opposition to express their concern about this would be to move to reduce this sum by \$30,000 or \$32,000 as an indication of our position with respect to the appointment of an executive assistants. Does the Government House Leader agree with that?

**HON. J. COWAN:** The Opposition has to do what the Opposition has to do and if they feel that makes their point and if they feel that point is important enough to make in that way, then that is a decision that they have to take. The record is clear from what they've had to say. If they want to, or believe that they can make it more clear by an action of that sort, then let them take that action.

On the other hand, this matter has been discussed in the Legislative Assembly Management Commission where Members of the Opposition made similar comments. It has been discussed here where members have made similar comments and I don't think there

can be any doubt in any individual's mind who is aware of the record that members opposite don't want the Speaker to have an assistant. At the same time, I don't think there should be any doubt in anyone's mind that the members of the government believe that the role we play as elected officials and the duties and services we perform for our constituents is an important role, and that when we ask one of us to take on a responsibility that takes some of their flexibility away from them to be able to accomplish that role, we believe that in order to serve those constituents - nothing more, nothing less - but to give them a similar level of service, it is important to provide support services like this.

So, when you make that motion, don't think for one moment you're getting at the Speaker or the Speaker's Office or the government, because what you are doing is you are getting at the members of a constituency, that elected representative here that has been asked by all of us to perform a duty that the others don't have to perform.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister explain the reason for the increase in expenditures here of some \$80,000 over last year?

**HON. J. COWAN:** There are increases here required for salary increases and for Other Expenditures.

The salary increases - there is \$24,300 for the interns, which by the way is a new program; which by the way helps us serve our constituents better.- (Interjection)- Well, now we know that it is not the newness of the program, it is not the fact that there is change that - (Interjection)- yhe Member for Brandon West suggests that we shouldn't put words in their mouths. I don't think there's any necessity in this debate to put words in the mouths of members opposite; they've said it all very well and they're on the record. I think they're wrong. I think they'll be proven wrong, but that is a matter for time to tell.

The fact is that \$24,000 is for an increase for the intern system, which helps us better serve our constituents through our work in here, as well as better perform our work as legislators, as caucus members. There's an amount in there which is for the MGEA contract agreement costs, increases, and an incremental allowance provision, because individual staff get incremental increases on an ongoing basis until they reach the maximum of a certain classification. Those amounts are \$26,900 for the MGEA contract agreement costs and \$1,500 for the incremental allowance provisions for a total in Salaries area, which is 01-4C of \$52,700.00.

There is an additional amount in Other Expenditures, an increase of \$77,500 in total, made up of \$30,000 increase in each caucus office for \$15,000 for telephone costs, \$29,600 for additional allowance for purchase of more word processing equipment, \$10,000 for the travel provision for the Clerk's Office to the United Kingdom for the conference that's taking place in the near future, the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference. There is a \$10,000 allowance for the Speaker's Office to host the 1986-87 Presiding Officers Conference; there's an \$11,000 increase which is comprised of different items for statutes and the Speaker's apparel, and there's a minus 13,000 which

is a removal of a non-recurring word processing cost from the '85-'86 budget, for a total net increase of \$77,500.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Mr. Chairman, on this line, Other Expenditures. It just strikes me funny that this problem in the Speaker's Office with the lack of assistance, lack of an executive assistant has been such a long-standing problem and if it's been needed for so long, and if it's government policy, that that position should be there and Speakers have been hard done by I take it for many, many years, why is it the government didn't see fit to include that in the Estimates for this year?

**HON. J. COWAN:** There are times that are more opportune for change than other times, but for those who resist change at any time I know that's a quaint notion. But the fact is that we are a new term, there is a new Speaker, and that in every logical way provides an opportunity for that sort of change to take place, nothing untoward about it at all.

The Leader of the Opposition doesn't see when these Estimates were being prepared, that should have been known. These Estimates have been under preparation, as he well knows from his tenure in government, for quite some time. I would suggest that they were probably finalized previous to the House beginning its sitting, and the Speaker being appointed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Mr. Chairman, two things. One, I'd like to make it perfectly clear that I do not oppose the Speaker having an executive assistant.

**A MEMBER:** How about the consultation; do you think there should be consultation with the other parties?

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Yes, I believe there should be consultation, however, I think that indeed there needs to be a special assistant for the Speaker. But I would like a clarification. As you were reading off figures I thought you said there was \$24,000 for the interns; now that is in addition or is that all the interns are paid?

**HON. J. COWAN:** The first year this intern program ran, it ran for only seven months because of the timing of the program. The second year it ran for 10 months, and the difference between the 7 months and the 10 months is a difference of \$24,300 with some holiday pay, I believe, in there, 4 percent vacation pay as well.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader attempted to tie in the political Internship Program as a similar program, which tends to give members of the Assembly greater ability to serve their constituents, tie that in with the appointment of an executive assistant to the Speaker. In respect to that matter, we're all aware, Mr. Chairman, that there was absolutely no consultation with members of the Opposition on the appointment of an executive assistant for the Speaker, unlike virtually every other expenditure that takes place under this whole item dealing with the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Chairman, we would therefore, as an indication of our concern over that issue, perhaps even more the lack of consultation in development of a consensus on an item like that. In the appointment of an executive assistant for the Speaker, which is totally unprecedented in this Legislature, and Speakers I can cite - the previous Speaker didn't require it; the Speaker prior to that, Mr. Graham, served a rural constituency hundreds of miles from this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, without an executive assistant. This item was obviously not contemplated, it's not in the Estimates. We all are aware, too, Mr. Chairman, that this government dealt with the Estimates for a number of weeks and months after the election before they called this Session, because there are items elsewhere in the Legislature that reflect the decisions and the deliberations that were taken by this government after the election.

The government cannot use the excuse that these Estimates were prepared prior to the election and that's why this item is not in. This expenditure and approval of the appointment of an executive assistant for the Speaker was something that occurred subsequent to the election, Mr. Chairman, something that was part of an arrangement deal with the Speaker. I won't say, Mr. Chairman, whether the numbers in the House reflect it in part the arrangement that was made with the Speaker, but it was in an unprecedented way made without consultation with members of the Opposition.

I would therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that this item be reduced by the sum of \$30,000 being the necessary funds required to appoint the executive assistant to the Speaker.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Could we have the motion in writing please.

The motion before the committee is: It is moved by the Opposition House Leader that Item 4.(d) be reduced by the sum of \$30,000 being funds necessary to employ an executive assistant in the Speaker's Office - the Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** So that the record is clear, these Estimates that we have before us were Estimates that were considered and approved by the previous Legislative Assembly Management Commission, previous to the election, and members opposite should well know that, so let them not say that these Estimates were developed after the election. They were approved and developed by the previous LAMC -(Interjection)- Well, the Leader of the Opposition, wrong again, from his seat says that if we were contemplating adding this, we could have added it in. The fact is there was no LAMC after the election until the time that the Speaker was appointed to the position. This matter was brought to the LAMC on the first occasion possible at the first opportunity, and it was discussed and debated at that time.

But even further to that . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. J. COWAN:** . . . but even further to that the Estimates, as the Leader of the Opposition should know and members who were members of Treasury Bench previously should know, are sent to print long before

they come into this House, long before the Speaker was appointed. It takes approximately a month - (Interjection)- Well, perhaps even longer, but at least a month, to err on the Conservative side, if to err at all - and that's where most of the errors are made - but it takes at least a month.

So, in fact, there was not an opportunity to incorporate these into the Estimates that you have before us. That does not in any way take away from the motion that was made. I believe that the motion that was made very clearly indicates a number of things: 1) a resistance to change on the part of the Conservatives which is historical; secondly, I believe it reflects upon their many reflections upon the Speaker. That has got to stop.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Is he imputing motives?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I am not imputing motives at all. The record is very clear. If you listen to your comments on CJOB, if you listen to your comments in the House, if you listen to the Member for Pembina's comments from his seat all of the time regarding the Speaker, you will know full well - and the record is very clear - what you think of the Speaker, and this is another way for you to get at the Speaker and we will not let that sort of an attack on that institution in this House go unchallenged.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Every step of the way he is covering Mackling and every other . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Let the record show, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Pembina from his seat said that the Speaker was covering Mackling every step of the way. I want that on the record, and I want to assure the Member for Pembina it will be raised in this House tomorrow. I want to assure you.

New, Mr. Chairman, to the motion. You know, there's a time when there must be a sense of decency brought to bear. The sheer hypocrisy of the comments of the members of the Opposition - just listen for a moment.

First, they said that they're opposed to the idea. Okay well, we could have had a decent discussion on that, on the role of the Speaker, but what happened, of course, was that our House Leader made a reasoned but impassioned plea for service to the members of the constituency, which they could not rebut, so then they distended one step down the sinkhole. They then said that there was a lack of consultation. Now, they've changed their ground. It's no longer the principle, but it's the lack of consultations. Now, you can't have it both ways. If you're opposed to the idea now, you were opposed to the idea before, what would consultation have changed? Nothing.

Then, you went one step further, and that was the worst of all, and that I hope will show on the record when the Member for St. Norbert in his remarks reflected on the Speaker by saying that he - these weren't his exact words - but he said, look at the numbers, was there a political deal? That was so shameful that it could only have been worsened by the Member for Pembina, as most things are.

It's time I say that there should be a sense of decency. You don't like the idea, then debate the idea, but when our Government House Leader got up and showed you in jurisdiction after jurisdiction that there is legitimate precedent for this, you had no rebuttal, so you stooped - as you always do - to innuendo; you stooped - as you always do - to character assassination; you stooped - as you always do - to the lowest of the low, and that again accounts once more for the reason why you're in the Opposition; you will be in the Opposition four years from now; you will be in the Opposition eight years from now, unless you get your act in order.

Maybe people like the Member for Fort Garry, the Member for Morris - even in his better moments the Member for St. Norbert will finally turn around and say to their Leader of the Opposition, look, stop being influenced by the Member for Pembina; stand up, be a man, give a sense of decency to your leadership role.

You know, a lot of us have been observing what has been going on, and I want to tell you the last 10 minutes is just about the worst. The Office of the Speaker in a parliamentary system is so important that even if you may have reservations about the Speaker, even if from time to time you may doubt the wisdom of a particular decision - and on balance if you'll look we've been the loser as much as you've been the loser on decisions - even then you're talking about the Office of the Speaker, and you have no right - particularly in her absence - to reflect, as the Member for St. Norbert did, as the Member for Pembina did, on the Office of the Speaker. That is the lowest of the low.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, through you, Sir, to the Honourable Attorney-General, I in no way intended to reflect upon the Speaker. My comments intended, Mr. Chairman, to reflect upon the government. That's what they do, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There's a point of order being raised.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** I can't hear the Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.  
The Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, the intention of my remarks are to reflect upon the government, not upon the Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, we have a government here that made a unilateral decision with respect to an office of the Legislature, and those kinds of decisions have always been developed by consensus, by discussion, by consultation between all members of the House. This was not done in any way, shape or form by the government. It was announced, Mr. Chairman, by the Premier in the appointment of the Speaker without any consultation or discussion with members of the Opposition.

The Attorney-General is right. If we had been consulted, if the idea had been proposed to us, we would have been very reluctant to approve it, because

we have an expenditure of \$30,000; perhaps \$30,000 in terms of the whole budget of this government is not that much, but it's an indication of where this government's priorities are. They're prepared to spend every nickel they feel is necessary to so -alled serve the constituents of Wolseley in this case - one of the seats they hold - rather than deal with the real priorities of the people.

The Minister of Finance will talk about fiscal integrity and concern over the deficit, but when it comes down to it, Mr. Chairman, this government will spend every cent they feel on political matters; matters that affect them in holding their constituencies.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason, for many reasons, we oppose the expenditure in this instance. It has not been required in the last century of this Legislature. There are Speakers who have served that office, who have represented rural constituencies and, if anything, there's more justification for a rural member to have an executive assistant than there is for an urban member who's a block away from her constituency, Mr. Chairman, and we oppose this. We hope that this motion will succeed, because we feel that it's been done without consultation, it's not necessary in any event, and it hasn't been necessary for over 100 years. This government doesn't have the money and the taxpayers of this province don't have the money to continue to support the spending of taxpayers' money for political purposes.

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm astonished by the Member for St. Norbert's new-found interest and concern about the deficit and he's focusing in on the position of executive assistant, of someone to serve the constituents of the Speaker of this House. Where was his concern when he was dealing with additional staff for his own caucus office? Where was his concern when he was dealing with additional remuneration for MLA's in this area? He didn't have that same kind of concern.

But when we're dealing with the Speaker of this House and her ability to serve her constituents, suddenly he's focusing in and he's concerned about deficits, but he wasn't concerned when it affected himself or his own caucus office, you know, no concern at all, but when it's dealing with the Speaker.

We've gone through it and we've gone through other Speakers in this country and other provincial jurisdictions that have the same kind. In fact, the Government House Leader went through and showed where there's additional staff far beyond what exists here in the Province of Manitoba, where there's staff in the Speaker's Office and the constituency office. But there was no rebuttal to that, saying that's not right, that's not needed in those provinces. If that's the case in those provinces, why isn't it legitimate here?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** This new-found concern, as the Minister of Finance suggested, goes beyond the examples that he gave. I think it should be known, because the question wasn't asked when we were

talking about the Leader of the Opposition's expenditures, but there's a new expenditure under the Leader of the Opposition's line as well, a \$25,500 increase in word processing equipment and office furniture for the Leader's office. I think that is money well spent, because I think it provides him with better service, the ability to better service the broader constituency he has to serve. As Leader of the Opposition, he has to do things that the rest of us don't have to do. He has responsibilities that go beyond that of an MLA, and his constituency, while maybe not a walk away, is not that far away.

So if you want to suggest that the proximity of a member's constituency to the Legislature is a criteria that should be used to determine whether or not they are provided with extra service, whether it be through staff or the acquisition of word processing equipment, then I think you're using the wrong criteria. The criteria is the role that individual has been asked to play, either by the Premier as a member of the Cabinet, by his party as the Leader of the Opposition, or by this Assembly, as the Speaker. Does that role, in fact, require us to provide assistance to the individual that is above and beyond what other individuals get, notwithstanding where their geographical constituency may be?

So, for the Leader of the Opposition to stand up and couch his talk, his speech, in terms of an extra \$30,000 and the impact on the deficit, I think, does not in any way reflect the situation we have with his own leader, who is having a \$25,500 increase in his appropriation so that he can provide better service.

What they are mad about is the fact that the Speaker has an assistant. They do not believe the Speaker should have an assistant, and that appears to be a philosophical position that they, as a caucus, are taking. Let them have that philosophical position. We have a philosophical position in respect to where we believe we should be providing extra service. We happen to think ours is right. They happen to think theirs is right and ours is wrong.

They have moved a motion and we have spoken to the motion, but let them not suggest and bring in the deficit, in the way in which the Opposition House Leader did, to suggest that because we have provided for this position, we have done something that we wouldn't do for other members of the House, including the Member for River Heights in her role, who has additional staff that independent members didn't have previously because there's a role that they are asked to play. In this particular instance and probably this instance only, it was suggested that role required additional staff, and we agreed to that.

So, if we can agree to it in respect to the Member for River Heights and if we can agree to it in respect to the Leader of the Opposition's Office and we can't agree with it in respect to the Speaker, that shows to me an attitude, clearly demonstrates to the public an attitude on the part of the Opposition in respect to the role the Speaker plays in this House. I think they're wrong, and that is why their motion will be defeated, because the government thinks they're wrong. But, please, don't let them try to muddy the waters by suggesting that this is an inordinate amount of money to provide for additional services when we are providing almost exactly the same amount to the Leader of the Opposition so he can provide better service.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Official Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm interested to find that the Government House Leader is bringing the analogy that, because \$24,000 worth of word processing equipment is being installed in my office, that somehow makes everything equal, and that indeed my role is equivalent to that of the Speaker, whereby she has all these responsibilities that ought to be performed that aren't being performed without an executive assistant.

I just remind the Government House Leader, because he said earlier that we as Conservatives are simply doing this because we're opposed to change. I remind him that when we were in government, we gave the then Leader of the Opposition, his leader, his Premier, an executive assistant, the first time that had ever been done. So, it wasn't a question, Mr. Chairman, that we're opposed to change. It was a question of justification. We saw that as a necessary role.

I remind him that, for the last couple of years, his Premier has been saying sarcastically to me across the House that I need more research staff. Now, he hasn't said that in the past Session. I think that the research that's been done by our one researcher working on behalf of all of our caucus with respect to the MTX issue, I think, has closed his mouth on that particular criticism very, very well. I think that particular research that's been done by the collective members of caucus and one researcher has dug up things that four previous Ministers responsible for the Telephone System, that this Premier, that an entire Cabinet were not able to uncover or unearth, were not able at all to look into whatsoever. Despite the fact that they have staff coming out of their ears and coming out of the walls of their offices, they haven't been able to uncover any information whatsoever with respect to the operations of MTX.

He has been saying that for two years, but has not necessarily been willing to provide any additional staff for research to the Leader of the Opposition's office. So let him not show himself to be so generous as to have provided for us equipment, the word processing equipment, and that now is equivalent to the decision that's been made on behalf of the Speaker.

Very clearly, the Government House Leader put on the record that he saw it as a matter of justification. If indeed it could be justified that the Speaker needed this support staff, indeed that was the justification for it and they were satisfied of it. We are not satisfied that there has been any proper justification for a Speaker getting a political assistant to, in fact, do political work, because at the time that this assistant was appointed, it was said in the media that this was to look after the political affairs of her constituency so that she could remain neutral and non-partisan in her role, but she needed a political assistant. That's what was said at that time. I suggest to you, that is the matter we do not believe has ever been justified, nor has it been justified by all of the fine-sounding words that have been put forward by the Government House Leader today or any of the spurious allegations that have been made by other members on his side as they entered into the political side of the debate.

We do not believe that there has been justification shown for the need because, to begin with, there used

to be only a part-time secretary in the Speaker's Office, there is now a full-time secretary; and in addition to that there is an executive assistant to do political work and constituency work on behalf of the Speaker. That is the principal part of the issue. That is the crux of the concern that we have raised, and he is totally glossing that over and suggesting that, in fact, it's very similar to word processing equipment having been installed in the Leader of the Opposition's Office; and I suggest to him that the comparison is not at all valid, and the comparison doesn't make sense whatsoever.

For him to suggest that the Leader of the Opposition's Office, that is to serve 57 constituencies, is able to get the equipment and that's similar to the Speaker's Office that has to have an E.A. to serve one constituency, I don't see any comparison whatsoever and I think he does a disservice to this House by putting forward that argument.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I wondered when the Opposition would succeed again in getting on to their single-focus issue, their single-interest issue and, of course, it's just been revealed to us in the last two or three minutes. Behind every issue lies MTX, and we heard that from the Leader of the Opposition. The issue is not really the issue of the executive assistant to the Speaker; it's again MTX.

Mr. Chairman, I have certainly over a period of years . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I take it there is interference with the proceedings of the committee.

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . realized the increasing importance with MLA's being able to perform their functions within their constituencies. Also, that those who hold particular offices in addition to those of MLA's are able to serve their constituents, so that we do not have an MLA simply because they assume additional responsibility, whether it is the Leader of the Opposition, whether it is a Minister of the Crown, whether it is the Speaker, result in the jeopardizing of the work that they must do in serving his or her constituents.

I know that, in fact, previous Speakers from time to time have felt that their constituents were not as well served, there being the Speaker, as they would have been if they had held other office. And insofar as the present Speaker, Mr. Chairman, the service of constituents is extremely important.

the representation on behalf of constituents is extremely important; the presentation to members of Cabinet, just as it is necessary on the part of members of the Opposition in respect to particular concerns that lie within that constituency, very important.

Therefore, to suggest that for some reason or other, probably not written as clearly as it ought to be here by honourable members across the way, that the constituents in the constituency of Wolseley should be punished because for 100 years we have failed to do that which we ought to have done in this Chamber, and that is provide an executive assistant to the constituency of the Speaker, isn't good enough, Mr. Chairman.

Just as I commend the former Lyon administration as providing additional services to the Leader of the Opposition by way of an executive assistant, just as this government increased the size of the office of the Leader of the Opposition, provided a secretary to the executive assistant to the Leader of the Opposition in order to ensure the Leader of the Opposition better carry out his responsibilities, in the same way, Mr. Chairman, it's important that we not denigrate the opportunity of the Speaker in order to properly serve the constituents of the Speaker. I believe that is extremely important.

It's a principle that we are dealing with here, not a partisan question as such, but a matter of serving the constituents' caseload, dealing with the issues that arise within the constituency, making representations insofar as government is concerned on behalf of the constituents. The responsibilities of the Speaker have increased in between Sessions substantially in the last number of years, the Legislative Assembly Management Committee and other services that are provided insofar as constituency service is concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is complete justification for ensuring that the Speaker of the House enjoy the services of an executive assistant so that Speaker's constituents can be properly served.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Before I recognize the Member for Arthur, I'd like to announce the presence in the Chamber of the former Member for Virden, who himself was a Speaker of the House.

The Member for Arthur.

## SUPPLY - LEGISLATION Cont'd

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one brief comment. As the Premier used as an example of not giving the Speaker of the Chamber an executive assistant would be punishment to the constituents of Wolseley, Mr. Chairman, it's unfortunate the Premier did not have the same feeling towards the constituents of St. Vital under his former Speaker.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

It's not my intent to comment extensively on this matter, but I would like to reflect on one theme, I think, which members should pull out of some of the unfortunate aspects of this debate of the last half-hour. That is of the particularly difficult role of the Speaker, both in this House and in other Houses across this country.

I've only been here a short five years but in that time I've seen the present Speaker and the previous Speaker go through some difficult times. In fact, I thought it was particularly appropriate that a former Speaker was sitting through these proceedings, because I know he faced some difficulties, some particular pressures.

I look now, Mr. Chairperson, at the House of Commons in Ottawa where the Speaker of the House of Commons has just resigned amid some of the greatest pressure on a Speaker that has ever been

seen in parliamentary history. I reflect, Mr. Chairperson, on the dual pressures that are facing the Speaker, pressures which face some MLA's, in fact most MLA's to some extent, but particularly pressure on the Speaker; and that is the pressure of the increasing demands on politicians, particularly members of the Legislature or members of Parliament, for constituency casework.

I have certainly recognized that in my own constituency, and I'm sure many other members have recognized that as well; and to that, we have seen in the past few years increasing responsibilities for the Speaker. In this House, those increasing responsibilities have already been recognized, not just in terms of the current parameters of the debate, but in terms of the responsibilities of the Speaker, the particular allocations given to the Speaker's Office. In fact, there's been a general recognition, even in terms of the salary given to the Speaker. At the present time, the salary is equivalent to that given to a Minister without portfolio.

So what I see is the Speaker placed in a particularly difficult position. What I see is this debate contributing to that difficulty. You know, I've sat here and heard some pretty horrendous insinuations against the Speaker's Office in general and the current Speaker in particular, and I'm concerned about that. I'm particularly concerned that members opposite are not recognizing the increasing pressure on the Speaker.

It's getting to the point where it's going to become increasingly difficult for members to accede to what surely should be one of the highest honours of this House, the Speaker's Office. I think some of the requirements for having potential Speakers accepting the responsibilities of that office are the recognition of the role they face, the administrative role which I think requires that they be given the proper resources in their office, but also their political role as members of a constituency to serve the needs of their constituents.

I, quite frankly, am very concerned about this debate of the last half-hour. I think it's totally unnecessary. The concern was expressed in the Legislative Assembly Management Commission. I was at the meeting. The members who were concerned about that matter expressed it rather clearly. I think that was the appropriate place to make that concern known, but I don't think in this arena - in the legislative arena - we should be involving ourselves in - as was the case of one member of this House - a direct attack on the Speaker or even an indirect attack, not just in terms of the present Speaker but the Office of the Speaker.

I quite frankly, Mr. Chairperson, consider this debate of the last half-hour one of the low points of this Session, because I think it shows just how much out of touch and inappropriate this House can be at times when we spend half-an-hour debating what I consider to be a self-evident need of the Speaker for assistance in dealing with constituency matters. Instead of debating real matters of public concern, we sit here and we cover the spectrum from concerns about the specific issue to personal attacks on the Speaker.

This, Mr. Chairperson, has got to be one of the low points, although there are certainly a number of other unfortunate incidents which can compete with it in that sense, and I, quite frankly, think we should get rid of this frivolous and vexatious resolution that is before this House and get on to some matters that are of

serious concern to this province and matters which do not have the same lack of coherent concern that the members have expressed on this matter throughout this debate.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I find it . . . , Mr. Chairman, on the exercise that we're going through here today. First of all, the members opposite including the Premier have just run out of the Chambers here to phone the Member for St. Vital so that he'll come and vote.

**HON. J. COWAN:** On a point of order. On a point of order. Improper.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Point of order being raised.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Firstly, it is not appropriate, and the Member for Emerson knows it, not parliamentary to refer to the presence or the absence of any member in the House.

Secondly, I can assure him that his supposition as to what the Premier is doing or not doing is inaccurate. In fact, we on this side are confident that the issue that's before us is such that we will enjoy the confidence of the House, even if they don't always show confidence in the Speaker.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Every member knows that the reference to presence or absence of a member is inappropriate under Citation 316(c).

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, there's a certain major concern on the other side of the House, on the government side of the House, of the comment I made, you know, I want to apologize to some degree.

It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is my personal opinion that the Premier and the leader of the government is trying to make some kind of a negotiation with the previous Speaker, who felt aggrieved already when he was Speaker of the House. I doubt whether the Member for St. Vital wants to come back and vote on this issue, because he was the one who already got a major increase over previous Speakers.

There's been major changes financially to the Speakers of the House since this government took office in 1981. They did that, Mr. Chairman, because you know the increase that was allotted to the Speaker of the House in the last Session, because that was not his desire to be the Speaker but they just sort of coaxed him into it financially, I suppose - I do - and, Mr. Chairman, tongue in cheek, everybody sort of accepted that.

That is one of the biggest concerns that the Government of the Day has right now. The Premier's here right now, and I suppose he's had discussion with the Member for St. Vital, and then we'll fix you up somewhere along the line. We just want to look after you to some degree, because that is why the scuttling and the concern is taking place since the motion was put. The Premier is smiling. Obviously, he must have had a positive conversation with the Member for St. Vital.

But, Mr. Chairman, when we consider just a few moments ago, you introduced the previous Speaker from 1977-81, the Member for Virden at that time . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.  
The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You just introduced the Member for Virden, who was Speaker from 1977-81, who served in that capacity and he lived a long way from this building. He did his job to the best of his ability. When there was a change of government in 1981, we had the rules and he wanted to be Speaker, so they had to make it more appealing to the individual, who was disappointed - and we know, it's common knowledge - Mr. Chairman, it's been in the papers. There's been speculation about the performance of the Member for St. Vital because, from the time that he was Speaker in the last term and this time where he got virtually nothing, there's been dissatisfaction. That's why the Premier had to rush out of here and make some kind of conference with the Member for St. Vital -(Interjection)- that's my opinion, yes, and that's the opinion of many people because everybody feels that the Member for St. Vital is loosey-goosey, so there's got to be some push. The Premier has to rush out of here and make contact with him to say, hey, we'll look after you.

That is the part, Mr. Chairman, that bothers me, because the Office of the Speaker has lost some credibility from '81 till the last election, and it's lost more credibility because you have to enrich the office of the Speaker's Office. Simply, nobody on that side is qualified or wants that position. That is what we're faced with, Mr. Chairman, and I feel that these are the problems that this government is facing. They've had great difficulties with everything they've done. They've had to use patronage.

You know, patronage has been the name of the game for a long time. It's also been illustrated in the Speaker's Office. Mr. Chairman, that is the problem that the Government of the Day has, and that's the problem that the Premier has.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The motion is being put that Item 4.(d) be reduced by the sum of \$30,000, being funds necessary to employ an executive assistant in the Speaker's Office. As many as are in favour of the motion, say aye. As many as are opposed to the motion, say nay.

The nays have it.

#### **MOTION presented and defeated**

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I request a formal vote.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** A formal vote is being requested.  
Call in the members.

The question before this committee is as follows: that Item 4.(d) be reduced by the sum of \$30,000, being the funds necessary to employ an executive assistant in the Speaker's Office.

All those in favour of the motion, please rise.

**A COUNTED VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

Yea, 25; Nays, 28.

**Tuesday, 9 September, 1986**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I declare the motion lost.  
Item No. 4.(d) Other Expenditures—pass.  
Item No. 4.(e)(1) Hansard: Salaries—pass; 4.(e)(2)  
Hansard: Other Expenditures—pass.  
Item 4.(f) Legislative Printing and Binding - the  
Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
I'd just simply like to know why (f) has gone up by  
32 percent.

**HON. J. COWAN:** There's a \$25,000 increase due to  
the printing requirements for both official languages.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 4.(f)—pass.  
5.(a) Provincial Auditor's Office: Salaries—pass; 5.(b)  
Other Expenditures—pass.

Resolution No. 1: Resolved that there be granted  
to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,646,000 for  
Legislation, Other Assembly Expenditures, for the fiscal  
year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Resolution No. 2: Resolved that there be granted  
to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,386,900 for  
Legislation, Provincial Auditor's Office, for the fiscal  
year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item No. 6.(a) Ombudsman: Salaries - the Member  
for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
There has been a considerable increase in the  
Ombudsman's Office which I think is directly related  
to the load the Ombudsman's Office is carrying.

The increase in the number of salaries, how many  
additional staff years has that provided to the  
Ombudsman?

**HON. J. COWAN:** There's an increase of \$105,600 in  
total, which provides for three additional staff years,  
and the MGEA contract agreement increases, a  
reclassification cost and the merit allowance provisions.  
In Other Expenditures, there's an increase of \$10,000,  
which reflects increased travel and activity by the  
Ombudsman's Office.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Will the additional three staff  
years be able to clear up the backlog that has been  
hounding the Ombudsman's Office simply because  
there's been insufficient staff in the past?

**HON. J. COWAN:** The backlog in the case work, I  
understand, is being cleared up and probably should  
be totally cleared up over a period of time with the  
additional staff -(Interjection)- well, the Member for  
Arthur suggests perhaps I was trying to clarify that too  
much, and perhaps I was trying to clarify too much.

What I'm attempting to say is that a not inordinate  
amount of time will be spent in clearing up that backlog.  
We believe or I'm informed the office believes that it's  
under control basically and it's a matter now of time  
rather than it slipping further backward. So the three  
staff have appeared to perform the function for which  
they were intended.

In regard to support service, I understand there is  
still some difficulty in that area, but the cases themselves  
are being dealt with.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Can the Government House  
Leader indicate if the government is in fact looking at  
the recommendation which would depoliticize members  
of the Civil Service staff of the Ombudsman's Office,  
and will legislation of that nature be introduced in the  
near future?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I think the suggestions which have  
been put forward are ones that should be discussed.  
Beyond that, there is no commitment for any specific  
action at this time, but that does not in fact preclude  
any specific action. That would have to be determined  
on the basis of those discussions.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go on  
the record as saying that I believe that the  
recommendations of the Ombudsman in this area  
happen to be absolutely correct and that if we are  
going to leave the Ombudsman and his office in a  
position where they can provide the necessary service  
to citizens of Manitoba, they must be in fact totally free  
of political obligations.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 6.(b)—pass.  
Resolution No. 3: Resolved that there be granted  
to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$431,800 for  
Legislation, Ombudsman, for the fiscal year ending the  
31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item No. 7.(a) Elections Manitoba: Salaries - the  
Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
If we could perhaps just deal with all of the  
expenditures here, I wonder if the Government House  
Leader could indicate the expenditures incurred in  
running the last election and the amount either paid  
or to be paid out to political parties under The Elections  
Financing Act for expenses incurred in the election.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Well, the figures are not finalized as  
of yet. The election cost itself, without the rebates, I  
understand is - and this probably is a fairly final figure  
- \$2.3148 million. The rebates, and they are not final  
yet, would be in the area of under \$2 million.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister  
indicate how that \$2 million would be broken down,  
approximately how much to each political party?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I understand that 161 candidates  
qualified, 3 political parties qualified. The exact  
breakdown as requested by political party by the  
Opposition House Leader is not available at this time.  
Again, the figures aren't entirely final, although I  
understand that they should be available between now  
and the start of the next Session, and that material  
can be forwarded then directly by the electoral office  
and, of course, it will be included in the annual report  
when that annual report becomes available to the  
Assembly after the beginning of the next Session.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Government House  
Leader indicate when those figures will be finalized and  
when those amounts will be paid out to the candidates  
and parties?

**Tuesday, 9 September, 1986**

---

**HON. J. COWAN:** So that the record is clear, there were 219 candidates in total, 161 qualified. Of the 161, approximately 121, I'm told, have been finalized of the candidates' expenses, and they will be sent out in the mail within the next couple of weeks. The others, additional information is required of one sort or another, and they will be sent out in the mail at a later date, but as of present, 121 have been finalized.

The rebates to the political parties themselves should be completed and finalized within a month or so and will be sent out accordingly afterwards.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the Government House Leader indicated that this information would all be included in the Annual Report of the Chief Election Officer, which we would not receive until some time, I would expect, in mid-1987. I wonder if I could ask, perhaps through him the Chief Election Officer, if it would be possible to provide to all members of the Assembly, perhaps even to all candidates who ran in the last election, a summary of the amounts paid out to the political parties and candidates when those matter have been finalized, which would be some time before the end of this calendar year.

**HON. J. COWAN:** I thought I'd indicate that we could send the information directly to the Opposition House Leader, but his suggestion of extending that mailing list is a good one. I'm informed by the Electoral Office that can be accommodated.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering if the Chief Election Officer can indicate, through the Government House Leader, if in his annual report they will be considering making recommendations to changes in The Election Finances Act, because I think it's fair to say that candidates for all political parties, I'm sure, had a great deal of difficulty in dealing with the act and its interpretation and the arduous requirements. I'm not suggesting that the reporting requirements be lessened in any serious way, but perhaps will he be recommending improvements to expedite and improve the whole process and the number of reports, etc.?

**HON. J. COWAN:** It's my understanding that the Chief Electoral Officer will be reviewing that which we have learned through the past election, and will be dialoguing in a consultative matter with the Advisory Committee, which is made up of representatives of all the registered political parties. I understand that discussion will take into consideration what ideas and suggestions he brings forward, as well as ideas and suggestions that are brought forward by the particular parties to that committee meeting. Then that will be incorporated into the report that will follow.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** One last question, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Chief Election Officer can indicate through the Government House Leader whether any prosecutions under The Elections Finances Act are being considered as a result of non-compliance with the provisions of that act.

**HON. J. COWAN:** It's my understanding that there are returns that are still being reviewed where there is

outstanding information or clarification that is required, but there are no prosecutions at this particular time contemplated. However, if in the review of those returns, it is determined that there are improprieties, then appropriate action would have to be taken, but at this particular time there is not information that would require a prosecution.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Would the Chief Elections Officer recommend winter elections in the future?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 7.(a)—pass; 7.(b) Other Expenditures—pass.

Resolution No. 4: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,554,400 for Legislation, Election Manitoba, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Chairman, the Government House Leader is indicating they require the Minister of Agriculture to deal with Emergency Interest Rate Relief. I think we would require one of the critics in the Agriculture Committee to deal with Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures, so perhaps we could move to Executive Council.

**HON. J. COWAN:** That's agreeable. They need a critic from the other committee.

#### **SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** We are proceeding to consider the Estimates for the Executive Council.

1.(a) General Administration, Premier and President of the Council's Salary - the Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the area to make some opening remarks. Insofar as the Estimates are concerned, they basically stand pat with the exception of the Native Affairs Secretariat, which we'll be dealing with during the process of the Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to present the Estimates for the Executive Council. Members are certainly familiar insofar as the program that has been presented during this Legislative Assembly through the Throne Speech, through the Budget and through various pieces of legislation during the Session, first and foremost, of course, The Farm Lands Protection Act which is being dealt with this morning in committee and this evening in committee, legislation that I believe will be fundamental and important to the agricultural producers of the province; The Trade Practices Inquiry Act, which deals with ensuring that consumers are given a fair opportunity for protection insofar as price gouging; the legislation that has been presented by the Attorney-General dealing with the victims of crime and compensation thereto; the further progress in respect to pay equity in order to ensure that there is fairness insofar as equality is concerned between women and men within the public service and the progress that has been made in respect to that; the 55-Plus Program, which I think certainly gives Manitobans a sense of a government giving further security insofar as the seniors of Manitoba are concerned.

As well, of course, Mr. Chairman, we're not only dealing with the legislation, the program within the Province of Manitoba, but the responsibility insofar as interprovincial, intergovernmental services and positions are concerned; and the position that has been worked out with the cooperation of Governor Perpich and Governor Sinner vis-a-vis the attempt to locate hazardous waste sites near the Red River; the position in respect to deficiency payments that has been taken strongly at Western Premiers' Conference and the Premiers' Conference in Edmonton a few weeks ago in support of ensuring that just as the Federal Government appears to have been able to obtain additional monies insofar as assist the oil industry of the Province of Alberta, that same sort of recognition be applied insofar as the farmers of Western Canada; positions that we have taken consistently in respect to the removal of regional economic disparities, whether those regional economic disparities be in Western Canada, whether they be in the Maritimes. That has been a main focal point insofar as presentations that we have made at all the federal-provincial meetings that we have participated in.

The issue of Quebec and seeing if Quebec can be brought home within the Constitution has been an issue that certainly we have expressed, along with nine other Premiers, our support for talks and for discussions to see if we can find a way of bringing Quebec into the Constitution. We're certainly prepared to cooperate in that process. I'd be prepared to answer questions as we proceed in regard to that particular issue.

The free trade negotiations and our concern, quite candidly, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the timing of those discussions at the present time in view of the atmosphere that has been built up in the United States in the pre-Congressional election period, the potential negative impact of the continuation of those discussions during this particular period of time and the possibility of different negative retaliatory actions that we have noticed that the United States has proposed, American politicians have proposed, but our preparedness at the same time to ensure that we have a trade representative and that we continue insofar as the meetings are concerned to ensure the protection of the interests of the Province of Manitoba.

I should mention to honourable members that we will be attending the meeting of the Prime Minister and 10 Premiers on September 17 for further discussions in respect to the negotiations under way between Mr. Eastman and Mr. Murphy.

The need for proceeding with national tax reform - two years ago, in February of 1985, it was the Manitoba Government, Mr. Chairman, that first raised the issue of tax reform. At that conference, we had no support. There was no expressed support around that conference table, 11 First Ministers and the gradual addition of support by different First Ministers in respect to the crying need to proceed with national tax reform, comprehensive tax reform in this country. I'm pleased, Mr. Chairman, that we were able, I believe, to lead the way by way of developing public sentiment in Canada until now we have announcements by the Finance Minister at the federal level that he too is intending to proceed by way of national tax reform. What started out to be an issue where we were all alone appears now to be an issue in which we have a great deal of company.

These are the wide spectrum of areas of interest, I believe, to Manitobans: the Aboriginal Conference which is coming in March or April, issues pertaining to the development of self-government insofar as the Native communities. The evolution of the institutions of self-government will also be an area of importance during the next few months insofar as the development of a Manitoba position. I am pleased again at the first aboriginal people's conference involving the aboriginal peoples, the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments, Manitoba stood practically alone. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are reaching a point - and the Minister responsible for Native Affairs will be discussing this further if questions are posed - it appears we are reaching a point by which we are close to seven provinces giving support to the proposals of aboriginal self-government.

The opportunity to oversee, as a government, progress in respect to the last five years by way of capital investment, which has been the highest rate of increase of any province; private investment rate of increase amongst the highest of any province; employment growth during the past year which has been amongst the best in Canada; housing starts numbering some 3,200 and some during the first half of this year, an increase of some 33 percent, the highest rate of increase by way of housing starts in a year since 1978 under this administration; the development of the hydro-electric potential of the Province of Manitoba under the stewardship of the Minister of Energy and Mines; the successful commencement of Limestone.

The fact that Limestone is now coming in under bid with a large Manitoba content demonstrates the competency and the efficiency of this government insofar as its proceeding with Limestone when it proceeded with it, the returns that will be realized for the people of the Province of Manitoba because, Mr. Chairman, we did not fear, we did not hesitate to proceed with this challenge during the 1980's for the benefit of all Manitobans.

The continued low unemployment rate in the Province of Manitoba, and I believe that the latest report in respect to unemployment indicates that Manitoba's youth unemployment has shrunk more rapidly than any other province in Canada in that group, 18 to 25, which concerns all members of this Chamber.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have come into this Session with an agenda in respect to jobs; in regard to the improvement of health care services and social services; a program to strengthen the agricultural sector of this province; the improvement of the quality of life for all Manitobans; to constantly present a Manitoba position, the interests of Manitobans at federal-provincial conferences in order to contribute to the better well-being of Canada as a whole.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I note from a review of last year's Hansard that the Premier at that time didn't feel it was necessary to make an opening statement on his Estimates. I note today the sense of desperation that leads him to have to try and put a good face on what has been an absolutely disastrous Session under his stewardship. Everywhere you look,

there is a sense of a government in shambles, a government totally out of control, and a Premier who doesn't know what's happening. As things crumble around him, all he can do is try and point to some things that he perceives to be in some way positive about what's happening here in Manitoba.

He begins almost laughably, Mr. Chairman, by speaking of, and I'll quote, he said: "The Farm Lands Protection Act." I don't know what that is, because if he's talking about Bill 4, it's The Family Farm Protection Act. Even that act has been so soundly criticized in each of the sessions of the Agriculture Committee, both yesterday and today, by speaker after speaker, by presenter after presenter, representing literally thousands of people in the farm community, it has been totally repudiated, criticized as being absolutely wrong-headed and the wrong answer for the problems that farmers are facing today. Yet, he has the audacity to cite that as the No. 1 accomplishment of this administration this Session -(Interjection)- As the Member for St. Norbert says, it could well be because, when you look at the disasters that have befallen his administration, that act may well be the best thing that they've put forward, despite the fact that the people who are representing the majority of the farm community have said that it's an absolute disaster for them and they're very upset with it.

Mr. Chairman, he cites such things as pay equity as being an accomplishment of this Session. Mr. Chairman, I know that you know because you were here in the last Session, that was passed in the last Session of the Legislature. The ongoing implementation is an administrative function of the committees that have been set up to deal with that and to implement it. It has very little, if anything, to do with this Premier's actions, certainly in this Session. There is absolutely no way that he could be taking credit for that as being a major accomplishment of this Session, because it has not been a matter that has come up here for debate in this Session of the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, he talks about Manitoba having taken a lead role in terms of tax reform country-wide. He, most of all, has to hang his head in shame that, while he was preaching one thing about tax reform and about fairness in the tax system, two of his Ministers were knowingly investing in SRTC's which he and his Minister of Finance characterized as legalized theft, as bilking the system. Mr. Chairman, I can't believe he would suggest that somehow he has been a leader and his government has been a leader in terms of tax reform when the Federal Government has been moving towards tax reform to implement a minimum tax system, to implement the removal of the SRTC's, to implement other measures of tax reform, when even the Government of Saskatchewan proceeded to change its own form of taxation to try and amend and create, in their view, some new fairness in the system. They have moved towards it, and he has done nothing but talk. While he's been talking, his own speech has been undermined by the very actions of two of his Ministers.

Do as I say, but not as I do, has been the impression that he has created to the people of this country. In every way, shape and form, it's been, do as I say, but not as I do, the poorest example that he could give to the people of Manitoba or indeed anywhere in this country as to what fairness is and what reasonableness is in the tax system.

He speaks, in terms of accomplishments, that he spokeout and took a position with respect to the nuclear waste disposal site in Minnesota. None of what happened was as a result of his action. The Government of the United States acted, and acted properly, to ensure that there would be no downstream effects with respect to the Red River drainage system as a result of the location of a facility there. He takes that as being an accomplishment of his government in this Session. It's absolute nonsense, Mr. Chairman, and the people of Manitoba know and understand that he has done nothing to in any way bring credit to himself on those issues.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the free trade negotiations, he is the only Premier in this country who is taking a negative position with respect to that whole issue, suggesting that the way to get into a better position with the United States, the way to get ourselves in a position to have better bargaining with the United States, where there is a growing protectionist movement developing, the way to counteract that is to walk away from the table and to cut off all the negotiations. That's been his major thrust with respect to free trade negotiation. The reason, of course, is that his strings are being pulled by Shirley Carr and the Canadian Federation of Labour and all of those people who have been against it from Day One. Only he has been looking for a way to try and change his position ever since the day that he, at a Western Premiers' Conference, agreed in principle to freer trade as an objective for Canada, he has been looking to try and back out of that position for more than a year now and he has finally found the way; and that is to suggest that the protectionist movement must be counteracted by us walking away from the table.

That will only inflame the protectionist movement. That will only make the Americans look for ways to retaliate against us and we will have no way of discussing it with them, no opportunity for open communication to get them to the table, to get them into the discussion with respect to free trade in the interests of all the people of this province and this country.

He wants to walk away from the table and let the American protectionist movement harm the interests of Canada, as it indeed will, and that is absolutely the wrong approach and I'm glad that he stands alone in terms of the Premiers of this country in that matter because it is absolutely wrong headed.

Mr. Chairman, he talks about all of these accomplishments and, as I've pointed out, there are few, if any, positive things that he can take credit for in this Session. But what about all of the other areas? Who is going to take credit? Who is going to stand up and take credit for the fire sale of Flyer Industries and the massive loss to the taxpayer of Manitoba as a result of the management and the administration of that company by this NDP administration? Who is going to take credit for the \$30 million loss in Manfor in only the past 15 months of operation? Who is going to take credit for the massive increase in the deficit last year over what was originally projected?

Who's going to take credit for all of the fiascos that have befallen this administration, that began with his promises to control and reduce gasoline prices, which he could not keep, which he did not keep, and all we

have now is a report that gives certain advice on the matter but doesn't do anything to keep his promise?

Who is he going to blame for the fact that during the election campaign he announced sales to the United States of hydro-electric energy worth over \$4 billion and all we had was one signed agreement for \$46 million? Who is going to take credit for that breach of promise on his part?

Who is going to take credit for all of the various things that have been listed by writer after writer, by people in the newspapers, by people throughout this province about the settlement with President Perkins at Brandon University, the lawsuit for wrongful dismissal that has cost us up to \$1 million as a result of the actions of the board of Brandon University, appointed by this administration, responsible to this administration, who is now responsible, and this government is, of course, having to take the responsibility for a \$1 million loss as a result of that decision which was made by that board.

Who's going to take responsibility for all of the various problems that we've had in Crown corporations? The firing, after an auditor's report, of the chief executive officer of MPIC? Who is going to take responsibility for all of those matters, including the disaster that's befalling us in terms of child welfare, in terms of the public inquiry that we're having to have by the Commissioner to look at all the matters of children being returned to homes in which they've been abused not once but twice and up to seven times? Who's going to take responsibility for that action on the part of his government?

Who's going to take responsibility, and I can get into this in much greater detail, for the whole affair of MTX and his negligence and the negligence of every successive Minister responsible for the Telephone System in ignoring that issue?

Mr. Chairman, I don't need to add and embellish upon these. They're all on the record, and all I say is that this Premier has a great audacity to try and put a happy face on the disasters of this Session and to try and say in some way that he is the one who has accomplished so much for Manitobans.

I say to him, go out and listen to the people of Manitoba because the things that you've accomplished, they don't want. In fact, they are absolutely abhorred at the things that have happened in this Session of the Legislature as a result of this administration and its maladministration and its disastrous activities and the fiascos that have befallen it.

I say to this Premier, go out and listen to the people and see what they think about the accomplishments that you've put forward and come back and tell us whether you can still put a happy face on this last five months of accomplishment of your administration.

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, what we've heard is the kind of hyperbole that we've come to be accustomed insofar as honourable members across the way. The honourable members have been attempting desperately since the election, because of bitterness on the part of honourable members as a result of their defeat March 18th, they have not yet forgiven the people

of the Province of Manitoba for rejecting them on March 18th.

Mr. Chairman, that is obvious from the faces of each and every one of the honourable members across the way day by day as they conduct a campaign in this Legislature, with the exception of the Honourable Member for River Heights, as they respond not with a rational kind of alternative approach, not as they deal with the issues before this Chamber in a way that is straightforward, but rather by way of innuendo and mud slinging rather than deal with the basic issues that confront Manitobans.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for that is because of their anger, their frustration and their bitterness because the people of the Province of Manitoba rejected them even though one year before the March 18th election they had a 30 percent edge in the polls.

I remember the Honourable Member for Emerson screaming in the Session in 1985, "Call the election; we're going to wipe you clean." I remember the Leader of the Opposition: "We're going to have you down to just a few seats." Thirty percent ahead they were and the people of the Province of Manitoba demonstrated what they thought of the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba and the Opposition by soundly rejecting them on March 18th of this year. And with just a few more votes, we would have had two more seats in this Chamber as well, Mr. Chairman. They can juggle with numbers all they want but those are the plain, clear facts that honourable members across the way, in their frustration, in their bitterness, would like to ignore.

The Leader of the Opposition likes to talk about Flyer Industries. Mr. Chairman, it was this government that arranged for a sale of Flyer Industries. Where were honourable members across the way from 1977-1981? Where were they, the great champions of private enterprise, those who were going to privatize the Crown corporations of the Province of Manitoba?

I heard the Honourable Member for La Verendrye on TV say, "We would have gotten rid of Flyer Industries except for the NDP Opposition." He expressed his government's weakness in dealing with Flyer Industries. It was this government, the present Minister of Finance who negotiated a successful sale of Flyer Industries so that there will be a continued opportunity for a bus manufacturer in the Province of Manitoba. Rather than that being a strike against this government, this government was able to accomplish what they were unable to accomplish, despite their professions, during four years, 1977-1981.

The Leader of the Opposition likes to talk about the price of gas. We advised the gasoline industry that if the price of gasoline was not down by 9.5 cents a litre by April 2nd of this year, we would take the appropriate action. Honourable members like to laugh because honourable members are nervous about the fact that they took no position whatsoever. Mr. Chairman, it dropped, closed by the 9.5 percent.

Let me tell honourable members the gasoline industry wouldn't have been afraid one bit of honourable members across the way because they have the Conservative Party in their hip pockets. We've seen that today on the part of the Ottawa Government. So are honourable members trying to suggest there would have been a decrease if they had have been in power?

And besides that, Mr. Chairman, we are proceeding with changes to The Training Practices Inquiry Act to give us stronger measures in order to deal with price gouging in the future including the gas industry in the Province of Manitoba. Yes, I say to the Leader of the Opposition, that is an accomplishment of this government and we take pride in that accomplishment.

Insofar as the Perkins, we've heard the misrepresentations before on the Brandon settlement. Wasn't it a billion dollars? That's been straightened out a number of times by the Minister of Education in this Chamber, but it doesn't matter, Mr. Chairman; even if he clarified that 19 times, the Leader of the Opposition would still continue to talk in terms of a billion-dollar settlement without accuracy. Truth is only irrelevant insofar as honourable members across the way are concerned.

The MPIC manager, Mr. Chairman, it was this government that ordered the audit that fired the manager as a result of that audit. I make no apologies for that. The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, because of the decisiveness by the Minister responsible for the Autopac . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** He changed his appearance. Let's give him a hand. I think there's been a walking across the aisle . . .

So I say to honourable members: we are proud of the record of this administration during its five years in office. We certainly have accomplished, I believe, even in the past six months, a number of important achievements. As much as honourable members continue with innuendo, with their house of cards that will collapse, they will lose because they're not playing with a full deck.

Since 1976, I've advised honourable members across the way that the perpetuation of allegations of innuendo, of smear didn't elect any party. Deal with policies and policy issues and philosophies and programs. The people of the Province of Manitoba are not interested in smears and innuendoes. I'm glad that honourable members have rejected my advice, because if they had accepted that advice, they might still be in government.

I believe, as was said just an hour or two ago, that honourable members will lose the next election and the election after that because their whole approach, their tactics, are to perpetuate a campaign of fear and smear and innuendo. Manitobans are not the kind of people who are won over to that kind of tactic. Manitobans want to discuss the important issues. That's why we won the last election; that's why we won the '81 election. That's why they lost it; that's why they'll lose the next election and the election after that because there seems to be something very basic, very fundamental to the Conservative Party of the Province of Manitoba that they just can't afford to discuss policies and issues. They have to deal with that big fear, the monster innuendo, the smear, and Manitobans are not that kind of people and they don't buy that kind of campaign.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that the Premier should talk about misrepresentation

and exaggeration when he makes the statement that Manitobans soundly rejected our party in this last election; soundly rejected us when we got the same percentage of the popular vote as he did, when we gained three seats and he lost four seats, but we were soundly rejected and he was roundly brought in with an overwhelming mandate.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier talks in terms of bitterness, but I say to him we accept the decision, we accept our role . . .

**A MEMBER:** You haven't demonstrated it.

**MR. G. FILMON:** We haven't? We have been doing the role of an Opposition: probing, questioning, examining, making the government accountable. The problem is that the Premier doesn't accept his role. He won't take any responsibility for anything that happened to the government. He doesn't realize that he's in government. He says: I close my eyes to all this and then I don't see what's going on; I close my ears and I don't hear what's going on. He says that, in his view, he doesn't have to accept responsibility for anything that's going on because he called in the Auditor and they fired the president of MPIC, his hands are clear; that's it, it's finished with, no responsibility on the part of the government.

He says that no matter what's happening in MTX, no responsibility of the government. He says that no matter what was done wrong in firing the president of Brandon University, he takes no responsibility even though he appointed the majority of the board, he controlled the board of Brandon University, but he takes no responsibility, absolutely none. He takes no responsibility for the board's actions at MTS, no responsibility for the board's actions at MPIC. Everywhere along the line, he is not willing to take any responsibility. He doesn't accept his role as government for heaven's sake. That's the whole point that we have to deal with.

We've got a Premier who wants to talk about everything except government responsibility. When we raised matters to public attention that, in fact, are doing a service to the people of Manitoba, that are telling them about the corruption, about the dishonesty and about the wrongful actions of this administration, he says that we're doing a disservice. He says that we're bitter; he says that we aren't appreciating our role in government. Because we lost, we should say nothing, we should do nothing; we should sit back here and let him do whatever he wants. Regardless of how dishonest, regardless of how corrupt, regardless of what it does to harm the interests of the people of Manitoba, we should do nothing because he's the government.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, we are being constructive. You have to begin first by showing people what's wrong before you can tell them how to make it right, and in this particular case it's this administration and everything they've done since they've been in government that has caused the problems. It is all these problems that we've been pointing out that are absolutely in the worst interests of the people of Manitoba and we have to get rid of that and we have to at least show some recognition, but this Premier will show no recognition and will take no responsibility. So that, Mr. Chairman, is the problem.

It is this Premier and this administration that won't accept the decision of the people of Manitoba in the election. They won't take the responsibility to do anything that will be in the best interests of the people of Manitoba. And that's our problem: they don't understand their responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Premier to give us a list of the staff who are included in Management and Administration, Item 1.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I will call 1.(b)(1) Management Administration: Salaries; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures.

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I forwarded to the honourable members the list of the staff members of the Executive Council

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Premier could indicate whether or not Joanne McNiven is still on contract to the government or working for the government in any capacity.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Yes, she's working for the government, the Jobs Fund.

**MR. G. FILMON:** With the Jobs Fund, what is her responsibility?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I can give the Leader of the Opposition the various responsibilities that she has. In working for the Jobs Fund, there are administrative responsibilities insofar as her activities for the Jobs Fund.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Unless there are any further questions, I am prepared to pass (b)(1) and (b)(2).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(b)(1) Management and Administration: Salaries—pass; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 1.(c)(1) Federal-Provincial Relations Secretariat: Salaries: 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Yes, I wonder if the Premier could provide a list of the staff who are included in item 1.(c)(1).

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The Federal Relations Secretariat includes Mr. Jim Eldridge, who's Deputy Secretary, Federal-Provincial; Robert B. Oleson; Chris Pochinko, P-O-C-H-I-N-K-O, Secretary; and Paul Vogt, V-O-G-T.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** I do have a question to the Premier on this area. In his opening remarks he referred to one aspect of a number of matters of discussions to include Quebec into The Confederation Act. He's talked about negotiations and discussions. I wonder if he could indicate any specifics of the Province of Manitoba's position with respect to this matter. What is the Province of Manitoba prepared to do or agree to?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** At the Edmonton First Ministers' Conference, all Premiers agreed to enter into

discussions with the Premier of Quebec, Premier Bourassa, on the basis of the points that were submitted by Quebec insofar as those discussions.

There is one area, of course, that we have serious difficulty with, as do other provinces, and that is with respect to the proposal for a veto. Despite that particular proposal on the part of Quebec, we are prepared to carry on the discussions and hoping that there is a way of obtaining a compromise that would not, in fact, result in the treatment of other parts of Canada in a way that would be secondary to Quebec. That is certainly the point that is of contention on our part.

The second area that is of contention at this time is the one dealing with controls insofar as federal spending. We have concerns, for instance, that some of the major social programs of Canada would not have been launched if it had been possible for Quebec to have prevented the development of spending programs of that particular nature. So we have concerns in regard to that.

The third provision deals with the recognition of Quebec as a distinctive society. We are prepared to certainly discuss with Bourassa and the other Premiers appropriate wording that could be accepted. What we did do, Mr. Chairman, is agree to commence the discussions, to participate in those discussions. I believe that Premier Bourassa received a message from many of the Premiers that although we're prepared to discuss the points that have been raised by Quebec, and also by representatives of the Quebec Government insofar as their visits to the different provincial capitals, that there are reservations in respect to those proposals as they now stand. But we at the same time do recognize the importance of attempting to ensure, to the good of Canada as a whole, that we try to find some accommodation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder where we would find it, because I understand that he used to be under the Native Affairs Secretariat - I wonder where we would find Terry Sargeant. He's not listed in this.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Sargeant is Director of Research and Planning, Department of Northern Affairs.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Margery Beer, she used to be assigned, I believe, to the Executive Council, as well.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Communication Officer, the Minister of Finance - Director of Communications.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Again, I thought this person was in Executive Council, Virginia Devine.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** No, she is with the Department of Health and her precise position is - she is in our Estimates, presently seconded, however, to the Department of Health. She is participating in the preparation of the Health reform package that the Minister has made reference to.

**MR. G. FILMON:** So, the Premier says she is in his Estimates but seconded. Is her position still that of Executive Council employee?

Tuesday, 9 September, 1986

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Yes, she is seconded to the Minister of Health.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** And paid for over there?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** We will be billing the Minister of Health insofar as the costs of Ginny Devine.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What is the role and responsibility then of Roger Turenne?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Roger Turenne is the Secretary of the French Language Service Secretariat.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Sorry?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Director of the French Language.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Yes, okay. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if perhaps we can get down to that and pass (c) and go through (d) and I'll ask my questions under the French Language Services Secretariat if that's the appropriate place.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(c)(1) Federal-Provincial Relations Secretariat: Salaries—pass; 1.(c)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 1.(d) Government Hospitality—pass; 1.(e) International Development Program—pass; 1.(f) French Language Services Secretariat: Salaries; 1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures - the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if now the Premier can indicate what the responsibilities in that role of Director of the French Language Services Secretariat, what the responsibilities of Mr. Turenne are.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Responsibilities includes recommending policy; coordinating policy in respect to the implementation of French Language Services; providing service to the Advisory Committee on French Language Services; maintain liaison with the Franco-Manitoban community; and maintaining liaison with governments both at the national, international level on French language matters. His responsibilities have, I believe I can say safely to the Leader of the Opposition, maintained in a constant way over, I believe, since the commencement in the French Language Secretariat.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What additional French language services have been implemented during the past year in Manitoba?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The activities have been during the past year, to identify those areas in which there is a lack of French language service in which a need ought to be provided, and in the process to identify those civil servants within the provincial public service that could be providing that service. That process of identification of civil servants and identifying the needs has been taking place.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Has it been completed?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** It hasn't been completed, it's near completion.

**MR. G. FILMON:** At this point in time are there any additional services that are contemplated being offered by the government to fulfill needs that have been identified?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The areas that we would like to improve are deficiencies in service in those areas where there is a significant French language population, where there's services not now being provided in the French language in those areas that do have a significant Francophone population.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Can the Premier indicate which ones?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The areas where there is particular concern that we provide this service would be in the areas of Community Services and Health, in Francophone areas in the province, areas of recreational services, the services to people in those areas that could be accommodated by the reorganization of government services.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Can the Premier indicate which areas of Francophone population have been identified as areas that there should now be developed?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** They would be the same areas as specified in the 1982 policy, St. Boniface, the Francophone areas along the Red River particularly.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Along the Red River?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Yes. St. Malo, St. Pierre, Ste. Anne.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I note that these are administrative costs, or at least I assume they are. I wonder where the costs of translation would be placed in the Estimates.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** They're in two departments, Attorney-General and the Ministry of Culture.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I wonder if the Premier could indicate how much has been budgeted this year for the translation.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I believe that could be identified in the Estimates and I think the honourable member can identify those areas. If not, I can get the information.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I noted from a news report that the most current estimate of the total cost of the translation departments, according to an article yesterday, was \$10 million. Am I correct about that?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** That was an estimate that the Attorney-General has given, yes.

**MR. G. FILMON:** What is the Premier expecting in the way of support from Ottawa? Is there any indication of whether or not there'll be any federal support for those costs, the \$10 million figure?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** We received support last year in the area of \$400,000, and we anticipate a similar amount

**Tuesday, 9 September, 1986**

---

this year, and the support for other aspects of the plan is being discussed with the Federal Government at the present time.

**MR. G. FILMON:** That's \$400,000 out of how much expended on the translation?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** According to the information that I have, it would be out of a total of \$1.2 million.

**MR. G. FILMON:** The federal share has been approximately a third, and is that anticipated to continue?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Yes, it has been one-third up to this point. We are hopeful of increasing that share beyond the one-third level.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** During the past winter Mr. Turenne attended a conference with representatives of the Federal Government in Europe, I believe in France. Could the Minister indicate whether the Federal Government paid for that trip by Mr. Turenne, and whether the province's only cost then was his salary?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Yes it is my understanding the Federal Government paid for the costs of travel, the costs of accommodation at that conference.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Was that participation by Mr. Turenne approved by the Premier's Office?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Yes, the participation of Mr. Turenne was approved by my office, myself personally.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Could the Premier indicate the results of that trip or what information or recommendations were gleaned from that trip?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I think, Mr. Chairman, I would prefer if we could take that question as notice and get back to the member with that information.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Brandon West.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I believe the First Minister made an addition or a deletion to this list. If that's so, I think I missed it earlier.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The addition identified those members that served in the Federal-Provincial Secretariat and listed those four members that work in the Federal-Provincial Secretariat, and they're included in that list. Mr. Jim Eldridge, Mr. Vogt and the two secretaries.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** If a list like this were to have been prepared five years ago, how many peoples' names would be on that list?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I would have to obtain that information for the honourable member.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** I assume from the First Minister's response that he's undertaking to do that. I would ask

him when he's preparing that information for me if he could give me, not the names but the numbers of people on such a list in each of the last five years so that we can get a grasp on just how slowly or quickly the staff in this department has been growing.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** We have provided that information, each of the last four years, to members of the committee, but I think we can get the actual numbers and get back to you tomorrow.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No more questions?

1.(f)(1) French Language Services Secretariat: Salaries—pass; 1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

1.(g)(1) Native Affairs Secretariat: Minister Without Portfolio's Salary; 1.(g)(2) Salaries; 1.(g)(3) Other Expenditures - the Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few comments on this portion of the Executive Council. I do so because of the fact that I've been looking all through the Estimates for some of the activities that may have been carried on by the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, Minister Without Portfolio, and I guess, Mr. Chairman, one has to really look at the overall job description or what the objective of the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Native Affairs is, because anytime that I've heard the Minister of Native Affairs comment or respond to any particular issue, he immediately turns and makes a comment that it's a federal responsibility or the Federal Government are doing this, or they aren't do that in this regard.

I really wonder, Mr. Chairman, the taxpayers of Manitoba are being asked to put forward an additional amount of money for this particular individual and I really would have to ask the Minister what his basic work activity is. I would ask, either of the Minister or the First Minister, why wouldn't it have been possible to reduce the number of Ministers and the cost of an extra ministerial staff and support staff if he had not have used the particular individual as Minister of Northern Affairs, or Minister responsible for some other line department, rather than saying that he had this Minister responsible for Native Affairs. I, quite honestly, Mr. Chairman, don't know what the Minister's responsibilities are.

The taxpayers are being asked to fund his salary, fund his additional expenses. I have not heard him make one policy statement relating to the hiring practices of the Natives in the North and the way in which this government, I would say, have short-changed his people in the North. They've made a major policy change; the land claims settlements, the lack of payment. In fact, it's an issue in the news this last day or two that there's a slowness by . . . and again, they made reference to the Federal Government, but it's my understanding there's a major responsibility of the province to pay a portion of the land claims due to hydro flooding.

Mr. Chairman, the whole issue that recently caused so much problem in the Native community, the hiring of Mr. Girman, a non-Native, to a position within the Department of Native Affairs, where in fact it is my understanding through discussions with certain individuals, that the Native individuals who should have

been hired did not even have a fair opportunity, did not have the opportunity of a fair hearing, that it was cut and dried, that this individual would have the job automatically?

I ask the Minister, what does he do? I mean, what is his purpose in Cabinet? Is he there as an individual to say that the Premier can say to the Native people, yes, I've treated you people well and you have a representative?

Another question that I have of the Minister responsible and the First Minister is; they refer to self-government of the Native people. I would like in the future to have the Minister of Native Affairs, whose drawing an extra salary from the taxpayers, to lay out what they really mean by self-governing policy. I think - and I commend the Member for Rupertsland who has run to become part of the parliamentary system to influence what is happening within government. Is that not satisfactory enough? Does he not get the ear of the Premier? Does he not get the ear of his Cabinet colleagues? Why is he and why does the government continue to press for self-government and what is it? What does it mean, self-government within the system that we have?

I think it would be helpful to the rest of Manitobans and the rest of Canadians to truly give us a clear definition of what they mean by self-government. I would think, if he was being treated fairly within the New Democratic Party and within the Cabinet in which he sits, that he should be able to accomplish those things that they were after, through the self-government pressure that they're applying. Those are all questions that I would hope the Minister would be able to respond to.

Mr. Chairman, as well, and I would like the Minister to explain, how many support staff has he? It's my understanding that he has a special assistant and an executive assistant. Does he have all the normal support staff of a Ministerial office? The air travel, back and forth to his constituency, automobile, the whole support to that office?

Mr. Chairman, it's important to know these things because we've just had recently the debate from the First Minister saying that it's important that the Speaker have an executive assistant. Well we have a Minister Without Portfolio who is supposed to be looking after a constituency which I would understand and he's not tied to the Legislative Assembly. I would be hard-pressed to understand why he would need two assistants. I would think that one assistant would be sufficient, and he and the assistant could look after the constituency matters.

You know, there's a whole area of questions that I think in voting the appropriation which we're being asked to vote, that we would like some answers. I know I've had certain discussions with the Minister and I know that he puts in reasonable office hours in the daytime, but I would like to know what really his mandate is as a Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Native Affairs, particularly whatever response that I've ever gotten from him or have ever heard from him that it's a federal responsibility; that the Federal Government aren't doing this or the Federal Government aren't doing that; I would like to know what he is doing within his jurisdiction - of which I'm sure is pretty restricted and limited - what meaningful

purpose, what meaningful job does he have to do? I would ask the Minister to respond to some of the questions that I have put on the record.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Native Affairs.

**HON. E. HARPER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, let me say I'm very pleased and honoured to be here to take part in the Estimates and also I'm very honoured to be the first Treaty Indian in the history of Manitoba to become a Minister of the Crown. I take this position with great respect, honour and pride.

The Member for Arthur, the Native Affairs Critic, has just rambled on the terms of what the Native issues are, what we intend to do as a government. It is very hard to unravel a history for hundreds of years and for me to put into context of the injustice and the lack of services, the lack of implementing the treaties that were made to my people, and the lack of priorities within governments, it's very difficult for me to say what the immediate solutions might be.

I think this New Democratic Government, as a government that has a political will, a political courage to support the aspirations of Native people, and those aspirations of the Native people are able to determine their destiny. I might quote, not directly quote, but I refer him to a report that was done by the Parliamentary Committee in the House of Commons, supported by the Conservative Party, Liberal Party, and the New Democratic Party in which it explains the wampum belt.

It says with two vessels that go down the river and each one has their own jurisdiction and no vessel would interfere with another vessel and that's the kind of cooperation or sharing or the type of relationship that the Native people expect, or expected. But somehow one vessel has gone ahead, at the same time when Native people weren't even given an opportunity to vote. At that time one vessel created legislation, created human bondage, and made legislation which we call The Indian Act, which in a sense shackled the Indian people of Canada.

Sometimes I get emotional when I talk about Native issues and I go back in my childhood days and talk about what exists beyond the environment that I lived. I didn't know parliament existed. I didn't know even schools existed, other institutions, and that is why I'm very proud and humble that I am able to be here and able to be part of this government and able to carry on the aspirations of Native people. We may have a different philosophical approach to life, but that's the decision of my people, that's the direction that they want to take.

I have with my colleagues made some changes, made some initiatives in respect to delivery of services to Northern people, Indian people, in respect to the services that they are to be provided for.

The Indian people, Native people are the poorest in this country and to this day, I wonder why, because they are a minority or are they misled or people who represented them lacked sensitivity to them or whether they were merely used for political expediency. Those are some of the things that come to mind, but yet in this country we don't receive the fair resources, yet I often say, the most well off people in this country should

## Tuesday, 9 September, 1986

be the aboriginal people, the first citizens of this country, the people that received other people from across the ocean.

Today I am standing before the Legislature, before the Opposition and hopefully the people of Manitoba will adhere and hear the aboriginal people of Manitoba, the things that they lack. We have demonstrations in streets here because of the treatment, the lack of insensitivity of governments. The Provincial Government has certain responsibilities too. The Premier has the political courage and his government are able to institute some of the programs and some policy directions that will benefit the Native people of Manitoba. It is very difficult for me to put into a program that's going to wipe out and hopefully take away some of the things that have been built up for so many years, but we will try our best. We will initiate the concerns and the needs of the aboriginal people of Manitoba.

In terms of the Native Affairs Secretariat, I believe I have seven staff people. I have a senior advisor; I have a secretary; an executive and special assistant; and then we have a director of Native Affairs; a policy analyst and secretary to The Native Affairs Secretariat Act.

In terms of initiatives that I have done as a Minister, I have been involved in terms of developing some policy in respect to Limestone, the training, in terms of the Treeline Entitlement Area; Northern Flood, to a certain extent in terms of advising with my colleagues and the positions that are taken.

Also, in terms of trying to develop some policy in respect to the overall jurisdiction plus federal and provincial jurisdiction and that's a challenging task because what seems to be happening is the Federal Government is off-loading some services and cutting back on some programs which is going to directly affect the Province of Manitoba. I am watching in terms of the services and the programs that they are cutting because the Federal Government has statutory obligations; they have treaty obligations which they should be responsible for and those are areas that we're going to be further developing as we proceed in the development of The Native Affairs Secretariat Act.

Thank you very much.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for some of the information which I asked for. I guess first of all, Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat taken back by the number of staff and executive assistants and special assistants that the Minister has. I would think that he would, in the next while, be able to provide for us - if not tonight in the near future - some of the policy papers and some of the developments in which he has talked about.

I do have to say, Mr. Chairman, I find that the Minister of Native Affairs must be somewhat frustrated and I can appreciate what he's saying, the whole problem, the unravelling of what is perceived to be the injustices done to his people and the fact that he is very proud, I think is a credit to him as an individual.

But, Mr. Chairman, I guess the concern that I have, I was once young in Manitoba too and I didn't know that this great Legislative Assembly stood where it

stands and that the whole process, that part of our upbringing and our developing as a Manitoban and as a Canadian and this whole process is part of our development. Really I don't perceive myself as being different than the individual who just spoke, the Member for Rupertsland, that I am a Canadian, that he is a Canadian; that I am a Manitoban and when growing up nobody came and said that there is a tremendous difference. We know that I think that some of our policies, the policies of our country that were developed prior to us being involved have been misdirected.

But what I'm asking of the Minister, and he makes special reference to The Indian Act under the Federal Government, that in fact how do we start to change those things that he says are wrong, and that's who I look for as a Cabinet Minister, who has given the kind of monies he has to start laying some policy papers on the table, to start telling us that, yes, we probably, as a nation, have an apartheid policy that is probably as bad as some other countries that we criticize.

You know, I am extremely concerned that we are - the Premier is an individual who is quite prepared to stand and lambaste and strike out at international affairs when it comes to apartheid and he's got a Minister sitting in his own Cabinet, Mr. Chairman, who appears to be crying out and is not heard by that same Premier. It's not politically advantageous for the First Minister to do so. (Interjection)- no, I'm very serious about this.

I cannot understand how the Premier of the province can sit and be such a great saviour of international countries, of countries outside of his jurisdiction, great tremendous recommendations, yet it comes within his own jurisdiction. His own Cabinet Minister who he has appointed as the first Treaty Indian in the Cabinet of this province is crying out, Mr. Chairman, for some support, for some direction, for some help, and he's not getting it, not getting the support to try to help him undo some of the injustice.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Minister in his capacity with seven staff would start to do the kind of thing that would be expected of him by the rest of Manitobans. To say here are some of the things that I feel are wrong, here are some of the ways that I think can be corrected. Here are some of the paths that I think we should take to correct some of the wrongs that he has perceived have been done. I don't truly understand, Mr. Chairman, some of the things that he is saying, why he hasn't been able to get more of a response from his first Minister, particularly when his First Minister is such a hero, such a hero for everybody in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that he has a Minister of Native Affairs who just in his last comments has told us he's proud to be in the Legislature, to have the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Native people. I would hope that the First Minister of this province would listen to his Minister of Native Affairs, where those areas of jurisdiction fall within the provincial responsibility and I'm sure there are very few - I'm sure there are very few. (Interjection)- The Minister of the Environment makes a snide remark from his seat that we don't want to give him staff. Mr. Chairman, I did not for one minute say that I didn't want to give him staff. What I was asking him to do and asking him what he is doing with the staff that he has. That's the question. I did not say that I did not want the Minister to have

## Tuesday, 9 September, 1986

staff. What I did say, Mr. Chairman, is I want them to be fully utilized -(Interjection)- Yes, yes, because I have not seen anything come from the Minister of Native Affairs. I have not seen one policy document come from the Minister of Native Affairs. I have not seen one policy document come from his department or one piece of direction come from his department. So we have to ask the questions, Mr. Chairman.

He has seven staff, what I'm suggesting is that he put them to work, he put them to work to lay out for the people of Manitoba what it is that he and his people want. I make reference again to self-government. Let's hear it. Let's fully explain what it is.

The land claims issue - I don't think he's done a very good job from what I'm hearing in the public in the last couple of days. Manitoba Hydro set aside \$30 million for land settlements, for the land claim settlements. The Nielsen Report says they are owed something like \$350 to \$400 million. There are seven band offices, I understand, to be closed today in the north, because they say the Federal Government hasn't paid them any money. Well is there not a provincial responsibility to pay some of the land settlement claims from Hydro? Yes, there is, Mr. Chairman. You bet there is.

Mr. Chairman, I would believe that this Minister should be prepared to stand up and say that, yes, he is working towards the land settlement claims and that there is a provincial responsibility and here's the Cabinet document which he's going to Cabinet with to satisfy the Native people which he represents and it will take X number of dollars to do that.

But we have heard nothing, Mr. Chairman, that's the criticism of the Minister. He is given that golden opportunity, he is given the golden opportunity, he is given staff, he's asking for support for those staff. He is given the golden opportunity to do those things that we would expect to come from him. He has had this whole Session, Mr. Chairman. I have to say that he hasn't been pressed too hard - mind you the Premier and his government have been in such a mess in all other areas of government. But, Mr. Chairman, what I am asking the Minister is to sincerely, on behalf of the Native people, in his responsibility, to lay some policy positions out, to tell the rest of society what he feels is the proper way to go. Don't just stand up and fall into the same trap as his colleagues, that it's a federal-bashing position that he has within the Cabinet and that as long as he continues to do that, he'll stay in favour with his Premier and his colleagues.

Let's be constructive, that's what I'm trying to be here in my comments tonight. I am trying to be constructive. I am actually saying to the Minister of Native Affairs, you have got the opportunity. I'm saying to the Premier, I would have thought you could have expanded your abilities by having Northern Affairs as your Ministry as well as Native Affairs, rather than what it appears to me. I say this not as a criticism of the Minister, but as a criticism of the Premier, that it is tokenism, that it is tokenism to the Native people that he gives the Minister without portfolio and nothing more. So it's not a criticism again of the Minister, it's a criticism of the Premier, that he, Mr. Chairman, is playing a tokenism game with the Native people and that bothers me to no end. It bothers me to no end, because I think the Minister who has been given that responsibility has

a greater ability, has more to contribute, and I say Northern Affairs, or other affairs, Mr. Chairman. There are other responsibilities which he could have been given which would blend in with his responsibilities.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, you have to excel, to the Minister, you have to lay some policy positions. The people of Manitoba, I'm sure, would be more than happy to pay the kind of money that you're going to spend, but we want to see results. I want to see results.

I've asked some specific questions, self-government. I don't ask for the answers to be given tonight, because I know we have a limited amount of time, but I would like some responses on what the Minister feels self-government is. I would like to know whether he's satisfied that his government are moving on the land claims and the settlements because of the Hydro. I have to say, we have something in common. This government have not treated the people who own the farm land, where they are mining the oil from underneath in southwest Manitoba as fairly as they should. So I have something in common with the Native people who have had their land used to put water on to produce Hydro for the benefits of all Manitoba. The farmers and the people who I represent in the southwest feel the same way, that they've been unfairly treated by this provincial government. We're not a mile apart in the way in which we have been treated by this kind of government.

So I'm saying he has a responsibility. I, Mr. Chairman, for some reason disagree with the Minister. I take exception to one comment that he made and that he and his people are the poorest people in our society. I think they are rich in heritage. I think they are Canadian. They have to be proud of that, as I'm proud to be a Canadian. I think we've got a golden opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to do the kinds of things that new legislators, not continually saying, pointing out all the wrongs in the past - and, yes, there were wrongs. In fact, I point out that I think probably we have, and still do, continue to support and are supporting an apartheid policy of our own under The Canada Indian Act, where we continue with the reserve system of having the Native people live on reserves. If it isn't, tell me that it isn't. Let's get on with the resolving of it. Let's use those seven staff. Let's use the Minister's salary. Let's expand his responsibility so that he can, in fact, have a greater influence.

Don't use him, Mr. Premier, and I say this through you, Mr. Chairman, as a tokenism to the Native people. I'm afraid that's what's happened. I'm sure the Minister realizes that, and I don't have to elaborate any longer.

The hiring practices, I'm not so sure that the Native people are being treated as fairly as what this First Minister lets on they are in the North when you see the reports of all outside Manitobans coming in to do the work. I'm sure there are some Native people who have had training programs. Yes, I'm sure there are.

Are they fully involved in the tourism? Are they fully involved in the full potential of the area in which they live to develop? I don't think so, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Native Affairs, I would hope, would speak up with a lot louder voice.

There's one thing he did not comment on, and I don't expect the answer tonight, but I would hope that he is prepared to say that there was not a Native - be prepared to table before us the hiring of Mr. Girman,

who was hired ahead of any Native people. As I understand, there were more than enough qualified Native people who didn't even get a fair opportunity for that job. They were disregarded before they were ever assessed for the job in which this man was hired.

So again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that he speak up loud and clear. I would ask him to table the names of those people who applied and the qualifications of those people who applied for the job which Mr. Girman has. Some of the answers, I would hope he could give now, but, Mr. Chairman, what he can't provide, possibly in a week or two he could provide some of the policy papers which he has developed or will be developing to better the way of life in the area in which he is responsible under Native Affairs.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Native Affairs.

**HON. E. HARPER:** I'd like to maybe make a few remarks in response to the long-winded speech that he just gave.

First of all, let me say that in terms of Mr. Girman's appointment, he was one of the candidates who applied for the position of Senior Native Adviser. We received several applications. I don't know off-hand right now how many applications. We had, I believe, about 30 applications, and 11 were interviewed. I believe, out of the 11, there were four who were recommended to us. Out of that four, we didn't have any Treaty people, or I believe we had one Native person that qualified.

In terms of the appointment of Mr. Girman, it is a decision that I made and also together with the Premier. I believe that the decision that I made is a good one, and also that I can defend Mr. Girman's appointment. I don't regret that we had appointed him, and he's a very capable person, someone who I would rely on in terms of working with the bureaucracy and with the technical people in various bands and tribal councils and Native organizations.

I believe mostly in terms of political discussions, I think those are issues that I will be dealing directly with the Native politicians myself. I haven't received many complaints from the Native people. I did receive one letter, and I have spoken to various chiefs on the appointment of Mr. Girman. They haven't said anything negative to me at all in terms of the appointment of Mr. Girman. As a matter of fact, there was a letter that was sent complimenting Mr. Girman's appointment and his ability to deal with some of the issues that he's dealt with, especially in the area of child welfare.

I guess, in terms of being Minister of Native Affairs, we've undertaken some policy directions and also in respect to the constitutional conference developing the issue of self-government. This is an ongoing discussion between the Native organizations, the aboriginal people, which includes the Inuit, the Metis, the Status Indians and, at the same time, includes 10 provinces, plus two territorial governments and, I believe, four aboriginal organizations plus the Federal Government. So in total, you have 17 different parties sitting around a table trying to define what self-government should mean. That's very difficult to come to an agreement, but I must tell the Honourable Member for Arthur that the

position that the Native people took in terms of self-government is one that would give them total self-government.

The Manitoba Government has been in the forefront of supporting the aboriginal and Treaty rights including self-government. Self-government is the ability and also able to control your own destiny. At the same time, we have to develop, in terms of trying to get control in terms of the delivery of services with adequate resources, able to deliver some services. At the same time, Indian Affairs is supposed to be responsible for directly on reserves, which is lacking, I guess, response.

As a matter of fact, I wrote to the Minister of Indian Affairs on June 7. I haven't had a response. I understand there was a letter written on May 24 in respect to the Northern Flood, no response. I also wrote another letter on July 7, no response. Then the Minister of Northern Affairs wrote to the Minister around August, urging them to meet on a Treaty land entitlement, no response. The Premier has written a letter too, and hasn't had any response. So, I don't know where we go from here, because we don't seem to be getting any response from the Federal Government. I even personally tried to reach the Minister of Indian Affairs, and I didn't get any return of the call that I made.

But in terms of developing the whole Native Affairs Secretariat and the programs and the policy direction, those are some of the things that we're going to be addressing, especially in the area of offloading of the Federal Government, because if we invest in the delivery and also in terms of Native policy, Native programs, I believe in the long run that the Province of Manitoba would be spending less money if the Federal Government was living up to its responsibilities. Those are areas that we're going to be looking into.

In terms of the staff that I have, I have maybe five people who are Native out of seven. So, I do have Native people working with me and then, at the same time, certainly I work closely with Native organizations, so there I don't get lack of advice.

I don't know whether I responded to everything but since he's long-winded I didn't really take down everything but hopefully through his comments, my critic from Arthur would be able to provide me with some constructive advice and I look forward to him asking some questions in the House. At some time in the future, I'll be able to maybe give him more definite answers to specific issues and I look forward to working on some of the issues with him.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's the first time that I've entered into the discussion of Executive Council so, first of all, I'd like to make a few remarks to the speeches given by both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition at the opening of these discussions today.

I think that both of them presume a little to think that either one of them were the real victors in the election on March 18 when, in fact, we increased our seats by 100 percent and our popular vote by 150 percent. If we, however, go into the -(Interjection)- Well, a million percent increase then, or infinity.

If, however, we could get to the Native Affairs Secretariat, I think that everyone in this House, Mr.

Chairman, is delighted to have a member of the aboriginal community as a member of the Cabinet. However, it is not enough that that individual be a member of the Cabinet, if in fact we see no efforts made positively to improve the way in which the Native population of the Province of Manitoba lives, works, receives its health care, and improves its educational qualifications. That's the essence to what a representative of that community, sitting on the Cabinet table, must represent.

So I'd like to ask the Minister responsible for Native Affairs some very specific questions about issues which are not federal in nature, but are Manitoba in nature, as to what his department intends to do to change that in the future.

Let's begin with the field of education. There are two appropriations in the Education Budget which specifically deal with education for Native people. One is Native Education, which this year received a \$6,100 increase, which was less than 1 percent, when the overall appropriations for that department were some 6.9 percent.

In addition, the PACE grant for Native language training went up by zero percent. Now I'd like to know what kind of representations will be made in the future by this Minister to ensure that Native education programs receive proper amounts of money in the future.

**HON. E. HARPER:** I could follow up and maybe give the information tomorrow on that specific question.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know what the Minister and his particular department intend to do about settling the Northern Flood claims, when it is my understanding that the lawyer representing the Northern Native Bands cannot, in fact, arrange meetings with Cabinet members?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this a bit because we've had people on the other side of the House trying to leave the impression, in a general way, that the province has been very remiss and very much behind other provinces in the country with respect to Native development. That's as far from the truth as people in this House have ever been.

**A MEMBER:** I don't think we've ever said that.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Yes, you have. I've been listening to some of the comments by the member who is the critic, saying that we aren't doing anything with respect to Native development. We heard the whole speech, saying when are you going to get up and stand up for Native people. I'm getting up to speak in part about this because a lot of people have been speaking from a position of ignorance. Now sometimes ignorance can be convenient, but it's not true.-(Interjection)- Exactly, exactly, I'm looking at one right now.

Historically, very little was done in this province, going back to 1969. That changed and the people of aboriginal ancestry recognized that. That's why consistently

they've been supporting the New Democrats. They've seen programs like the BUNTEP Program. I'll admit the Conservative Government, when they were in government, continued those programs. I'm glad they did. Some of them were cut back because a lot of the programs in Northern Affairs were completely demolished and what happened, when that happened, is you had people lose faith.

They thought that a program that requires a lot of patience and perseverance to be carried out would be subject to the whims of a government that didn't care that much, and they voted in 1981 very clearly, in terms of what their preferences were, and they voted in 1985.

Let's come now to the whole question of the Northern Flood Agreement. In 1977, or early 1978, the Northern Flood Agreement was signed by the Conservative Government and for three years they did nothing. When we came into office in 1981, the big complaint from the Native community was the Lyon Government has refused to deal with this matter completely. There was a tremendous backlog of claims to deal with.

The Member for Rupertsland was very involved in arguing that we should try and change that, that we should deal with a lot of the claims. Frankly, about 95 percent of the claims have indeed been dealt with and there are some major outstanding claims.-(Interjection)- No, they're large. There's a difference in calculation as to what the dollar amount of some of those claims are. We had talked in terms of \$20 million to \$30 million as a settlement. There were a number of Indian communities that looked very seriously at that and were considering it. Their concern was that they didn't want to, in a sense, sign off forever and we had argued that in the \$20 million to \$30 million that has been put forward, we had built in a cushion and that's why we said, look, if you say that you won't sign off forever, then the settlement amount will probably be lower than \$20 million to \$30 million because we had built into the settlement amount a cushion to take into account any uncertainty in the future.

I can appreciate the Member for Arthur not wanting to learn any of the facts because that would confuse him. He's confused as it is, but at the same time, I'm trying to give the Member for River Heights the context in terms of answering the questions she raised about things that had taken place in the past with respect to the Northern Flood Agreement.

In the last while, two things have happened. One, you've had the federal Nielsen Report which, in my estimation, is a terribly superficial piece of work, that doesn't do any calculations at all and leaves some numbers of a fairly large magnitude out there hanging as a set of false expectations, in my estimation. We've asked the Federal Government to quantify and to substantiate those numbers. They have not done so. We have said that we're prepared to sit down and work towards a settlement of that.

The second thing that has happened is that the Northern Flood Agreement has hired obviously a high-profile lawyer, Jean Chretien. Jean would like to come in and nicely and quickly settle this. That's his style: well, let's all get together and we can just sort this out very quickly and easily. And we keep saying that there's a lot of homework that has to be done and we think the homework should be done.

People have in fact been meeting with him and people have in fact been meeting with some of the people who are working on part of his team. In fact, I think there were meetings as recently as two weeks ago on that. But it is difficult when you have some wildly exaggerated, unsubstantiated numbers hanging out there creating some sense of false expectations.

The other thing that the Nielsen Report did, which I think was one piece of precise, or a bit more precise calculation, was that they did an analysis on what's happened to date, and they have found that the Federal Government has in fact used the Northern Flood Agreement as an excuse for not doing things that are within its own jurisdiction on Indian reserves. I don't think that claim can be made against this Provincial Government. We have done a number of things way beyond what we were doing before as part of our responsibility and part of our obligation.

One sometimes gets into debates as to whether in fact one should not only do those particular things but do something extra and special beyond that for the Northern Flood Agreement as opposed to other communities. So I think that one can have some legitimate differences of opinion or debate there, but the government has been completely and totally committed to the notion of negotiating. We put offers on the table; those offers were considered and rejected, which is part of a negotiating process. We have asked for counter offers, and we haven't quite received counter offers at this stage, but I can assure the member that process is continuing, it's taking place right now, there's been no foot-dragging on our part.

In fact, the Nielsen Report made a comment that maybe the Federal Government should be following the Manitoba Government's example in terms of dealing with this particular problem of trying to put forward some general numbers to try and deal with this. They also pointed out that the Federal Government had not kept up with its obligations on certain reserves. That has been a function primarily of the Minister of Northern Affairs and a function of Manitoba Hydro, which is why I'm speaking on this particular matter.

We have received counsel throughout from the Member for Rupertsland, when he was the Member for Rupertsland, and we've received counsel as well from the member in his capacity, dealing with the whole question of aboriginal land rights and other matters relating to constitutional matters, because we have not wanted to interfere with that whole process of constitutional discussions with respect to aboriginal rights.

I think what we find, not from the Member for River Heights, but we found it occasionally from Members of the Conservative Opposition, is that they, in my estimation, feign an interest in aboriginal issues to try and embarrass the Member for Rupertsland. He's handled them very easily because their motives are quite transparent when that happens because they've usually been phrased in that respect: aren't you embarrassed, Member for Rupertsland, by what the government isn't doing? Now, don't talk about the Federal Government, just talk about the Provincial Government. Over and over that's said. Each time the Member for Rupertsland gets up and completely demolishes that because that's so transparent.

In fact, we welcome, on the one hand, some added interest by the Conservative Caucus in the whole

question of aboriginal issues, but sometimes some of us feel sorry for the Member for Arthur when he gets clobbered over and over again by the Member for Rupertsland, and I can see why, licking his wounds, he occasionally goes back and tries to become the critic for Agriculture because of that.

But I think it is quite unfair to use this type of a sensitive issue in that way and he's in fact done it.-(Interjection)- I certainly do. You notice the Member for Arthur right now, when we are debating the substance of the issue, crawls into the hole where he came out of. I'm dealing with that, I'm not talking -(Interjection)- That's right. And now what we have is we have an onion skin in our midst who can't again deal with the substance of the issue. I'm quite happy in dealing with it.

So I hope that we have dealt with the question raised by the Member for River Heights. She's asked a very serious question. I think this government has been quite consistent trying to pursue the settlement of the Northern Flood Agreement, knowing full well that it's a rather unique agreement and knowing full well that it's a complex one and one where there is genuine uncertainty on the part of certain parties which might make them a bit cautious. That's understandable, but at the same time when you're cautious because of uncertainty, you, I don't think, have quite as much legitimacy in criticizing another group for foot-dragging.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Well, I thank the Minister of Energy for a very long and detailed answer, but I think that what he has done has simply highlighted the problem that I have with this entire line of the Estimates process.

If we cannot use the Minister responsible for Native Affairs as a catalyst, as someone who can in fact stir up the ministries responsible for a variety of issues, but which impact, most importantly, upon the Native people of this province, then what is his function at all?

And so I would go back to the Minister responsible for Native Affairs and I would ask that Minister what specifically is his department doing to speed up the settlement of these claims.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Native Affairs.

**HON. E. HARPER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have spoken with various chiefs and also I have communicated by correspondence to the chiefs in terms of the Northern Flood issue, and I have also provided rights to the Minister responsible of Hydro and also the Minister responsible for the Northern Flood Agreement.

As a matter of fact, the Minister has responded positively to the issue of getting on with resolving the issues in the Northern Flood, and the bands have responded favourably. As a matter of fact, there have been various meetings taking place not necessarily at the political level, but at the staff level to start developing negotiations. So in terms of the Northern Flood issues, it hasn't been just sitting there idle, but there are certain

## Tuesday, 9 September, 1986

things that we are proceeding to do. Certainly, we, as a Native Affairs Secretariat, are providing advice to the Ministers concerned and we work as a team.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you. To move into another area, and that being affirmative action, let me congratulate the Minister responsible for Native Affairs if in fact five of his seven staff people are treaty or non-status Indians, then obviously he is practising affirmative action in his own portfolio.

What types of things does he see his particular portfolio doing in order to encourage that same kind of affirmative action in other departments of government?

**HON. E. HARPER:** Certainly, that's one of the areas that we are concerned about as, I guess, a department or a secretariat of Native Affairs. We would like to see more Native people be involved in government positions, and not only that but in other areas in Crown corporations so that Native people would be there to contribute to their own development and also certainly provide service to the Native community.

One of the areas might be the telephone system where we'll require some service in terms of -(Interjection)- no, they're concerned about a telephone system in terms of the old people getting on the telephone who maybe couldn't speak to a person, a telephone operator who can't understand Cree, so we may have to have people there, maybe employed or trained, to become telephone operators in Northern Manitoba so that they can provide the service to all the communities that have access to the service.

So we are very concerned and also hopefully able to accommodate many of the Native people and also encourage my colleagues to implement the affirmative action that we have as a government.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Finally, one last issue, Mr. Chairman; although there are many more, it's getting very late. That is the whole hiring policies with regard to Limestone.

The preferential clause was dropped because they had in fact reached their target level, but they had reached that at a very low period of employment on the Limestone project. It is my understanding that it is now at 22 percent as opposed to the height of 35 percent and that was by end of July.

I'm wondering if his department, not the other departments, but his specific department will be in fact preparing a paper, a study, to see the impact of what occurred when the prefential clause was dropped in order to encourage the project to in fact not drop that in the future, particularly at a time when it would impact most upon the Native community of the North.

**HON. E. HARPER:** I can advise the honourable member that since we have implemented the agreement, we have had more Native people working on our projects compared to the other projects that have taken place like the Jenpeg, Long Spruce, Kelsey generation projects; but I believe the clause is back on, I believe, but I'll have to check that out.

But under the collective agreement, there are certain provisions in terms of job categories in which certain

targets are to be met. The agreement provides that every four months the preference clause is reviewed and if they have met those targets, then they would not be dropped off but suspended for the time being until another review has taken place, and at that time I think - that's what my honourable friend was mentioning - I believe another assessment was taken this month and I believe five of the eleven categories are back on. So they are not as the members have said that they're off now.

I may say that in terms of the Limestone project, we have had many of the Native people, probably 900 who have been trained in respect to the Limestone projects, that have been taking pipefitting, heavy truck drivers and the journeymen and certain trades, but part of the problem has been, I guess, the referral process which is the responsibility of CIAC. We were having some problems in terms of job referrals. The Limestone Training Agency doesn't directly refer to the people on site, but it has to be done through the Federal Government CIAC Department which they have the mandate for.

I believe we are doing an excellent job, but we need to assess that, let's see how over the period of the life of the project will become because I believe that over the long run we will see that Native people have been employed at the same time, not only in employment training but in business areas.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Mr. Chairman, let there be no confusion as to what the situation is. There is no question that there are more Native people hired on this project than ever before in the history of this province and the government is to be congratulated for that; but when the Native preference clause went off, the percentage of Natives employed went down, and I want some assurance that some studies will be done by your department, Mr. Minister, in order to make sure that does not occur in the future and that we keep up the high level and you continue to be congratulated for the high employment rate of Native people.

**HON. E. HARPER:** I believe we have a detailed evaluation that will be done, so I think that will indicate the positive results of the action by this government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(g)(1) - the Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was rather interested in some of the comments that were made regarding Cross Lake and the regulation of the lake over there. If I remember correctly, we had spent considerable monies in Cross Lake building the new arena for them. If my memory serves me correctly, we spent some \$4 million on building a complex for them. If memory serves me correctly, we're spending some \$4 million compensating the community in loss of fishing benefits that they used to have, the claims that they put against Manitoba Hydro.

I wonder: can the Minister tell me what is it really that Cross Lake is looking for, as far as compensation is concerned?

**HON. E. HARPER:** I guess, in terms of compensation, we provided the arena to Cross Lake. I may remind

the members that they were the ones that were complaining because Cross Lake wasn't getting the arena. I remember the former Member for Turtle Mountain was quite concerned about that.-(Interjection)- I don't think it's a waste of money compensating the loss of the community or the loss of the recreation lifestyle of the people in Cross Lake. There are a number of issues that are still outstanding that have to be resolved in fishing and also in terms of setting up some development planning in that area. I think that's proceeding quite well.

I may say that I don't know what the total costs might be, but in terms of the overall Northern Flood Agreement, there is land that still has to be addressed and old areas that have to be addressed. The fishing and the trapping compensation, the whole wild resource management area, we have trained some conservation officers to deal with some of the issues that have affected Cross Lake as a result of flooding, but we are proceeding to address that.

I've been getting the feedback that Northern Affairs and also the Federal Government and the department staff are getting together to start the process of negotiating on the Northern Flood, so I'm pleased that it's ongoing, but we'll have to wait and see.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the major issue we have at Cross Lake is the fluctuation of the water level at the present time in the lake which has disturbed the fishing and, consequently, the reserve out there found that much of their income that they used to get from fishing and so on has been depleted. I think we all sympathize with them.

But I remember a very comprehensive study that was done by Manitoba Hydro, and it was done at the University of Manitoba, in which they said that for \$12 million we can give you an adequate structure which is going to give you the same water level that you had before, possibly a better water level than what you had before, we can guarantee this to you. And I know that some of us who were on the Hydro Board at that particular time, we thought well \$12 million is a little high, sent hydraulic engineers down there to take a look at it. He came back and he said, you give me a caterpillar and you give me \$350,000 and I'm going to give you adequate control of the water level on Cross Lake. We, at that particular time, went to the band over there and we said, we will give you control. But it was turned down on all counts, because they were afraid that they were going to be losing the revenue that they were getting at the present time.

Now my question to the Minister is: How are we going to resolve this situation? Apparently almost every attempt has been made to give them the regulation of the lake - it has been given to them. It has been given to the band at Cross Lake. What is it that the band is asking for at the present time? That is my question to the Minister. I want to know. We offered them, at that particular time, regulation of the lake where it was previous to the disturbance of the Winnipeg Lake Regulations. We offered them, at that particular time, that we were going to do everything to restore the level of the lake and we were going to compensate them until fishing had returned, and this was refused. I want to know now from the Minister what more is it that

this band at Cross Lake is asking in order for them to be happy as far as Lake Winnipeg Regulation is concerned?

**HON. W. PARASIUOK:** Maybe I might comment on this because, again, this is more directly related to what Hydro has been doing. I can appreciate the comments of the Member for Rhineland because I think they do point to some of the difficulties involved in these types of negotiations.

I'm not sure whether in fact the people in Cross Lake only wanted the revenues say from a \$12 million type of settlement as opposed to a \$350,000 weir, because I do think that a lot of the people aren't quite certain that a \$350,000 weir would be the same as a \$12 million weir. If you have a choice to go between 350 or 12 million, you're going to take the \$12 million even though people have come back and said, well, look, for a cheaper weir that we think will do the same type of job, what if some of the other money was used for other development purposes in the area? Those are the types of discussions that have been taking place and you often get, as you'll get within a Legislature here, differences of opinion over a period of time as to what would be the best course of action.

So over a two or three-year period, there might be a prevailing mood as to what might be our response and then there can be internal political discussions within the community, and then another position might develop. No one is denying that there hasn't been an adjustment to the water levels.

I think one of the first things I did when I became Minister is that I went up with the board - and a number of the members of the board are people who the Member for Rhineland served with when he was a board member - we went up and took a look at Cross Lake and you can see that the water levels are changed. We then started saying, well what types of things does one do to either probably regulate the flow of the water a bit better or provide a type of compensation in kind?

The debate has gone on with, I think, genuine lack of consensus possibly at the community level, because they're looking at those types of trade-offs and options. A consensus is sometimes formed and then changes, because signing a deal is a long-term commitment, and that's a hard thing to achieve. That's why we've had offers on the table. I can appreciate the uncertainty the people in Cross Lake would have in terms of trying to make trade-off decisions.

So that's why I do say that I think it is complicated. Sometimes it can be frustrating for both parties because I know that the Member for Rhineland, when he says what the offer was, reflects on that and realizes that the offer was certainly made in good faith by people involved with Hydro at that time. I think the rejection that was made by the people in Cross Lake was not made maliciously. I think it was made in good faith as well because there was uncertainty. The member asked the rhetorical question: well, what can be done to try and get some type of agreement? What do people really want? I think it's hard to say that this is exactly what people want.

I think people would like, and I've heard the Member for Rupertsland say this: where possible, try and restore things to their state of nature. At the same time,

circumstances change. We've had that with fisheries, for example, where the fishery industry has changed because there isn't that much of a world-wide demand for fish, and the prices go down. So, was the change in the water levels the cause of fish prices going down, which has changed fisheries' incomes? It becomes, I think, a very difficult thing, and I think the things of the Northern Flood communities will have to come to grips with is the fact that if they want a resolution and some settlements, they will have to make some decisions and that means some trade-off decisions, and that means accepting that there is some risk and uncertainty in making this decision as opposed to making another decision. One way of dealing with that is to not make a decision, but that means that those issues drag.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Well this is exactly it. I realize that the difficulties that were up North regarding the Flood Committee and the agreements and so on, that these are very complex and I've been involved with them and I realize it. But I feel that at Cross Lake, for instance, we should be able to come up with some kind of an agreement with this community, where we can restore things back to the state that they were at. But my problem is this: why are we not addressing that particular situation? Why are we not moving ahead and restoring things to the state of nature where it was before the Lake Winnipeg Regulation?

**HON. E. HARPER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I agree with the member raising the question of the water level. I've always mentioned that you can't put a price on the lake that you've damaged and try to restore it again to the same state. But what you should try to do is try to restore it as close as possible to the natural state that it was before. It is a very difficult thing to do because once you have touched the environment or the lake levels and those certain things that happen within the lake and is very difficult to restore, maybe you have done something biological in the lake itself.

But I have spoken to my colleague, the Minister responsible for the Northern Flood Agreement in this regard. But the whole issue of the Northern Flood Agreement is a complex issue and I believe when the Conservative Government sign an agreement, I think it was basically signing an agreement of principle, certain things that they would like to address, but there were certain things left out as to how some of the things could be implemented and certainly has caused a lot of problems. The Federal Government, the Provincial Government, the bands and those are the kind of things that hopefully we can restore and also hopefully begin to start implementing the Northern Flood Agreement.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 1.(g)(1) Native Affairs Secretariat: Minister Without Portfolio's Salary—pass; 1.(g)(2) Salaries—pass; 1.(g)(3) Other Expenditures—pass.

Resolution No. 5: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,601,900 for Executive Council, General Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that we've passed the Premier's Salary. Is that correct?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister's Salary, 1.(a) Premier and President of the Council's Salary. Thank you, Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I am being encouraged by members opposite, I think, to speak. I'm not certain what the Minister of the Environment has been saying, but I will indicate to him that I've thought a good deal in preparation for these Estimates about an appropriate thing to do or to say with respect to the Premier's Salary. Heaven knows, if we make comparisons, knowing that on a number of occasions members on our side of the House moved reductions in the salary of Ministers of various departments, I could make a very strong case, I believe, for moving a motion to reduce the Premier's Salary.

I say to you very quickly that I'm not going to do that, and I say that because I don't want to trivialize anything that might be said or done with respect to this Premier's actions.

I speak more in sorrow than in anger when I say that this Premier has, I think, been judged very thoroughly by people throughout this province, by media observers over the past five months, has been judged with respect to the many sins of commission and omission. and in every case, he's been found wanting.

Now, I see he's getting advice from the Minister of Energy and Mines to the effect that I have been judged by the people in the last election. Well, I say to him that I accept that judgment, as I did in the opening remarks. I say, we must get on with our responsibilities.

I say the problem over the past five months has been that this Premier has not accepted his responsibilities, responsibilities not only for the things that he perceives have gone well for this administration or the things that he wants to take credit for, but the responsibilities for every single one of the fiascos and problems that they have encountered over the past five months.

If I wanted to put on the record some absolutely devastating comments that have been made - and I reviewed some copies of articles that were written about the Premier - but there was a series of cartoons, I think some of the most devastating cartoons that I've ever seen in a political sense have happened over the past five months, the Premier covering his eyes to all of the things that have been happening around him, all the devastation that has occurred to this government. I say that none of anything I could say could exceed the critical commentary that's been made, and I think rightfully so, by media observers across the province -(Interjection)- no, I say that's one of the examples of the serious criticisms.

I say, as well - and if the Minister of Finance insists, I'll read onto the record some of the comments that have been made by observers who I don't think are biased observers, observers such as Frances Russell who has written two of the most devastating columns on this Premier in the last five months: "Pawley's weakness intensifies damage to NDP" was one of them. Another one was: "NDP stonewalling compounds MTS problems." In each case, she talked about how the Premier vacillated and continued day by day to change

his position, to change his mind, to change his justification for what he was doing: (1) on the SRTC's where he started out defending the Minister of Energy and Mines and the Minister of Environment, and then he slowly brought himself to the point of acknowledging that indeed their actions had caused serious damage. Then eventually bringing himself to the point of saying indeed, as was the case and had been recognized long since by most observers across the province, how badly they had acted and finally bringing himself to criticizing his Ministers for having made those damaging investments and how they had damaged the province's case in terms of tax reform and so on and so forth. But that sort of thing, as I said, doesn't need to be repeated.

The stonewalling that was referred to with respect to the MTX issue; there's one of the prime examples about how, even today, this Premier's response to the MTX issue is to attack individual members on this side for having brought up the issue. And as he did in the early going where his response was to refer to "Star Chamber tactics" as being what we were doing, referring to Star Chamber tactics as a request for a full and complete public inquiry when, of course, the Star Chamber was done not in a public sense but in private where people were, in fact, tortured - and nobody is suggesting that people ought to be tortured - and the direct parallel that the very kind of open public inquiry that he called on the Member for Transcona in order to clear the Member for Transcona, that he was now calling a Star Chamber if it were done to investigate MTX and its operations.

Well, all of those anomalies, all of those contradictions, all of those examples of the Premier's lack of understanding of what we're dealing with, as I say, speak more eloquently than any of the criticisms that I could make.

He was criticized early by media for not doing anything. Then, as the issues started to fall down around his ears, the very damaging, negative issues that have been tarred with this government; the withholding of the Third Quarter Financial Statement; the disastrous eventual fire sale of Flyer Industries; the withholding of the information on Manfor and all of its serious negative consequences; all of those things.

The problems in child welfare; the problems with respect to the settlement at the Brandon University where over and over he chose not to deal with the problem directly, but to try in some way suggest that it had to be dealt with by the board and that he couldn't interfere, and ultimately getting to the point of contradicting his own Minister of Education, who was standing up on the one hand and defending the board, and the Premier was now saying that the board ought to make public the information on the settlement, all of those things.

MPIC, not wanting to suggest that there's any government responsibility, that the only government responsibility was their action in firing the Chief Executive Officer; not to do with whether or not the board ought to have been aware, or the board was advocating its responsibility, or ultimately the responsibility of government, to keep a steady hand on the wheel of the Crown corporations and all of the activities of the government.

Everything leads to an image of a Premier who wants the public to believe that he's totally in the dark with

respect to anything that goes wrong; that any answer that's given to him, as long as it seems to satisfy the immediate needs, is acceptable and he never bothers to double-check or to find out whether or not there is any ministerial responsibility; whether or not there is any government responsibility; he simply hides from the problem and stands up in question period, seems to want to play all those little games where he wins by stonewalling, or by not answering the question directly, or by fed bashing, or trying to turn the question away so that he never gives a direct answer and he never actually addresses the problems that are raised to him. In fact, he simply takes the tack, that he can attack individuals and therefore get away from any government responsibility.

That's been the whole tack that he's taken on MTX; is to say that the problem is the Opposition because the Opposition have raised the concerns and made the allegations. If he can find any little part of a comment that he can prove to be not quite correct, he uses that to try and brush away all the other things that have now come forward on the table; that have had to be admitted to by senior officials at MTX; that have been admitted to by the Minister responsible; where they are now finally acknowledging that indeed many of the concerns that have been raised, there is substance to; that it has finally led us to now, an appointment of management consultants, however inadequate that may be, an appointment obviously referenced to the RCMP who I know will do a thorough investigation to the extent of the matters that fall within their jurisdiction but has still left open the area that observer after observer, people who have no sense of political preferences one way or another, recognize, as I think I mentioned earlier Frances Russell has, that there simply will not be an adequate review of the matters by virtue of the tact that the Premier has taken.

For instance, it said "By stonewalling a thorough area, the government may just be postponing the inevitable in increasing the damage to itself. If it has nothing to hide from a public inquiry, it has nothing to fear either." That very simply is the point that has been raised, and the fact of the matter is that the kinds of inquiries that have been put forth by the Premier will be sadly lacking in their ability to get at much of the needed information, and that we've said before, we believe it to be true; and I think the MTX issue brings all the various unfortunate failures of this First Minister to really lead and to take control and take responsibility altogether. He's happy to have the matter dealt with as expeditiously as possible, brushed under the carpet, preferably, so that as little political damage as possible sticks on him and his administration, and that seems to be the whole objective.

When I looked at the responses of the Premier's senior advisors, it was all to do with political responses; for instance, "In addressing the MTX issue, senior government sources say the MTX affair has not become a popular issue. So far it's only big with the media. The party hasn't received a single phone call about it," says one.

Now that's the whole way of assessing whether or not they're doing right on the MTX issue, and I say, most unfortunately, as I said earlier, more in sorrow than in anger that that has to be the biggest criticism of this Premier, that he's quite prepared to judge what

to do based on the number of phone calls that come to the party's offices as to whether or not there is serious public concern; not whether or not the allegations are of such a serious nature that they deserve the widest possible airing and that that, and only that, will result in ultimately the cleaning of the slate for MTS so that once again it can be restored to public confidence, so that once again the people there can hold their heads high, so that once again the people at MTS can know that the Crown corporation and its administration has the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

But to avoid the issue, to duck the serious consequences and questions that have been raised, is unfortunately again an example of this Premier's desire not to face head-on and take responsibility for the things that are under his control.

I accept the consequences of the March 18th election. I don't know whether or not this Premier does though because the consequences are that he's the Premier and he's responsible for the governing of this province and just once I'd like to see him take that responsibility instead of backing away, covering up and hiding on every one of these things and placing the blame on the Opposition.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I really can't permit some of those remarks to proceed unchallenged and, also, I don't respond to threats, I say to the Member for Arthur.

The Leader of the Opposition made reference to a number of areas, but I want to say to the - and I'll give the Leader of the Opposition some advice. I know he won't follow this advice, but I have found and I say this is one that was involved in five successful campaigns, and four of the five in which government was formed. The honourable members have lost four of the last five campaigns. I say this is one in 1979 that had some cartoons and some commentaries written that we would never win the 1981 election and the same a year or a year and one-half ago when we were 30 points behind the Leader of the Opposition's party, oh, we won't win the 1986 election, but I say this is one that has successfully waged two provincial campaigns.

I say to the Leader of the Opposition: you don't win elections with smear campaigns, with innuendo, and also very important, you don't win elections by trying to fool the public. I believe, regrettably for the Leader of the Opposition, that he would have done better in the last election if he had rejected the advice of Mr. Lassinger and those from Toronto who, upon taking analysis of polls, advised the Leader of the Conservative Party to be a pseudo-New Democrat, to pretend that he was a New Democrat for 35 days.

The Leader of the Opposition chose, during that 35-day period, to attempt to hoodwink Manitobans into believing that they had a second New Democratic Party. I could, at some length, produce the brochures and the pamphlets and the materials in which the Leader of the Opposition was attempting to pretend that he was leading a left-of-centre alternative in fact a little bit left of the New Democratic Party.

The people of the Province of Manitoba are not fooled in that way, and I do believe that if the Leader of the

Opposition of the Conservative Party really wanted to test the will of Manitobans, they would campaign not on the basis of personalities, not on the basis of innuendos, not on the basis of pretending to be something that they're not, but run as Conservatives. Run as Conservatives on your basic program, your basic issues, and not attempt to proceed in a cosmetic way.

In this Session, all that I've seen this Session has been the shotgun approach. If you spray enough shell all over the place, you're bound somewhere to hopefully hit somebody. That's the innuendo. That's the innuendo technique. We saw it with the Minister of Energy and Mines and you're embarrassed because the Minister of Energy and Mines has demonstrated clearly throughout the last three months that you're wrong. You demonstrated in respect to 115 Bannatyne Street. The Member for the St. Norbert constituency and the Leader of the Opposition suggested it was some sort of incestuous relationship between the government and the tenants of 115 Bannatyne. Oh sure, that captured a lot of media attention, but it was a fabrication and the Provincial Auditor dealt with that very clearly. I agree with the Minister of Finance - regrettably, much of it was a waste of money - but the allegations were incestuous relationship. You will have to, as an Opposition, absorb the impact of a lot of your false allegations.

It was this government, Mr. Chairman, that has taken action. When there are problems that occur within government, we move to deal with those problems. There isn't a government anywhere in Canada that doesn't have some administrative and other problems, but when our problems have occurred, whether it was A.E. McKenzie Seed prior to the election; whether it was the highways kickbacks which commenced during the term of the Lyon administration when the present Member for Pembina was the Minister of Highways in Carman, Manitoba - we called in the R.C.M.P.; whether it was in respect to the government service kickbacks, electronics equipment, which also took place during the Lyon administration - we called in the R.C.M.P. We didn't call for a public inquiry. We called in the appropriate bodies to do the investigation, the initiation of trial and the proper conviction of those who had acted contrary to the laws of Canada. That's the way you deal with it. Manitobans are not fooled insofar as the MTX matter is concerned. They know what is a proper way to deal with that - call in the RCMP, call in the management audit - find out what's true, what's false, eliminate the chaff. But, honourable members want to use the shot-gun approach for everything.

I know honourable members aren't going to accept my advice. From time to time, there's some advice that is worthy from across the way and we will accept good, constructive advice when it's offered.

I'm just as happy that honourable members, ever since 1969, ever since I've sat in this Chamber, honourable members have been advised over the years how they could win an election by being up-front and forthright. I don't mind advising them because they've ignored the advice that we've given them every year since 1969 how to win the next election - and we're going to continue to win elections - because honourable members are, and regrettably for them, are caught within a rut of approach, losing four of the last five elections. In 1977, you lost when you had the largest

popular vote in the history of the Province of Manitoba; the only government to lose after only one term in office.

I think it's time that honourable members, rather than use the innuendo, rather than use the smear, do a little soul-searching, look at yourselves, examine yourselves.- (Interjection)- I say, and I don't want to be immodest with the honourable member, you're looking at two successful provincial elections, because we fought on our basic principles; we fought on our policies and our programs; we have fought as New Democrats in the campaign; we haven't pretended to be something that we're not. You pretended to be New Democrats in the last election; you pretended to be left of centre in the last election - that's what you pretended, but the people of Manitoba saw through that transparent act and they rejected you in the last election.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, the Premier demonstrates again precisely what I've said, that rather than talk about the issues, rather than talk about the problems and the concerns and the responsibilities of the last five months, he wants to review the election campaign and has the arrogance to give us advice, to suggest to us how we should run our campaign.

Firstly, Mr. Chairman, if I were to take his advice, it wouldn't be designed to help me, I can assure you; that his advice would be designed to have me do what he would want me to do and that is to do things that would not be in our best interest. His advice is that kind of self-serving advice given by somebody who believes he's infallible and who believes that having gone through this election campaign and got the mandate that he no longer has to be concerned about criticisms; that he can write them off as smear and innuendoes; that he can sit there and be absolutely smug and content with the thought that his government is right no matter what happens; that our criticisms, no matter substance there is to them, no matter what evidence there is to support them, that our criticisms are not worth listening to.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I tell you this, that we'll accept it because right now he's riding a high, but he still doesn't recognize that ultimately he is responsible for anything that is done in this administration. Ultimately, it is he who has to take the responsibility on all of these things, and he won't face up to that. He wants instead to call it smear and innuendo and say that there's nothing wrong with this government.

I say to you that I don't have to criticize him any further; I don't have to criticize him anymore. I know how difficult this past five months have been.

We look at this story that says "Pawley's Secretary Quits for Position in Yukon".- (Interjection)- Yes. We know that five senior staff people have left the ship under his stewardship over the past number of months, five people in the past five months. The most senior people in this administration have chosen not to continue to keep working for this Premier, because they know that it's a hopeless cause. They know that as long as he wants to live in this fool's paradise, he's going to continue to ignore the real problems; he's going to continue to ignore the warning signs; he's going to continue to ignore the real information that's being given to him by people in this province who are

saying that it's not good enough to simply blame your problems on the Opposition; it's not good enough to blame your problems off on Crown corporation staff; it's not good enough to blame your problems on the board members. You've ultimately got to face the responsibility.

I say, Mr. Chairman, this Premier is going to have to face the music, look in the mirror and ultimately decide that if he's going to lead this province, he's going to have to take the responsibility for the things that go on - good and bad - and unfortunately over the past five years, there's been far more bad than good that has gone on in this province.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly wouldn't want to leave the impression that there are not times, in fact, where I believe that the Opposition has done their homework.

I want to give you one instance, and that was when the former Member for Turtle Mountain raised in this Chamber the A.E. McKenzie Seed issue. We sensed when the member raised that issue, that he had done his homework and he had done it quite well.- (Interjection)- No, Mr. Chairman, I recall when that matter was raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain and the question was raised in this Chamber, within hours the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seed at that time and I immediately called in the Provincial Auditor, and the Provincial Auditor did his comprehensive analysis and, as a result of that comprehensive analysis, the RCMP were immediately called in by the Attorney-General.

I want to commend the former Member for Turtle Mountain and other members in the Opposition who participated, if they did, insofar as the research and the effort that was involved and . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . Yes, well, it's true the Member for Brandon East does point out that the origin certainly commenced during the time they were in office, but - (Interjection)- we have learned to be a little leery, especially over the last five months, of some of the statements by honourable members across the way.

I mentioned 115 Bannatyne. The shrill words of the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for St. Norbert, when they immediately assumed - and I believe it does speak to some extent to the disposition of honourable members across the way - there was some sort of incestuous, was the term that was used, relationship between the tenants of 115 Bannatyne and the government, that there was a feeding, a deliberate, calculated feeding financially by the government of selected tenants through some sort of conduits. That was the impression that was left by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for St. Norbert when they used the term "incestuous". I don't know any other term or definition that one could assume from the use of that sinister term "incestuous".

Well, Mr. Jackson dealt with that. He dealt with that very, very clearly yesterday; no incestuous relationship; nothing irregular or improper at all. The Leader of the Opposition has tried to put some distance between himself and the Parasik Inquiry, though it was the

## Tuesday, 9 September, 1986

Member for St. Norbert who advised the Winnipeg Free Press that what was happening in respect to the allegations was, in his words, much worse than the issue of the tax. The Leader of the Opposition complained to one Radha Thampi, June 15, 1986, that he was not, and the Conservative Party was not getting adequate credit for forcing the resignation of the Minister of Energy and Mines. June 15, 1986, and the Leader of the Opposition tried to put his distance.

It reads, "Filmon partly credits his party for the resignation of former Energy Minister, Wilson Parasiuk, who quit Cabinet last month over conflict-of-interest allegations. It's true that it was Filmon who first questioned the awarding of Hydro contracts to WMC Research Associated Ltd. last year during a committee meeting. Filmon says, though, it's the first time in 20 years a Minister has resigned and no one is giving any credit to the Tories." No one is giving any credit to the Tories.

So I say to honourable members, we're interested in good, constructive advice, but the constructive advice that we're looking for is suggestions to create additional jobs in the Province of Manitoba. We've got so much unemployment. We still have too many in the 18-25 year bracket who are unemployed in Manitoba. Suggestions, constructive ideas for the good of Manitobans, we welcome. The health care system, we're entering into a period of health care reform in the delivery of services, but we've got to find ways of providing health care, not in a more costly way, but a more efficient way and not in a narrow sort of sector approach, but in a proper health care reform manner. Let's hear your ideas; let's hear well thought out ideas insofar as the improvement of health care in the Province of Manitoba. We welcome that. We don't have all the ideas on this side. Surely you've got some ideas on the other side, outside of the innuendos here. Surely there's something from across the way. I know there's plenty of brains across the way; there's plenty of ideas from some of the members across the way.

I know the Leader of the Opposition has many good, worthwhile ideas that he can present on jobs and health care. There are cultural situations in the Province of Manitoba. And don't pretend that we can do something in respect to agriculture that is the responsibility of the Federal Government. Deal with the plight of agriculture in Manitoba, with your suggestions as to what can be done. Let's hear your suggestions in regard to federal-provincial relationships. When it comes to transfer payments, don't automatically click to the defence of your federal cousins in Ottawa, when we're dealing with a 1.5 percent to 2 percent increase in the cheque and transfer payments from Ottawa this year over last, when every Premier in the country has condemned that reduction in transfer payments. Give us support; give us good constructive advice because we, unlike honourable members across the way, don't claim to have a monopoly on knowledge. We acknowledge that; I acknowledge that. Honourable members can acknowledge that too on their part, but honourable members can - well, Enns on our side, Mackling on that side, eh?

Let's work together for the good of Manitobans. I don't believe the smear and the innuendo and the prejudging accomplishes much. I don't even think it accomplishes anything for you politically. It hasn't in

the past; it's not going to in the future. Let's hear your good constructive advice and let's have good philosophic and ideological disagreement, good honest disagreement in this Chamber.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I find it very interesting that the Premier is talking about good constructive advice. Indeed, we gave him a great deal of good constructive advice. As a matter of fact, I would say that during the course of this Session, we have time and time again placed on the record bits of advice that have been agreed with by many, many observers with respect to the manner in which he dealt with the original allegations on the SRTC's, the damage that we said this did to his credibility as a Premier, to his party, when he stood up for tax reform. That was constructive criticism.

I'll quote here from the article, again, from Frances Russell: "Premier Howard Pawley's singular inability to manage political crises has done as much damage to his governments as Energy Minister Wilson Parasiuk's use of tax shelters." She said, "By his unwillingness or incapacity to deal decisively with controversy, the Premier has escalated the harm to his administration and party, and by his vacillation between half-hearted defence and cloaked criticism, he has condemned Parasiuk to a political twilight."

It goes on and on and on to talk about his indecisiveness. With respect to that issue of the awarding of the contract and the eventual public inquiry, this Premier would not have acted had the Member for Transcona not resigned and not indeed taken the advice of the Member for . . . This Premier wouldn't have acted even on that matter had it not been for the fact that the Member for Transcona resigned and forced him to act to call the inquiry. He did not have the courage or the good sense himself to make any decision whatsoever. Had it not been for the actions of that member, demanding that his Premier do something to help him to clear himself, nothing would have been done. That's what we're dealt with; that's what we're dealing with, absolutely no leadership whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, this is the thing that we're dealing with time and time and time again. The only thing the Premier can say is give us your advice. He can read 40 pages of advice that we gave him about dealing with the health care system, about dealing with problems in terms of the social service network, about dealing with problems with respect to child abuse in this . . .

I want to know, Mr. Chairman, where the Premier has been keeping the Deputy Premier locked up, because she's exorcized and she wants to get out all of a sudden. I've never seen her this talkative or engaging in this kind of heckling as much in years.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I said earlier that I didn't want to trivialize the Premier's Estimates or the Premier's department, but I see that his members want to do that and are engaging in song to try, in some

**Tuesday, 9 September, 1986**

---

way, trivialize this whole exercise that we're going through, with respect to the approval of the Premier's Salary.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that time and time again this Premier has failed to show leadership, has failed to demonstrate that he will be decisive, make a decision about anything. He is in this situation with respect to MTX because he was away in Edmonton and by the time he came back, decisions had been made on his behalf, obviously by his Cabinet and senior officials. They have left him in a position of having to defend the appointment of Coopers and Lybrand and the reference to the RCMP and now he's simply hung out to dry, unable to make any decisions for himself - like he has been on so many other issues - and he is not showing that he has the leadership or the will to carry forward and to do anything positive for this province.

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The Leader of the Opposition reads from the . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We need some respect here.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** The Leader of the Opposition reads from the Frances Russell column and from time to time, Frances Russell . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** A point of order being raised.

**MR. J. ERNST:** A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Would you call the members opposite to order? I can't hear the Premier.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I thought it would be of interest - Frances Russell from time to time is wrong as well. I think the Leader of the Opposition - I was somewhat surprised that he was quoting Frances Russell because I know that he wasn't very happy with her column after column, during the French Language Debate, in which the Leader of the Opposition felt that she was quite wrong.

I'd like to read another article for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition; Winnipeg Sun, Wednesday, May 14, 1986, and it's headed "Quit Flogging Dead Horse. Come on Gary, let's get serious. It's time to get off this horse about tax dodges used by NDP Cabinet Ministers. If Tory Leader, Gary Filmon wants to ride this ringer to victory in some far-off election race, he better pack a lunch and flashlight. The issue is going nowhere."

Filmon was back in the Legislature this week flaying the government over the fact that a couple of Cabinet Ministers used tax shelters that earlier had been criticized by the Finance Minister. Now it's time to start looking at some of the other problems of the province and this government. Surely the Opposition can find something other than the use of legal tax shelters to harp about. Filmon can bellow all he wants about how these guys should resign. The fact is they aren't going anywhere. If Ministers resigned on the basis of stupidity, there would be an echo in the Cabinet room."

Well, I think the Leader of the Opposition should accept some of that advice. What we have seen during

this Session is, as I mentioned, a shotgun approach. I know there's a leadership review that is coming up in November; I know, prior to the election, that the Leader of the Opposition advised his convention of Conservative delegates to quit sniping at him; Filmon tells Tories.

I know that in the Conservative Party you have to watch your back. There's a long history of wounded backs from knives in the Conservative Party. I can understand the desire of the Leader of the Opposition to attempt to safeguard his position by shooting in all directions, hoping that some of the shells might find their target. If you spray far enough, you're going to end up hitting some target. With the leadership convention coming on, it's quite obvious with what the Leader of the Opposition - I feel sorry for him - what he has to put up with because the Member for Pembina obviously is trying to grandstand his way to the leadership of the Conservative Party.

He's got the Member for Morris, who I must say is, I think, a basic Conservative with real basic Conservative integrity, watching out for the leadership of the Conservative Party. I'm sure there are some in the backbench that are also watching out for the possibilities that might occur in the future. I understand, each and everyone of us understand, precisely what's going on across the way; the turmoil, the emotions that are under way, the campaigning that's under way, and the need for the Leader of the Opposition to defend himself against all those people with their knives out across the way.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, this is again the example of the Premier. He doesn't want to talk about the issues. He wants to try in his cute way to deflect the attention from it and to try and raise the issue of whether or not there's going to be a leadership review. I don't need his advice or his assistance in any way, shape or form for any leadership review. He has as many problems, if not more, to be concerned about with respect to his leadership as I ever do; I want to tell you.

He says that he reads from an article that suggests that we ought to get off the SRTC scam and get onto other things. Well I might tell him that we took the advice of that article. As a result, we had so many more things that we were able to deal with as the time went on.

As time went on, we of course had the firing of the President of MPIC; we had the Auditor's investigation into the Department of Natural Resources; and of course we had the whole issue with respect to the wrongful dismissal suit settlement of the President of Brandon University. We had of course, the situation with respect to the backlog in so many different areas; and of course the problems at the Workers Compensation Board; and of course the problems that we've been having throughout the government departments, whether it be with the Highways department officials and their charges and their convictions and all of those; and of course then we had, later on, eventually the MTX issue.

So I say to the Premier, we've taken the advice from that editorial and we've followed through, Mr. Chairman,

with so many other areas and we'll keep following through. He's not going to put us off the track by suggesting to us that he wants to talk about our leadership. We'll deal with our leadership as we do with the party. His problem is showing some leadership in government and demonstrating to the people of Manitoba that he's prepared to deal with the real issues and get on with the business of government. He hasn't been able to do that and it's time he stood up and said that he's prepared to give the people the leadership and to deal with the problems that are facing them and not try and deflect from the problems by turning on our Federal Party or by turning on our party matters, but rather dealing with the problems under his jurisdiction, under his responsibility, and taking responsibility for them.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I want to reassure my colleagues that I won't be accepting the advice from the Leader of the Opposition to accept suggestions on leadership from the Leader of the Opposition. No one need to have worry in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I've been waiting for some advice in respect to jobs and job creation. How we can even do better than we're doing at the present time with the best capital investment record in the last five years anywhere in Canada in the Province of Manitoba? But we can do better. How can we even do better by way of private investment growth which has been amongst the best in Canada; how we can even do better insofar as the job creation though we have created in the Province of Manitoba with the cooperation of Manitobans everywhere, an additional 15,000 jobs in the province, mostly permanent jobs; how we can even do better despite the very favourable results that we received only the other day in respect to the improvement in the 18-25 year age bracket, the best record in Canada in that respect. But we can do much more. Let us talk about those issues.

But all we hear from honourable members across the way is Parasiuk's scientific tax credits; Andy Anstett; MTX; that's all we hear from honourable members across the way. If there's dismay across the province insofar as the Opposition is concerned in Manitoba, it's because people are tiring of hearing the same old harangue. You're not discussing the issues that Manitobans are interested in.

Take any poll anywhere and ask Manitobans what is the most important issue in the Province of Manitoba today? Are they going to say Andy Anstett? Are they going to say MTX? Are they going to say A.E. McKenzie Seeds? Are they going to say Parasiuk's scientific tax credit? No, what Manitobans would tell you, No. 1, it's jobs; jobs and jobs. Secondly, Manitobans would tell it's the farm economy, it's agriculture; help for the farmers. That's what they'll tell you. They'll tell you in that poll it's health care, social services to Manitobans; that's what they'll tell you.

I suspect, and I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to take a poll and you won't find one Manitoban in a thousand that would tell you the most important issue in Manitoba is MTX. But go on, I hope you carry on and ignore the issues that concern Manitoba.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, if you ask the people of Manitoba, they will tell you that they are concerned

about the dishonesty that pervades many of the actions of this government and this Premier. They are absolutely concerned, Mr. Chairman, with the dishonesty that's surrounded many of the promises of the election campaign.

This Premier had the audacity to say earlier that we shouldn't be trying to fool the public. He is the one who made promises that he could not keep during the election campaign, who promised that he personally would reduce gasoline prices and would control gasoline prices in future, a promise which he has not kept, a promise which he cannot keep.

He, personally, is the one who stood up during the election campaign and said that he had entered into \$4 billion worth of agreements on hydro-electric sales. It wasn't true, because all we found out eventually was that there was one deal for \$46 million. But he said that.

Now he's telling us that we shouldn't be fooling the public. That's why the public has a concern about the honesty of this Premier and of his government. If you can't trust the Premier to tell you the truth, who can you trust? Who can you trust in this province? How can you have any confidence, faith or reliance in this government to do anything worth doing if you can't rely on the Premier to tell the truth. That's one of the things that they have concern about.

People have talked to us. How could it be, they say, that the Premier announced the programs on Farmstart and the programs on the small business development without having any criteria, without having any information on it, without knowing how the program would work, how people would qualify or what would happen? How could he have announced a rural development program in which he had absolutely no information and he had to hire Andy Anstett after the election to develop the criteria, to develop the program? How could he have been so dishonest to the people of Manitoba? That's what the people are saying to us.

They expect honesty out of their Premier. They expect honesty out of their government and they aren't getting it from this administration or from this government. The people are talking to us and they are saying they can't stand the hypocrisy that this government enters into.

How on the one hand they can say to people that they are interested in tax reform, they are committed to tax reform, they are absolutely opposed to the SRTC and yet two of their Ministers have been investing in the SRTC? People say to us they're concerned about that hypocrisy. How could they have the Premier say to people that we ought to have no truck or trade with South Africa, because it is a discriminatory policy against people because of colour and race and, at the same time, be participating and willingly making an investment in Saudi Arabia, in a country that in fact requires us to be a part of discriminatory hiring and appointment there. They say to us, how can a government have this kind of hypocrisy? They say to us, how can a government tell us all of the things that it is telling us and yet do exactly the opposite? That's the problem of the people.

How can a government be shown to be so corrupt in terms of its operations, Crown corporations, in terms of having to fire the head of MPIC, in terms of some of the dealings with respect to government departments,

**Tuesday, 9 September, 1986**

---

in terms of MTX and all of that scandalous operation? How can a government tolerate that corruption and do nothing about it? That's what people are saying to us.

They are judging this Premier and this government based on their actions, not what you say you are going to do, based on what you are doing. That, Mr. Chairman, is the problem that we have with this Premier and his government, the fact that he says one thing and he does another, and in fact he takes no responsibility for any of the problems that have occurred under his administration for the people of this province. That's our problem. We have a Premier who takes no responsibility, whose word can't be trusted and, in fact, we have employees at MTS who are saying, I can't rely on the government to protect me because the government has shown itself to be absolutely vicious about people who criticize it and attempt to get rid of people who would dare to bring forward allegations. They are concerned because they don't have a Premier they can rely on, because they don't have a Premier they have faith in. That's our problem in Manitoba today.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to accept the verdict of the Leader of the Opposition as to whose word can be trusted and whose word can't be trusted. I would prefer to look to the voters of the Province of Manitoba. The voters in the Province of Manitoba indicated in November of 1981 that it's this Premier, it's this administration's word that can be trusted. The voters of the Province of Manitoba on March 18 of 1986 indicated this Premier, this administration's word can be trusted and it said in clear terms that honourable members across the way, insofar as their pretended policy approach, can't be trusted.

Mr. Chairman, I heard a number of misrepresentations just a few moments ago, gross misrepresentations from the Leader of the Opposition. I heard a lot about MTX. I heard words from the Leader of the Opposition that we're not going to do anything about MTX. Where has the Leader of the Opposition been for the last month when we advised him day after day after day that the Attorney-General has called the RCMP into the investigation, that the Minister responsible for the Telephone System has appointed Coopers and Lybrand to do a management audit of MTX? Where has the Leader of the Opposition been?

Talk about not seeing, the Leader of the Opposition doesn't hear, and I'm going to ask the Minister of Health to provide him with a hearing aid tomorrow so that he can for once hear that this government is dealing with these serious allegations.

The Leader of the Opposition accused us of breaking our promise on gas prices. Why has the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues spoken against The Trade Practices Act, to get the provincial government more teeth to deal with runaway gas prices and energy prices and other consumer prices? Why hasn't the Leader of the Opposition given us support? We are fulfilling our election commitment.

In rural development, I heard the same sort of nonsense from honourable members across the way about Main Street Manitoba and I remember how they ridiculed the former Member for Ste. Rose because he didn't proceed immediately with the Main Street

Program. Now they call him "Main Street Pete," trying to embarrass him in this Chamber. But we had patience and we planned and we designed, and by the election in March of 1986, Main Street Manitoba and Pete Adam's contribution to that program was finally recognized in this province. And I'll tell honourable members, the present Member for Ste. Rose wouldn't be in this Chamber if the former Member for Ste. Rose had run again in this last election.

The Leader of the Opposition talks about Hydro and Thompson. Here's an Information Services release February 14th, that contracts are expected to be finalized in about six months and then submitted for approval to the National Energy Board. That was public information, no misrepresentation. The news release refers to business arrangements, power arrangements to be completed in six months. Where is the misrepresentation the Leader of the Opposition speaks about? News Service release, February 14, 1986, released to all Manitobans.

So I say to the Leader of the Opposition that whether it's the commitment vis-a-vis the gas price, but the Leader of the Opposition suggested we had misrepresented our way through the election campaign.

**MR. G. FILMON:** You did, you did.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** But we didn't, here's a News Service release, read it, read it! It says that contracts are expected to be finalized in about six months and then submitted for the approval of the National Energy Board. Where's the falsehood? Where's the lies?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Deputy Clerk, I'd like to table that. So whether it's the gas prices, whether we are dealing with Hydro, whether we are dealing with the fund for world development, Mr. Chairman, we hold our heads proud. Manitobans have judged this accordingly and, Mr. Chairman, I have every confidence in the will of Manitobans four years down the road.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I tell you this, at no time during the election campaign did he or any of his colleagues talk about the increase in Pharmacare deductible. At no time. If that wasn't misleading, I don't know what was. Immediately after the election campaign, they implemented it.

At no time during the election campaign did they tell the people of Manitoba that they could expect the Third Quarter Financial Statement to have a \$55 million increase over what was budgeted nine months earlier. At no time did they say that. At no time did they tell -(Interjection)- well you know the Member for The Pas - that's the one who is one of the 10 sexiest men in Manitoba - he says that they told the people of Manitoba about Bill 4.

Well, they told the people of Manitoba that Bill 4 was going to help them, but now we find from all the farm communities, from the farm representatives, from all the organizations that Bill 4 is going to harm the farmers and that's not what they told them. That's not what they told them, and brief and after brief after brief to committee said that, and yet the Premier says that

that's one of their accomplishments. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is the problem we have, is that what they said and what they're doing are two different things and that's the problem that this Premier has.

But time and time and time again, he's talking about their solutions to the problem and he said, as he did today, that Coopers and Lybrand will be the solution to the problem. He said earlier today that on advice from one of his colleagues sitting on his seat, that, in fact, Mr. Provencher had said that the Coopers and Lybrand investigation would get to the matter of all the accounts over in - that they would be able to look at the Datacom accounts. He said that they would, as a courtesy, have access, so I'm going to read to him because he was again misinformed by his colleagues, just exactly what Mr. Provencher said on the record. I was asking Mr. Provencher to confirm whether or not we had legal access . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. G. FILMON:** . . . whether or not we would have legal access to the accounts in Saudi Arabia, the accounts of Datacom, and I want the Premier to listen to this, because what I said was: "Is it correct that we had no legal access really, but it was just being given as a result of the partner in recognition of the major outstanding liability he had to us." Here's what Mr. Provencher said: "That's correct and I think it's a courtesy in the partnership relationship and we'll address that in the paper on the relationship between ourselves."

My next question to him: "Will that same courtesy be extended to Coopers and Lybrand in their investigations?" Mr. M. Provencher: "I cannot undertake to determine that," he said, "That is, I think, up to Sheik Abdullah. I cannot specifically state on his behalf what he may answer to that question."

Then I asked the Minister responsible, I said: "I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether that question has been asked of the Sheik, whether the Sheik would allow us access to the books." Mr. A. Mackling: "The answer is no." The answer is no, so they haven't even asked whether or not Coopers and Lybrand could get into the books of the Sheik's company, and yet today he stood up and said that that was the answer, that he was confident we'd have access to the Sheik's books. His own Minister says that they've never asked. They've never asked.

That's the problem we have is that this Minister, this Premier doesn't understand the problem. He takes any advice that's given to him. He doesn't double-check it to find out whether it's accurate, whether it's a right answer, he just simply says, "Here's the answer, take it or leave it," and it's not right. It's absolutely not right, Mr. Chairman, so that's the problem we have, that this Premier continues to roll on and say whatever comes into his head, give information as he did in the election campaign that wasn't accurate and he doesn't care. We have a great credibility gap with respect to this Premier and that's the biggest problem that we have. No leadership and no credibility from this Premier.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I really can't fathom what the Leader of the Opposition is saying when he

suggests that we uttered inaccurate statements during the campaign. He's given a few examples here but each and every one of those examples was pure hogwash. I think the Leader of the Opposition surely recognizes that in his heart of hearts tonight, but obviously he has to continue to pretend for the purposes of internal political digestion, that that is the case. But Manitobans know differently. Manitobans know quite differently and Manitobans expressed themselves, despite the fact that only a year before, March 18th, they had a 30 percent lead in the polls that we had access to.

I must tell the Leader of the Opposition it was pretty demoralizing for awhile to find ourselves 30 percent down in the polls, in March, April of 1985.

The Leader of the Opposition again talks about MTX and I know this is a single-issue party, single issue focus, but I want to deal with one area. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that I had criticized the committee for being Star Chamber. It was the Leader of the Opposition who was proposing a Star Chamber tactic. I thought it was the Leader of the Opposition who told the media that we should have the committee, why? - so that we could use the words of witnesses expressed at the committee, to complement the RCMP investigation. A public hearing, a Star Chamber, that is contrary to the very essence of the criminal justice system, that you would use words, use witnesses as pawns before a public inquiry, use their words for the criminal justice system.

I'm going to have the Attorney-General provide the Leader of the Opposition with a half hour criminal justice lecture tomorrow, so that the Leader of the Opposition has a better understanding as to appropriate proceedings under the criminal justice system and the protection of the individual. That's what I was referring to as Star Chamber tactics.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, again I refer to the fact that during the election campaign, he did not tell the people of Brandon that in September of this year, he was going to close 31 beds at Brandon General Hospital.

He said he was going to expand Brandon General Hospital. He said he was going to expand many of the diagnostic and treatment facilities, just as he said to the seniors that he was going to help them out, and then he increased the Pharmacare deductible and he increased the fees on personal care beds. He did all of those things.

Those are the problems of credibility I have. Those are the problems of leadership I have with this Premier.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I do have to take exception to the suggestion that I closed down beds in Brandon, the inference that I failed to advise Brandon residents that I would be closing down beds in Brandon.

The Minister of Health dealt with that very decisively the other day in this Chamber. Brandon Hospital spent in excess of its budget. It's the Brandon Hospital Board that's closed down beds at the hospital in Brandon in excess of their budget. The Minister of Health pointed that out very clearly, very comprehensively the other day in this Chamber.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I say it over again that this Premier now is demonstrating exactly what I said earlier, that

**Tuesday, 9 September, 1986**

---

the problem is somebody else's. He's saying that the problem is the problem of the Board of Brandon General Hospital. That's our difficulty. He will not take the responsibility for the things that are under his control, and that's the lack of leadership that we've been talking about.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** All that I would say, Mr. Chairman, is that I'm prepared to submit to the verdict of the public as we did in 1981, as we did in 1986, and I expect we will in '90. We'll submit to that verdict and the people of Manitoba will decide.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, that's one thing we can agree on, and I say this, that the democratic process is going to make this Premier accountable even though he doesn't want to make himself accountable himself.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, I warmly embrace that challenge from the Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** When he's ready, I'm ready.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Chairman, agreed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We have agreed.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the Premier has finally agreed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We have reached the end of the road. 1.(a)(1)—pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,601,900 for Executive Council, General Administration, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

What is the pleasure of the Committee at this hour? Committee rise.  
Call in the Speaker.

**IN SESSION**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos:** Is there a motion to adjourn the House?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that we adjourn now.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is that agreed? (Agreed)  
This House is now adjourned and stands until tomorrow (Wednesday).