

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 30 April, 1982

Time — 10:00 a.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding (St. Vital):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. JERRY T. STORIE (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain Resolutions, directs me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. MAUREEN HEMPHILL (Logan):** Mr. Speaker, I ask for leave to table the Annual Report of the Public Schools' Finance Board Province of Manitoba for the year ending December 31st, 1981.

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

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

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

**MR. GARY FILMON (Tuxedo)** introduced Bill No. 25, an Act to Incorporate the Winnipeg Humane Society Foundation.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 52 students of Grade 5 standing from the Maple Leaf School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bourbonniere. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River East.

We also have 60 students of Grade 6 standing from the West Park School under the direction of Mr. Ken Doell.

There are 50 students of Grade 9 standing from the Laverne Ray School under the direction of Mr. Wilkberg. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

There are 40 students of Grade 11 standing from the Lord Selkirk Regional Comprehensive School under the direction of Mr. Wishnowski. This school is in the

constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**HON. STERLING LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Yesterday's news reports carried a number of stories concerning the federal prosecution of carpet store operators in about three provinces who were allegedly advertising floor covering, carpets, in imperial measure and in square yards as well as in metric.

My question to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, is this, will he make immediate contact with his federal counterpart, the Minister of Justice, on behalf of Manitoba business people to ensure that no business people in Manitoba will be harassed or capriciously prosecuted for advertisements which while possibly technically in breach of the metric legislation, are otherwise quite harmless and are in furtherance of common sense merchandising and represent the will of the majority of the people of this country?

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

**HON. ROLAND PENNER (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that it would be my duty, and I intend to make it my duty not to interfere with the due administration of justice. Not so long ago in this House, I was asked by the former Attorney-General about what I might do in the event that anyone attempted to open up a freestanding abortion clinic in Manitoba. I said then and my answer now is analogous to that, I would not interfere with the due administration of justice.

If rightly or wrongly, Mr. Speaker, the federal authorities acting within their jurisdiction launched a prosecution, that is for them. And for me, even before that has happened, to get on the blower to the Federal Minister of Justice and say: "Hey, don't enforce your laws," would not only be wrong, it would be impudent and I don't intend to that, nor should I be asked to.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has had some experience in the administration of justice; I've had some experience in it; the former Attorney-General has; and I can tell him that it's not unusual for Attorneys-General to make submissions to their federal counterparts when they see something that is utterly foolish going on. There is a section, Mr. Speaker, — and I frame my question to the Attorney-General in these terms — there is a section in the new Charter of Rights, a document that appears to be favoured by the current Attorney-General which while dealing with evidential matters uses the words of putting the administration of justice into disrepute. I suggest to him, Sir, that the Minister of Justice, by permitting these nonsensical prosecutions to proceed, is putting the administration of justice in this country

into disrepute. Will not that cause the Attorney-General of Manitoba to make representations on behalf of the business community and the people of this province against this silly metric prosecution business.

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

**MR. PENNER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in the citation of rules, which I understand you distributed to the members — I have a copy of them — one of the things that is enjoined is the asking of hypothetical questions; that is, one would have to deal with a hypothesis and I don't intend to deal with a hypothesis. As of now, I'm not aware of anyone in Manitoba being prosecuted under that Act. Should that arise and should representations be made to me, I will deal with them, but I have given to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition a statement of general policy which I intend to follow. Federal prosecutors may, as Crown prosecutors do here from time to time, stay charges where indeed, a situation arises where to pursue the matter might indeed — and I think the phrase is appropriate — bring the administration of justice into disrepute.

One cannot, I think, hypothetically deal with whether or not a given situation does or does not do that. We leave a great deal of discretion at the prosecutorial level relying on the common sense and we have reason to believe that works well of the Crown prosecutors or the federal prosecutors acting within their jurisdiction.

The section of the Charter, to which my learned friend the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition refers, deals with evidentiary matters but I'm content to use the phrase in its broader application as he has, and hope, indeed, that in any given situation, whether within our jurisdiction or the federal jurisdiction, the law is not so enforced that it does bring the administration of justice into disrepute. There we have a common view.

**MR. LYON:** A final supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, working on the age-old axiomatic premise that a stitch in time saves nine, would the Attorney-General not agree that to make such representations before any silly prosecutions begin in Manitoba would not be helpful to Manitoba business; in words that I don't mind if he appropriates, tell the Federal Government to keep their carpet snoopers and carpetbaggers out of Manitoba on metric prosecutions.

**MR. PENNER:** No, I certainly will not, either in the language used by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition or even in politer language, which I would hope I would use, act in that way. I will act in the way I've outlined in the answer to the two previous questions.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Could the Minister of Mines and Energy, in view of the lay-off announcements that we have been hearing recently from ManFor — I think the most recent announcement was a week ago today — could he bring us up to date on the current state of negotiations for a joint partnership or joint venture on

behalf of the Government of Manitoba, as owner of ManFor, and any other private sector company, could he bring us up to date as to the status of those negotiations at the present time?

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

**HON. WILSON PARASIUK (Transcona):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we've had discussions with one company that the previous government had discussions with before. Those discussions are continuing. We are talking to a couple of other companies just to see what the options might be.

Mr. Speaker, what we've done, we've launched a joint set of engineering studies with the Federal Government to ensure that we can get the maximum amount of federal contributions to any type of development in The Pas. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will remember the difficulty that was experienced in trying to get any type of firm commitment of federal monies to any type of development at The Pas. There's a belief of this government that type of contribution of federal money, which has been made to forestry improvements, pulp and paper improvements, sawmill improvements, in eastern Canada, should apply equally as well to Manitoba because we have a forestry resource here, Mr. Speaker, that contributes greatly to Manitoba's gross domestic product and we feel strongly that the Federal Government should contribute. We've had meetings at the ministerial level with the Federal Government. The response was favourable in a general manner and now we want to firm it up through some very detailed studies.

We have informed the companies of what we are doing with the Federal Government and we are bringing them along as we proceed with the technical studies to ensure that when those technical and engineering studies are completed we could make a decision, not only with respect to federal contributions, but with respect to some possible joint venture with other parties.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer. To be somewhat more explicit I wonder if he could advise the House, Sir, if one of the companies, and the name has been in the public forum before, with whom he is maintaining an active stance of negotiation is the Repap Company, which was one company that had moved along the furthest in negotiations with the previous government and in negotiations with the Federal Government.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary on that point, is the Minister satisfied that the study which he and his federal counterpart have under way, is he satisfied that study will not prejudice the successful culmination of negotiations either with Repap or with any other private sector companies that are involved?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, that would in part be determined by the conclusions of the technical studies, although I don't think that should impinge on the

possibility of relating to Repap or to any other companies. Although I think the Leader of the Opposition can recall that there were some difficulties with respect federal contributions in the past and I hope those difficulties can, in fact, be removed, but I can't be certain at this particular stage, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition can recall some of the problems that, I think, his government encountered in this particular respect.

**MR. LYON:** A final point, Mr. Speaker, could we have some indication from the Minister on the specific point as to the time that may be required for the federal-provincial study? Is he satisfied or can he ensure that the study, which may well be required, does not interfere with the successful conclusion of a joint venture agreement with one of the companies?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, the joint venture discussions carried out by the previous government, from the documentation I have available to me, were dependent on federal contribution, which at that time weren't forthcoming for particular reasons that I think were kept private between both levels. We hope that the general commitment that we have received from the Federal Government was a sincere one. That's why we have proceeded with the technical engineering studies which focus first on the sawmill and it will require more time to look at the pulp and paper complex. I would hope that the sawmill study, the engineering study, would be completed within two to three months. The pulp and paper complex study may take between six to eight months. We're trying to move the process as quickly as possible, but in order to ensure the federal participation, we have to go through the particular steps required by their Treasury Board process. But we are, I think, moving very quickly in this respect, Mr. Speaker, and I can't see a reason why involvement with the Federal Government to ensure federal contribution should jeopardize any discussions that might be held with any parties with respect to the way in which other parties might relate to that development either in the way of marketing or in the way of technical skills that they might bring or management skills, Mr. Speaker. But again, I can't see any logical reason, but who can tell? We'll have to determine that in the future.

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

**MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services.

I'd like to ask him, Sir, whether he will consider expansion or broadening of the task force that he announced earlier this week, yesterday I believe, to examine Manitoba's provincial and municipal social assistance programs? Will he consider an enrichment of that range of personnel examining that question?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East):** Well, Mr. Speaker, we're always ready to listen and con-

sider reasonable suggestions.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, without in any way reflecting on the quality of the personnel named to the committee, all of whom I think are eminently suited to provide valuable input, I would ask the Minister whether he would take under consideration the fact that the vast majority of the members of the committee whom he has appointed are associated with tax supported institutions, tax supported bodies in this province. In view of the fact that committee will be dealing with the whole income security area in Manitoba, would he consider expanding it through the addition of persons from the private sector and from other perspectives who can add additional ingredients of thinking to the process that will be at hand?

**MR. EVANS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the honourable member agrees with the people that we have put on. It was our objective to put a cross section of persons who were knowledgeable in the field not necessarily in delivering it, but somehow or other had some knowledge of it either through Legal Aid Manitoba or through the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg. The Social Planning Council of Winnipeg is a body supported by various groups and does various types of social research. We simply asked that organization if they would submit a name to us, someone who could help us in this very important task. They did and we accepted their name. But generally we've got a group of people who are very knowledgeable and I think will come up with a piece of research and a report that will be of use to the government, to the Legislature in considering any changes that may be necessary and desirable in the future.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, I would simply ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he would consider the fact that from one perspective, the complement composition of the task force may be rather limited in its orientation and consider the fact that it could be used to go to the private sector for some additional input?

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister whether there is any change in his position with respect to the establishment of a review or the undertaking of a review of the Child Welfare System which I concede is a different subject but nonetheless is a matter that we discussed during his Estimates? Where is the status of his thinking on that subject?

**MR. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a very broad question, the status of my thinking on a subject such as broad as the child welfare legislation. There's no question in my mind that many of the programs and many of the policies that have been in place for some years should be reviewed. Certainly, I think this is one area that deserves a lot of consideration and it certainly will receive hopefully adequate consideration in the years ahead. One element of it, of course, is being addressed in a sense by the Kimelman Committee. That's only one small element, I must agree, but our intentions are the best as I'm sure the intentions were the best of my honourable friend when he was Minister responsible in this area as well as being responsible in Health, but certainly it is uppermost in our minds. I can't be anymore specific than that at the

present time.

**MR. SHERMAN:** A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the Minister mean that the child welfare system is a very broad area or the status of his thinking is a very broad area?

**MR. EVANS:** Both, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. HARRYENNS (Lakeside):** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable First Minister. The other evening, Mr. Speaker, his Minister of Northern Affairs and Environment in my judgement correctly advised a group of Manitoba residents about the responsibility that the Federal Government had with respect to an environmental problem in their homes arising out of a federal program involving insulation.

My question to the First Minister is why the inconsistency in terms of that position as compared to the position that he is taking with the Department of Water Resources in rushing in to commit the province to upwards to 40 percent contribution in an area which heretofore has traditionally and clearly constitutionally has been totally a federal responsibility. I'm referring to the aid being promised to the Peguis Indian Reserve.

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

**HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that question has been very well answered by the Ministers previously.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister once more that question. Is that a position, a commitment that this government will accept on all Indian reservations regardless of what constituencies they are located?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I thought that the Minister dealt with that question the other day that it will be dealt with in a program by program basis regardless of the constituency. The important question will be the needs, the particular circumstances involving the program by program analysis.

**MR. ENNS:** A final supplementary question. I suspect that the needs and requirements of the some 400 to 500 homeowners that met with the Minister of Environment were equally great and needed. I suggest to the Honourable First Minister that his course of action and that of his Minister was the correct one in recognizing the appropriate responsibility, namely the Federal Government. This new policy that is being enunciated by the First Minister through the Minister of Natural Resources is a very significant departure in Manitoba. Is that the case?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the analogy whatsoever between the two programs nor do I think the honourable member understands the analogy. In connection with the question of the foam, there is a legal obligation on the part of the Federal

Government, a legal obligation on their part, to provide compensation to the homeowners that have been prejudiced. In the other example that the honourable member has provided, I know not of any legal obligation in respect to the matter pertaining to the water resources.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I ask perhaps the Attorney-General if he cannot confirm that the Federal Government has a legal obligation, a treaty obligation and by tradition a historical pattern of accepting 100 percent the responsibility of a whole host of services that are required from time to time on reservation lands that are administered and federally responsible to the Federal Government.

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

**MR. PENNER:** The difference is this, and I would like it to be well understood, that there is a difference in the legal obligation in terms of jurisdiction and between the legal obligation in terms of a cause of action.

What we are saying with respect to foam is that it appears clearer and clearer, day by day, that the Federal Government acted negligently and that there is a cause of action against the Federal Government for acting negligently just as there would be a cause of action against a person for acting negligently. We believe that cause which has been taken up and which we will support and assist will bring the relief to those homeowners which we acknowledge they deserve and we're encouraging them in every way to follow that course of action because it's from the feds where it must come, but the question of jurisdictional obligation to the Native people is a much different question. I understand that the Honourable Member for Lakeside may not understand that distinction. It's quite clear that the Honourable Member for Pembina doesn't want to understand that distinction but that's their problem.

**MR. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I do now ask very sincerely. It's just a straightforward question. Has it not been the Federal Government's responsibility whether it is in the building of roads, whether it is in the provision of housing, which certainly our Native brothers, our requirement is just as they are in other communities, but housing programs that are carried on our reservations have been carried on under the aegis of the Federal Government? Road building has been done on the same basis; training programs, these are by Constitution, by treaty, by arrangement. In fact, it is a position that the Indian Brotherhood maintains and want to maintain very strictly. They do not want to take the Federal Government off the hook, relieve them of that responsibility and I find it very strange coming from this government and from the Attorney-General that seems to question this long-held responsibility of the Federal Government vis-a-vis our Indian Reserves.

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

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, far from questioning the federal obligation with respect to aboriginal and

Treaty rights, it is the position of this government that we, in a different forum, are going to be doing everything that we can leading up to the forthcoming Constitutional Conference to strengthen the position of the Native people with respect to aboriginal and Treaty rights and with respect to federal obligations, everything that we possibly can we're working to support these groups in that way and in other ways.

Here, as I indicated with respect to the UFFI problem, the foam problem, we are supporting the UFFI people in a particular way. There are different areas, different questions of legal obligations, different methods of support, that's all I'm saying, quite sincerely.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister, I ask the First Minister then if, in fact, this is not a political payoff at the expense of the rest of Manitoba taxpayers as a result of the election on November 17th.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I can recall when indeed the previous government divided Manitobans into two sets of citizens, when they discontinued the payment of provincial employment program grants insofar as the pensioners were concerned so that pensioners in other parts of the province continued to receive them but those on Native Reserves did not receive grants.

I can recall indeed when bursary assistance was cut off insofar as students coming from the reserves in Manitoba to attend at universities. Mr. Speaker, I could recall many other instances, and I wish the Honourable Member for Rupertsland was here because he could list many many instances where Native people have been treated as second-class citizens in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, there are federal obligations, there are provincial obligations, but when it comes to certain areas of programs such as those that I mentioned and others, we do not intend to treat the Native people in this province in an inferior basis.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, following upon that rather remarkable statement of the First Minister wherein he attempts to divide into some sort of mythical class system which perhaps suits his ideological well-springs, but has no relationship to fact, the treatment that is accorded by any government to Native citizens in Manitoba. Is he aware in the slightest, Sir, of the tripartite negotiations that were going on between the Federal Government, the Indian Bands and the Provincial Government wherein this government, the administration of Manitoba, identified at least \$35 million of provincial taxpayers' money which was wrongfully being used with respect to services for Indian Bands in Manitoba which should be paid for by the Federal Government? Is he aware of that, No. 1, and No. 2, if he is aware of it, how can he go ahead and casually and lackadaisically accept a responsibility to pay flood damages which heretofore, to the best of our knowledge, have never been paid by the Provincial Government but have always been paid by the

Federal Government, with that kind of fact facing him with respect to the \$35 million that the taxpayers of Manitoba are already paying that they need not be paying?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the tripartite negotiations that the Leader of the Opposition makes reference to were proceeding quite well indeed in the period leading up to '77. It is my understanding they went nowhere in the past four years when indeed the previous administration had responsibility in the Province of Manitoba for those negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talks about referring to some sort of class situation. The Leader of the Opposition knows full well what he is talking about when he refers to class situation because it was the policies initiated by the previous administration that were, indeed, structuring a class situation insofar as treatment of various peoples within the Province of Manitoba.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would consult with his colleague, the Minister of Community Services, with reference to his statement of a few moments ago that from 1977 and 1981 the tripartite negotiations went nowhere. I wonder if he would check with the Minister of Community Services with respect to the recent establishment of an Indian child welfare system in Manitoba, in Southern Manitoba, which at the time of its announcement was acknowledged fairly and honestly by the Minister of Community Services as being the result of a considerable amount of work done between 1977 and 1981 by the former government.

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

**MR. G.W.J. (Gerry) MERCIER, (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Highways or the Minister of Urban Affairs. The government has failed to achieve co-operative federalism, Mr. Speaker, but I wonder if they could achieve a practical working relationship with the City of Winnipeg. In view of the work being done by the City of Winnipeg on Route 90 and the St. James Bridge, Mr. Speaker, in view of their advice to motorist and truck drivers to use alternative routes such as Maryland or the Perimeter Highway, could the Minister explain why the Department of Highways is proceeding at this time with work on the median on the Perimeter Highway between Roblin Boulevard and Portage Avenue and reducing traffic to one lane in each direction thereby causing, Mr. Speaker, even more congestion than would ordinarily be there and would they consider deferring this work, as they have been requested to do by the City of Winnipeg, until the work on Route 90 is completed?

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

**HON. EUGENE KOSTYRA (Seven Oaks):** Yes, Mr.

Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and report back to the House when I get the answer.

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister responsible for the Workplace Safety and Health. It is reported that workers who work on the video display terminals in the government have received a suggestion, a cure for eye strain and tension headaches, the direction that they massage their scalps and squint and wishes those who try the therapy, "good luck." Is that the new thrust, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister's policy on Workplace Safety and Health?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. JAY COWAN (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I would only hope that Member for St. Norbert would read the entire article and then he would not abuse the time of this House in asking that particular question, because the article did very clearly indicate that is an unofficial directive and one of which we do not endorse. Now having had the opportunity to expand upon that a bit, I would like to set the record very clear in stating that the Workplace Safety and Health Division does have some very serious concerns about the use of video display terminals and the proper use of video display terminals. I should clarify that, we are concerned about some of the hazards which may be associated with that use and, correspondingly, we have issued directives to those individuals who have come to us to ask for information on the use of this new technology. These are official directives as compared to what was described accurately so in the media as an unofficial directive from an unnamed source within the government department.

If I should happen to know who that source was, and I am attempting to find out, then I will try to provide that individual with a more accurate description of what the official policy and the official directives of the department are. But for the benefit of the House, and for the benefit of those individuals who may be watching these proceedings or listening to these proceedings and who do have to use video display terminals, and I direct my comments in specific to the Hansard operators, who have to use those terminals, there are some problems. Some of those problems are fairly well defined and documented. We are worried about the economics of the situation; we are worried about glare from fluorescent lights interfering with a person watching the machines. For that reason, we have asked, and this is government policy that when those machines are put in place that we consider the working environment so as to ensure that the effect of those machines is minimal upon individuals . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

**MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Virden):** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister is referring to the Hansard operators and if his speeches were a little shorter, it wouldn't be so hard on the Hansard girls.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thank the Honourable Member for Virden. I'm not sure whether it was a point of order; however, it's my impression that the Minister is nearing the end of his answer.

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I've tried short answers, but I find that if I give short answers we go the full 40 minutes anyway, so I think it makes little difference on the Hansard operators in respect to the Question Period. I do wish to commend them on their good job, but having said that, I do wish to warn them about some of the hazards which may be associated with the use of this new technology.

We have directed departments to take a look at the working environment. We have also suggested that workers who are going to be working on videodisplay terminals have eye examinations and have a surveillance program to ensure that any difficulties, which may result as a result of their working with those machines, in respect to their vision can be clearly documented.

Finally, we are advising individuals who ask us that there is no definitive action or no definitive decision one way or the other in respect to the effect of VDTs on pregnant women, and therefore we are suggesting that if a pregnant woman requests a transfer away from a video display terminal, when in fact she is operating one, that transfer be granted.

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

**MR. DAVID R. (Dave) BLAKE (Minnedosa):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

In view of the fact that there are obviously funds available, I wonder if he could inform the House if the additional funds requested have been provided to the Game Branch Section in his department in connection with the extra staff required to check on illegal sale of game in the province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. AL MACKLING (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, I have been assured by staff that more effective use is being made of services in that department. There were changes in personnel, consolidations in respect to the department as a consequence of the merger of Parks and Natural Resources and I've reviewed the deployment of personnel and I'm satisfied that, given the financial circumstances of this government, we are doing our utmost with the personnel to provide adequate supervision of this resource.

**MR. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, there was a specific request for additional equipment and more sophisticated radio equipment and some extra vehicles. Is he saying now, that they are not being provided to the department?

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, there is naturally an ongoing consideration of vehicles and equipment in the department. Equipment as it becomes obsolete or worn is replaced. There has been no significant

change that I'm aware of in programming for equipment and vehicles and so on. There are improved techniques that have been put in place in respect to use of radio equipment and so on. So there is a constant upgrading, but there has been no massive change in the function of the department. There are concerns that we could do a great deal more but, Mr. Speaker, it is virtually impossible to have sufficient conservation officers, sufficient staff, to detect every problem that arises.

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

**MR. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. In view of the fact the First Minister promised to the beef producers of the Province of Manitoba in the election campaign, and in view of the fact that we voted some \$14.5 million for the beef producers of the province, and last night at a meeting in Brandon where there were in excess of 400 beef producers in Manitoba totally rejected the beef producer program that his Minister of Agriculture has introduced, will he instruct his Minister of Agriculture to immediately, with a no strings attached marketing scheme and all that other glorious socialistic ideas he has with it, will he instruct his Minister to immediately pay out the \$50 per cow to each beef producer in the Province of Manitoba?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Arthur had indeed been following what has been taking place, and the format and the structure that the Minister of Agriculture has been putting in place, he'd be aware that meetings are taking place throughout the Province of Manitoba, meetings to deal with the detail of the Beef Stabilization Program; that those details are being finalized through a process of consultation with the beef farmers of the Province of Manitoba. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in the implementation of those details, the program itself may undergo positive change.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately insofar as the present Member for Arthur is concerned, that consultation did not take place, and the honourable member apparently does not understand the process of consultation when it takes place throughout the various parts of Manitoba involving beef producers, consultation encouraged by the Minister of Agriculture.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, it's all very well for the First Minister to go over his grand and glorious comments.

The question to him was, will he instruct his Minister of Agriculture to pay out the \$14.5 million to the beef producer on a \$50 per head basis without any strings attached?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the member ought to know the meetings are taking place, that the Minister of Agriculture is meeting with beef producers, and my what a pleasant change it is after the previous four years when nothing was being done, meetings, discussion, programs — nothing was done in the previous four years — for the former Minister of Agricul-

ture now to rise to his feet and piously attempt to condemn the present Minister of Agriculture, who at least is attempting to evolve a program that is satisfactory to beef producers of Manitoba.

**MR. DOWNEY:** One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The First Minister refers to meetings that have taken place throughout the province. My colleague, the Member for Emerson, indicated to him what the results of the meeting at Vita were earlier this week where, from the floor, the people were calling for the Minister of Agriculture's resignation. Those same kinds of comments are travelling throughout all of Manitoba. Will he live up to the requests of the people of the agricultural community and have his Minister of Agriculture resign?

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** I don't doubt that there are some that would call for the resignation of any particular Minister but I do know, Mr. Speaker, that on November 17th the people of the Province of Manitoba called for the retirement of the previous Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba, that I do know.

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

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS (Cont'd)

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we go to Orders of the Day — order please, order please. Order please. A little earlier this morning I was a little premature in announcing the presence of a group of students who had not yet entered the gallery.

Since that time there are 52 students of Grade 5 standing of the Maple Leaf School in the gallery under the direction of Mr. Bourbonniere. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River East.

On behalf of all of the honourable members, I welcome you here today.

#### COMMITTEE CHANGES

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

**MR. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, just an announcement with respect to committee changes. Law Amendments which is meeting on Tuesday, May 4, at 10 o'clock, the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs will be replaced by the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines will be replaced by the Honourable Member for Gimli.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented.**

#### MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to rise on a point of grievance, a Matter of Grievance, particularly in light of the fact that No. 1, it is very difficult to find the Minister of Agriculture in this House. He is either trying to recover from an illness that he has prior to becoming Minister or with the ill-conceived programs that he's trying to force down the throats of the people of Manitoba that the reaction that he is getting from them is somewhat poisonous to him and he is unable to face the Opposition in this Chamber. We are unable to question the Minister of Agriculture on the policies and programs that he's introduced and I know it's unparliamentary to refer to the attendance of a member in this House, I will withdraw that particular comment, but it's certainly a point that I thought that should be made.

Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the agricultural community today is one that has to be addressed, not just the beef industry but particularly the whole of the agricultural community, and I will try to keep my remarks specifically to the beef industry but I may somewhat wander because I have two or three other major items of concern to me at this particular time. Mr. Speaker, in reference to a particular business that I am familiar with there has been some research work done and I think we can all accept the fact that the Manitoba Co-Operator pretty much represents the major advertising paper or the communication link for the farm community within the media of Manitoba. Some research points out that we have seen in the month of April, taken for the last three years, an average of probably 170 farm auction sales in the Province of Manitoba. Without having the last edition of this week's Co-Operator calculated in these figures, we are now seeing well in excess of 200 farm sales, Mr. Speaker, something that I think is a figure that the Minister of Agriculture should be prepared to look at and review.

I would estimate, Mr. Speaker, of those additional increases that there are a lot of those people who are, in fact, being forced out of business, something that the First Minister of this province promised the people of Manitoba wouldn't happen. Where is he going, Mr. Speaker? He stands in this House, he says we're consulting with the beef producers. What are the beef producers telling him? They're saying that the program that his Minister of Agriculture is a disaster, Mr. Speaker. What he wants to do is change the whole marketing system. What he wants to do is control whether the cow-calf people feed their cattle to slaughter weight; and a further discredit to his government, the Minister of Economic Development says that it's the beef program that's going to enhance the marketing or the slaughterhouse industry in the province and make it a great, grand and glorious business, Mr. Speaker. What an ill-conceived group of people have we got running the Province of Manitoba? Where is the leadership, Mr. Speaker? I, for the life of me, cannot sit in here as a member of Opposition and take it much longer, that's why I am compelled to stand and speak.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a lot of the one-termers on the other side, and I refer to them as one-termers because the Member for Flin Flon yesterday truly indicated the length of time that he'll be in this House. I'm pleased the Dean of this House and a longstanding member in

good order, Wally McKenzie for Roblin-Russell, stood in his place and gave that member what I would call a good blistering that he deserved for the comments he made.

Referring to my colleague for Turtle Mountain of misleading the people of Manitoba when the Minister of Agriculture in this House, Mr. Speaker, said what does private ownership have to do with food production? — and we're moving to a Soviet system of food production or of land ownership. Mr. Speaker, that's Communism, that's Communism in Russia, Poland. The people are starving and that's what he says is going to happen in Manitoba. Why doesn't the Minister of Agriculture stand in his place and defend himself, Mr. Speaker. He can't even attend question period to face these people who want to ask him questions on what he's doing in the province; he's ruining agriculture. Mr. Speaker, he's ruining the agricultural industry and I think he should listen to what the meetings are telling him.

The First Minister says were consulting with the farm community. What is the farm community telling him? They're telling him to stick their programs where "Paddy put his six pence," Mr. Speaker, that's what they're telling him. It happened right in Vita; it happened in Brandon. They don't want the ill-conceived programs and let's go a little further.

We have a sister province to the west of us, Mr. Speaker, that have a strong rural base. Who did they elect as their Premier, Mr. Speaker, in Saskatchewan? A farmer, Mr. Speaker, a farmer to replace the socialistic misguided policies of Allen Blakeney, Gordon MacMurchy and all those people who want to do what? They want to put the farm community back in the horse and buggy days and they've proven it here by introducing a resolution on the Crow rate, Mr. Speaker.

I will get up and speak on the Crow rate and I'll lay a few current history facts on the record. I'll get up and speak on it because under the leadership of Sterling Lyon, Mr. Speaker, in his four years of office we saw more aggressive, positive moves taken throughout the nation in the movement of grain and grain transportation in this country. More positive moves, and we didn't stand up with a rhetoric of "save the Crow; bury your head in the sand, ostrich." No, Mr. Speaker, we go down to the problem at hand and dealt with it. As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, we saw record numbers of bushels and tonnes of grain, if you want to go metric as your Attorney-General does and the Member for Gimli, we saw record bushels of grain move not only through the western and eastern ports, but the northern ports of Churchill as well.

What happened last fall when the labour movement in Thunder Bay, Mr. Speaker, cut off the life-blood of the farm community? The Premier of the province stood up and said by telex to the Prime Minister, it cannot be tolerated, management and labour have to sit down and get back to work.

I spoke at a meeting, Mr. Speaker, in Miami where there were thousands of farmers gathered on a busy harvest day. To do what? To protest what was happening in the labour movement in this country. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this government should be dealing with. What about the Manco plants that have been closed and the dairy farmers that can go plumb to



Hades? That's what they're telling our dairy farmers. That's what they're telling them. What has the Minister of Agriculture done when it comes to the overall policies of the grain industry in this province. You haven't heard from him, you haven't heard from him, Mr. Speaker. What did he do, Mr. Speaker, he hired a couple of ill-conceived socialists around him to try and redirect the people of the Province of Manitoba and the farm community. His executive assistant, Mr. Speaker — why doesn't he tell the farm people what he has for an executive assistant? A fine gentleman of the cloth, a fine man of the cloth; he used to be the Minister in my own local church, but he doesn't know Hades, Mr. Speaker, about agriculture and cannot relate to the farm community. He's a socialist hack that he brought back from Saskatchewan when he felt the ship sinking out in that country.

Let us, Mr. Speaker, go back to the Saskatchewan election. Every policy that this government have introduced and stood for, Mr. Speaker, every policy they've introduced and stand for, were wiped clean in the agricultural-based Province of Saskatchewan; wiped clean, demolished. Now, they're trying to shove it down our throats. Why don't they pay attention, Mr. Speaker, or else call an election? They've proven that they don't believe farmers should own their lands; they've cancelled the Crown lands sales; they've taken away the best MACC Farm Credit Program; farm sales are at record highs, Mr. Speaker, and people are going out of business every day and they are doing darn little to help them other than to speed it up with their ill-conceived programs. Not one nickel, Mr. Speaker, has flown from his election promises.

The First Minister of this province, I would hope would go through the Province of Manitoba and close those buildings that he's not supporting. He should be cutting the ribbon on building closures. That's what he should be doing because that's all he's any good for, Mr. Speaker.

I, Mr. Speaker, am totally upset about the way in which this government is handling the affairs of the Province of Manitoba. I believe, again, that it's been demonstrated time and time again with what we've seen in Saskatchewan that there is in fact some common-sense approaches to what is happening in this country.

What are the issues that are facing people? The energy costs certainly and the mounting of energy taxation on the backs of people. Trudeau's doing enough of that without the provinces having to do it. Petrocan, who wants to buy Petrocan? Who needs it? —(Interjection)— The Member for River East needs Petrocan and "Landslide" from Thompson would love to have a share of Petrocan. What he's got is a dominating, state-owned controlled business that when they don't want to pour him a gallon of gasoline after five in the afternoon, he'll blasted well walk to where he wants to go. That's the kind of a country we're going into, Mr. Speaker. We're maybe doing it at a national level and they maybe thought that they were making great strides in Manitoba, but in Saskatchewan on Monday they hit a knot in the rope that I'll tell you they'll have a long time digesting, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite had better smarten up pretty quick, particularly the Minister of Agriculture, who I am sure is very upset, and he well should be, about the

reaction of the farm community when he says what has private ownership to do with the production of food. We know, Mr. Speaker, that when we had a drought in the Province of Manitoba, we had a farm community that were terribly upset because they didn't believe the environment was going to support them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Our rules call for only one debate at a time. If there are other members who wish to debate between themselves, perhaps they could do so somewhere else.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your courteous efforts to allow me to continue on my comments, which I do feel very strongly and deeply about, because it is a disastrous day in Manitoba when we see this kind of governing taking place. The irresponsibility that we are seeing when the First Minister of the province stands up and tries to cover up with a smokescreen the damage and the destruction of not only his Minister of Agriculture, but I can go around every one of them — the increased school taxes — and him to stand up and say we had a bandaid approach to the education taxation system in the province when the numbers of percentage increase, Mr. Speaker, have been increased at a fantastic rate when particularly landowners and businesses are having extreme difficulty. The province last year put in \$70 million and a restructuring of the whole financial system.

We've had the Walter Weir Commission do a total review of the whole business of assessment and the Minister — and this is really very interesting, because as I said last night in committee, the only election promise that the First Minister has lived up to is that he's promised to give the Member for Neepawa a Cabinet post. Well, he gave him a Cabinet post and I'm glad he gave him the one that he did because he'll be able to demonstrate the kind of capabilities throughout all of the municipal people in Manitoba of that kind of government. I think that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is a good reflection of the kind of government that the First Minister has and that's the kind of thing I think he should demonstrate throughout Manitoba. I'm pleased that he gave him that portfolio.

But, what is his major thrust? We're dealing with the whole area of assessment which generates the revenue for all the community services that are best looked after by local government. What is he doing with that committee? Well, he wants more consultation with the rural municipalities. Well, that's good, but his major thrust is a \$1.5 million Main Street Manitoba Program. Well, under his policies, Mr. Speaker, under the present First Minister's policies there won't be any Main Streets left in the Province of Manitoba, there won't be any Main Streets left because they're all closing up, Mr. Speaker. It's a disaster! He, on November 17th came to power; certainly, he came to power with the number of seats to administer and govern this province under the democratic system, but I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, they aren't by any means the wishes of the majority of the people of Manitoba, as is being demonstrated by the way in which my colleagues on this side of the House are

pointing every day in question period, every speech that is heard, Mr. Speaker.

I have to give credit to the Minister of Health. He is not coming under a lot of attack, because he's introducing a good health program that was put in place by our Minister of Health under our term of office. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, it's a common-sense approach and it was inherent.

The Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, I never for the life of me sat in on Estimates anything like it in my life last night. I couldn't believe it. He hasn't got a policy or a program and can't stand up on his own two feet. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's in the best interests of the province to have Ministers of the Crown who can't come out with a specific policy without wavering and waffling the way they do; either they're afraid to enunciate them to the people of Manitoba or they don't have any. I would think the latter part is that they don't have any and in five months of office are already bankrupt, bankrupt of ideas.

What are they going to do, Mr. Speaker? They're going to roll in hundreds of socialist hacks from Saskatchewan now to further help them in their misguided way. Well, Mr. Speaker, welcome to them because I think it'll just further help the demise of the Howard Pawley Government. He talks about the fact that he's not going to be a one-term office. I would speculate that he won't even make the full term, because if any of those people are bringing forward the comments and the ideas from their constituencies like a few members that I would hope would be talking to their constituencies, then they'll tell him where he stands and they'll leave him; stand as naked as the old crow is dead that he's trying to debate in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the record is pretty well clear, I believe, Mr. Speaker, the whole process of government in the last four years under Sterling Lyon's Government and under the members — and I certainly don't want to take any credit for it, Mr. Speaker, — but, I'll tell you we had some difficult times and we dealt with them responsibly. We can talk about drought, flood, forest fires, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — You know this is interesting; the Minister of Natural Resources from his chair, as he usually speaks — it's hard to tell whether he's on his feet or his chair anyway — but anyway when he speaks he says what did I do without about beef? Well, Mr. Speaker, if he knew anything about the beef industry at all, he would know that when we took office the beef industry was starting to improve and we in our first term under their ill-conceived program paid out \$6 million; yes, we paid out \$6 million. They can't say that they paid out all that \$40 million because that program was still in place and we paid out some \$6 million under that old ill-conceived beef program and then under our administration, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Natural Resources should know this, the market went up. We didn't get in there with the hammer and sickle, try and straighten it around and cut it up and implement programs and marketing systems that were not in support of the beef industry. We let the thing go and tried to implement policies that would support the people.

Well, let's talk about the \$40 million drought program without any strings attached. The Premier and I and some of my colleagues, the Minister of Natural

Resources, the Member for Turtle Mountain, flew to Brandon or drove to Brandon. However we got there, we were in a hurry to get there because the people needed some assistance. Yes, we were, and we met with every municipal councillor. We had that hall filled with people and they were distressed and they were in a thinking of drought and depression mind and they weren't very happy, Mr. Speaker, but when they left that meeting they didn't have to worry about going through a bureaucratic entanglement to get the cash money they needed. They had to go to their municipal councillor and get him to approve payment of the funds and the funds were paid. \$40 million was approved and they'll say well, sure, that \$40 million wasn't all used, but as much of it was used as was needed by the farm community.

We didn't try and force feed it like they're trying to force feed that program now and I still maintain, Mr. Speaker, if they'd give the freedom to the farmers and let them go ahead and give them assistance, they wouldn't need all the money that they're trying to say is available. It's proven time and again, that give the farmer a bit of support when he needs it, let him go when he doesn't need it and he'll produce the food for this nation that you've never seen. But no, that doesn't wash with a socialist government. They believe firmly that to give a dollar you've got to take a lifetime of freedom for a dollar's support; that's what a socialist believes in. If I give them a dollar's worth of freedom, then I take their lifetime of freedom away from them.

Yesterday we heard the debate on the Peace Garden. What does the Peace Garden really mean to those people on the other side of the House? The Peace Garden to me, Mr. Speaker, means that we as a nation, we as a province, we as rural and city people in the Province of Manitoba have an establishment there, have a real symbol, a symbol about what it's all about. That's what it's all about, the freedom to do those things that we've had in this country for 114 years and now we've got Pierre Elliott Trudeau with a new Constitution that nobody knows what we have for freedom.

We have a socialist government that does not believe that the farmers should own their land, Mr. Speaker, that the state should not allow the farmers to buy Crown land. I'm not taking those words out of context for the Member for Flin Flon. If that is the case, why doesn't he allow the farmers to buy the Crown land? I challenge the Member for Flin Flon because he was pretty upset yesterday that we're retaking his Minister's words out of context. I challenge him to write a letter, to phone him, to get a hold of him in his hospital bed or to drag him out from under a cattle producer someplace out on the prairie. I challenge him to do that and tell him, reintroduce the selling of Crown land; that's the proof we need, reintroduce the lending programs that were put in place by a Conservative government. That, Mr. Speaker, is all I'm asking for.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left because I have one other area that I want to cover that I feel is very important?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has 22 minutes remaining.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Flin

Flon, I think would be well advised to do a little further review of what happens in the House before he stands up on a grievance and I would say he felt strongly about it. I know he did. I know he felt very strongly about it but he is in a political arena and is he wants to judge the past actions of the people on this side of the House in the last four years, read all the Hansards. I would like him to read what was said by his members on this side of the House and when we were on that side of the House. Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that he wasn't here. Well, I'm kind of glad he wasn't, but it's unfortunate that he wasn't here to see how a government operates under leadership, to see how the Province of Manitoba was moving ahead in a major way to increase the taxation base through our Hydro resource.

Our taxation base, Mr. Speaker, was being built and developed so that we could have the same kinds of funds building as the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The oil industry, Mr. Speaker, we weren't going ahead and spending \$20 million of your and my money as taxpayers to get into the gambling business of drilling oil. My God, we can take all the money we need from them through the taxation policies that governments have the power to introduce without investing money that my constituents, Mr. Speaker, have to earn and pay in taxes for them to go out and gamble on drilling a well whether it's got oil in it or not. That is big money, that is big business. They've done it and they've been taxed and they've paid their royalties, but we've got one layer at PetroCan in the Federal Government. Now we are going to have another one within the provincial jurisdiction. Does he want the municipalities to get into it as well? Is that how he's now suggesting because there is a cap on the municipal ability to go into debt — in fact, they can't — does he expect now that they should get into the oil business and generate revenues in the same way? Revenues by the way that I would challenge them to show us that they're going to make in the next 10 years because with the world oil prices going the way they are, by the time they get established, we'll probably have the cheapest priced oil in the world if the act gets put together at the national level.

Well, it won't because we've still got Pierre Elliott Trudeau and we're still going down the wrong road, Mr. Speaker, supported by the way by the members opposite who put him back in office through a motion of nonconfidence to upset the Joe Clark Government that was coming out with a mortgage rate interest relief program for people who owned houses, for capital gain relief for people that wanted to sell their farms to their families, just a good common sense approach of removing the taxations off the people of the country. But no, we now have Pierre Elliott Trudeau, we have gasoline that was supposed to go up .18 on a tax. It probably has gone up \$1.18 and nobody even knows because he changed the country to metric so nobody understands what the heck we're measuring in. You see, it's all a grand plot to change Canada into a Soviet system of government which the Minister of Agriculture says first of all, he doesn't understand what private ownership has to do with food production and then he says we're moving to the Soviet system. Well, you know, it all ties together.

Ed Broadbent, the leader of the New Democratic

Party, put Pierre Elliott Trudeau back in office and then they wouldn't give the people of Canada the right to own property. It's there; the picture is there. It's a grand design by Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the New Democrats of Canada, and there are quite a few less right today after you look at what happened on Monday. You see, the people of the country won't stand for it. They won't stand for it, Mr. Speaker.

There's one other area that I am terribly upset about and it directly affects me and my constituency and I have to say that I'm glad the Minister of Natural Resources is here because I will direct my comments pretty much to that department. I'm not attacking him. I'm not attacking the previous Ministers of Natural Resources who were my colleagues — (Interjection) — That's right, because the Minister of Natural Resources, if you ask him, sued my constituent. Yes, they sued my constituent because my constituent what he did was he or they — I say more than he — they cut a channel around the Hartney Dam. Now why did they cut a channel? Because they felt when it came about, the flood plain, there was a great mound of dirt and concrete restricting some of the flow of water, to a lay person like me or to my constituents, Mr. Speaker, they believe . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Does the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources have a point of order?

**MR. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Speaker. I wondered if the honourable member would permit a question on that subject.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, following my comments, I will permit a question because I would like to talk to him at some length and if I don't have time in my speech, I'll try and corner him before he leaves the round room here.

Mr. Speaker, I'm referring to the issue of the Souris River and the Hartney Dam and let's just quickly look at the history of some of the developments that have taken place with water and water resources in the Province of Manitoba.

The Red River, of course, we know drains the largest portion of water out of the Hudson's Bay Drainage base and yes, Mr. Speaker, we saw the Red River Floodway built by, I say, a tremendous Premier and supported by the Conservative Government and that was the thing that had to be done. Look at the results and the benefits that were proven in 1979 with the building of the Red River Floodway and then, of course, we saw all the farmland in the southern part of the province that was flooded. Now we went into a major ring diking and protective mechanism paid for by the province and the Federal Government and that, I believe, Mr. Speaker, was the right thing to do.

Then, Mr. Speaker, as a part of the grand drainage basin on that whole system, we saw the developments on the Assiniboine River take place: the Shellmouth Dam in my colleague's constituency, Roblin-Russell, the dam that would hold water back and feed it through the Assiniboine system; the diversion made from the Assiniboine into Lake Manitoba to take off the high water in that time of the year. There's been problems created up at Fairford because of it.

The other part of that, Mr. Speaker, that I think

should have been planned and carried on with and I would have hoped would have been done — I know some of my colleagues were certainly entertaining and looking at the idea — and that was the whole process of doing the third part of the whole drainage basin that comes into Manitoba and that's the Souris River that flows into the Assiniboine at Treesbank or near Wawanesa. That, Mr. Speaker, is another tributary and it's a fairly major one to that whole system. It is unfortunate that we have seen, and I'm not going after the Minister, I'm not going after the previous Ministers, but what I am saying it's unfortunate that the bureaucrats, the engineers who work for the Department of Water Resources, can't seem to be able to work their way through what could be done to that particular area to assist in removal of the water a little faster from the Souris River without affecting the downstream towns.

### POINT OF ORDER

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

**MR. MACKLING:** Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member now in his remarks is questioning the qualifications and the integrity of civil servants in this province and it is tradition in this House that kind of remark does not go unchallenged. I am addressing the point of order and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that those remarks should be withdrawn by the member who has just uttered them.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am not truly making any personal — I think it's the whole core of engineer and I don't think that the member had a point of order. I hope that that is not deducted from my time because I'm trying to lay out the feeling that I have for the whole drainage basin system coming through Manitoba. So Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the member had a point of order.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that to my knowledge, it is the rule of this House that members do not put into question the integrity of civil servants in this province and the honourable member is questioning the integrity, the capacity and the ability of civil servants in my department. I ask that he reconsider his remarks.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not taking a personal attack on anyone at all and is he telling me that his people who work for him, who worked for us, are beyond question, beyond reproach. Are they on some pedestal that nobody can question — my goodness.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I call upon you to make a ruling in respect to my concern.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I will take the matter under advisement so that I can check the actual words used in Hansard and make the matter known in future. The point is a good one. The Honourable Member for Arthur should bear that in mind that criticism or personal criticism of members who are not here is probably not appropriate for debate.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, it's a sad day for democracy if we cannot ask questions of the people who work for the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I will ask questions and I'll challenge the Minister of Natural Resources to meet with my constituents. I am not slamming them. I would not slam them because I know them personally and if I've slammed them, I'll withdraw any remarks, Mr. Speaker. Then I will carry on and suggest that if that is the case, I will challenge the Minister with all the records that have been requested by my constituents and me to sit down with his civil servants; all that information that has been previously requested, and the Minister, with my constituents to meet and discuss and let us question them, let us go over them detail by detail and question them on the water levels.

Well, he refers to a letter, but what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the corps of engineers have not taken into their whole account what has been said locally by the farmers, who have lived there for 100 years and seen what the river does, and sat down, talked to them and had their thoughts and input put in a meaningful way that they have felt the Red River has been fixed. That's important to everybody, we're spending hundreds of millions of dollars to ring dike the towns and villages on the Red River and I was part of supporting all that, Mr. Speaker. I believe it has to be done; the same on the Assiniboine River.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the Souris River Valley deserve equal treatment when it comes to the Water Resource Department of the Province of Manitoba. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to let up on this one and I don't care what the Minister thinks how I'm attacking his department. I'm not attacking them personally but what I am upset about, and I can tell you that on Sunday night of last week, I drove on to a farmer's field where he had just seeded 1,100 acres of flat land and what was happening — the river was pouring out all over top of this land, Mr. Speaker. Then I drove further down the riverbed to south of Melita where the river normally flows north but because corrections haven't been made, it was coming back south again towards the border. Well, we know there's a level problem and the drop between the United States boundary and Hartney is somewhat less than it could be desired, but there are small things that could be done that would make the people at least feel as if there was some caring in government. And one of those things — (Interjection) — no, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting reversing nature.

What I am suggesting that should be done, if the Minister would take it into account and not listen to his engineers for once, and that is to remove the Hartney Dam and restructure it, take all that top — because what they're trying to do is put water through a 600-foot outlet when every bridge on the Souris River is 900 plus, so there is no question that there is a restriction there. There is 300 foot less of area that it has to go through. It's not going to answer the total problems but what it will do, Mr. Speaker, is what that farmer who took the cut around the Hartney Dam thought it would do was help. That's what his department could do right now, is order a dragline in and recut that channel, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask him to do it, because that would give him a lot of marks and it would at least let the people in that area feel —

(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the first reason that the engineers come out and say why it can't be done is because it would weaken the structure of the Hartney Dam. Mr. Speaker, weaken the structure of the Hartney Dam — I would hope that it would wash it away so they could rebuild a dam like is at Souris, where it doesn't affect the flooding; there's a lower part of the dam that holds the water for short periods of time, but when floods come it completely goes. Mr. Speaker, that's what I'm asking the Minister to do, is to cut a channel and remodel that Hartney Dam; do some dredging immediately west of the No. 21 Highway at the Hartney Dam; put a cut straight there. It can't be done now but, let's give — because it's supported by every municipality, Mr. Speaker, between Hartney and the boundary; it isn't as if it's just one farmer. Every municipality have a resolution on the books from Hartney south to remove that or to do something about it. The Town of Hartney have a resolution, Mr. Speaker, to do that. It's not just as if one person was affected. I believe what I heard today there are 40 some farmers affected by what's happening on the Souris River today and it's not a big costly thing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, probably \$100 worth of dynamite would pretty well solve the problem. That would remove the Hartney Dam. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm not saying that should be done. I think that a dragline could remove part of the dirt and give the people the feeling that somebody was interested.

Mr. Speaker, it's not the Ministers. It's the bureaucrats. It's the department who do not believe that it would help. —(Interjection)— Well, that's on paper, Mr. Speaker, that's on paper. I know he's sending a member out of his department to look at it. Mr. Speaker, I've pretty well put on the record my feelings about that current issue but, I think it has to be demonstrated to the people of Manitoba that there is need to develop the water systems that are affecting the whole water system that have been already corrected. That's the point I'm trying to make that the Red has been corrected and people have had government funds to ring dike them. Carman have had promises; Ste. Rose have had promises and, Mr. Speaker, I don't think — he's asking me; you know, he thinks I'm making some accusations against his department. I'll back it up a little further, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister would like to do a survey of all the municipal people in the Province of Manitoba, — all the MLAs — I'd like him to tell me how many of them really support a lot of the work that has been done by the department and what kind of a working relationship has gone on in the last many years between the Department of Water Resources and the municipalities? I agree that they aren't going to agree in all cases. But, let's just take a general survey of the municipalities and find out how many of them really feel strongly that the Department of Water Resources have been really sensitive to the wishes and the demands of all the municipalities. I hope that I'm wrong. I hope that they would come out and say we support everything that has been done, but, Mr. Speaker, it's time to deal with that issue. I don't care what political stripe you are; it's time to deal with it. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, he says I'm in trouble. The only trouble I might be in is that he won't do anything and hold me at ransom over this whole thing. —(Interjection)— I'm not inciting

public mischief.

Mr. Speaker, I've put that on the record and I'm pleased that I have. I'm pleased that I have put it on the record, because I, Mr. Speaker, feel that I represent a constituency and a community that have sometimes misunderstood what other people are trying to do when it comes to the overall operations of the grander scale.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, my grievance by going back over it again. We have the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba who is totally opposed to anything that the farm community want. The feedlot industry, Mr. Speaker, need an assistance program like we've seen in Alberta; like we've seen in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister stands and criticizes me and says what did I do? I had a committee established, Mr. Speaker, with the beef producers of the Province of Manitoba to recommend what would be in their best interests. What they recommended, Mr. Speaker, was a one-time payment and that is still being requested; no strings attached. Then, Mr. Speaker, work out a national stabilization program, because that's what the answer is eventually is a national stabilization program for nationally produced commodities. It just makes good common sense, Mr. Speaker, that when the country of Canada has a support program for anything, it should be on nationally-produced commodities. The Crop Insurance Program is a good example. The Western Grain Stabilization Program is a good example. That's based on a national picture. That's what we need for the beef industry in this country. Mr. Speaker, what we need for the Province of Manitoba is a one-time payment to the feedlot producers and a one-time payment to the cow-calf producers and then work out a national program. That's what should be done. I hope the Minister is working with the Federal Minister at this particular time, but apparently he isn't because he's introducing a six-year program and he's never hoping to get the Federal Government to take on their responsibility when it comes to national stabilization.

The Interest Rate Relief Program, Mr. Speaker, I've laid it on the record; there's an increased number of farm sales probably by 25 percent at least this year. I'm being very conservative but, I'm sure there's 25 to 50 percent increase in farm sales. The Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of the province promised that no one would lose their sales because of high interest rates. The Minister of Agriculture again yesterday confirmed that there wasn't nickel flowed to the farm community or to any of the other aid programs because remember he was the lead Minister on interest rate relief, he was the lead Minister. He was the Committee Chairman; he got his picture on the front page of the Free Press. It said Billie Uruski with a nice smile, the corners of his mouth were turned up to this way, you know. Now I think if you look at him and got a picture there'd be somewhat like the moon that's upside down, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Agriculture is not working in the best interests of that constituency which is his responsibility. So, there hasn't been any emergency interest rate relief program.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen the government say that the best kind of food production is not of private

ownership. I mixed that up. He said that what does private ownership have to do with food production? Well, any Minister of Agriculture in any province in Canada who doesn't understand that isn't worthy of the position of Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, because that's a general understanding of any farm person. We're moving to the Soviet system of land ownership, and what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is he did not stand up and say, "I'm going to try and stop it." He didn't stand up and say, "I don't believe in it, I'm going to try and stop it." He could clean the record off if he would do that, but he won't do it.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister says we're consulting with the beef producers. Well, if he listened to what the beef producers are telling him, then he'd ask for his Minister's resignation because he doesn't wash with the farm community.

Mr. Speaker, we've seen the Crow rate resolution. We've lost the leadership in Manitoba of positive moves made by the hopper car interjections because with all the movement of grain increases — the grain transportation co-ordinator — all that thrust has been lost, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister of Highways and Transportation wants to take us back into the dark ages of horse and buggy days and talk about old-time politics. How many people is he getting at his meeting, Mr. Speaker? He's had five at Portage, Mr. Speaker. How many did he have in Brandon? I'll tell you if he called a beef producer's meeting to talk about the Crow rate he'd get a full house, Mr. Speaker, but they wouldn't want to talk about Crow rate. They'd feed him crow, Mr. Speaker, that's what they'd feed him. That's how he'd get a farm turnout.

The Saskatchewan election, Mr. Speaker, again, strong, rurally-based people shoved the Allan Blakeney Government and the Gordon MacMurchy Government almost out of sight in this world. Who ever thought the great Allan Blakeney would ever disappear from the political scene, the great national leader potential. Mr. Speaker, I've never seen anyone age any faster in my life than he did from the Constitutional pictures that were taken two weeks ago to the ones we saw on Monday night. I feel sorry personally for a person who has to take that kind of defeat but, Mr. Speaker, he doesn't believe in those things that are in the best interests of the rural and the city peoples in Western Canada and he paid the price. You can't, Mr. Speaker, try and lead people in a direction they don't want to go. That's why the Minister of Agriculture and the Premier of Manitoba would be well advised to start to pay attention, Mr. Speaker, and I will speak on the Crow rate and I will lay out my policy and my feelings and I don't think there'll be too much disagreed with by the farm community of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope the Minister of Natural Resources would move to resolve the flooding problem on the Souris River where we've seen the devastation of cropland that's already been seeded, where we're seeing people's lives upset because we have had difficulties with his department over many years and I would hope he would help correct the situation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources speaking to the motion?

**MR. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member indicated that he would permit questions at the end of his submission and I wondered if there is time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member's time has expired. If there is leave of the House, the Minister may proceed. The Minister has leave? (Agreed)

**MR. ORCHARD:** Stand up and answer the question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I'm being admonished from the Member for Turtle Mountain, pardon me, for Pembina to stand up to answer the question. I appreciate that he is of very great stature himself and therefore has some reason to be concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after that rude interruption, let me ask the Honourable Member for Arthur whether or not he, as an Executive Member of government, agreed with his colleague, who is now the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, who was then the Minister of Natural Resources, that the Hartney Dam was not the cause of the flooding in 1979 and incurred with the prosecution of the gentleman who tried to, well, did, in effect, dig a channel around the dam? Did he agree with that?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, do I have leave to answer the question? (Agreed) Mr. Speaker, I will first of all clear up one matter that I did support the Minister of Natural Resources, my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain. I, Mr. Speaker, would like get the information more specifically on whether he said that it didn't cause any flooding. I, Mr. Speaker, agreed with my colleague when the prosecution took place because an act was made by an individual to affect the waterway that is outside his jurisdiction. I supported that action but, Mr. Speaker, what I have said is that I believe that there has to be something done and I've recommended some ways that it could be done.

Now, I don't care what the engineers have to say because we've gone through that before. I know the engineers are good and qualified people, but not in all cases. We're all human beings and certainly an engineer can be allowed one or two errors in his life as well, Mr. Speaker, so it wouldn't cost a lot to find out if the 40 people in the municipalities and the towns in that community are right or wrong. I'm not saying take the dam out and not replace it, I'm saying clear off the flood plain, clear all that garbage of concrete and cement off the top and leave a low-level dam so that when flooding came, the water could go. Remove all the questions that there are about it and leave a low-level dam which wouldn't cost a lot of money. That's what my plea is, Mr. Speaker. But seeing as I have leave to answer the question, I would certainly like to further add to the whole area of my comments that I wasn't quite finished with when my time arose. If I have leave, I understand leave in the House, Mr. Speaker, permits me to do that. Is that not right?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. Beauchesne makes it quite clear, that where a question

occurs at the end of a member's speech, it is for clarification and any remarks by the member have to be strictly relating to that particular question. It is not to be used for the member to make another speech with.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. BRIAN A. RANSOM (Turtle Mountain):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I agree to your ruling. It is certainly correct with respect to clarification. The question asked by the Minister of Natural Resources left an erroneous interpretation on the action that had been taken by myself when I was Minister. I wonder if the Minister of Natural Resources would give leave to let me clear up that misrepresentation.

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

**HON. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** Mr. Speaker, the reason why we have debate, so people can clear up and make their own statement in their speech. This is not a point of order. You give him leave to ask a question, that's your business, not mine. We're certainly not going to have leave to start making speech after speech after 40 minutes; the people can't find time, Mr. Speaker. Anybody can speak on this once during the Session.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. It seems clear that the House is not prepared to give leave for a continuation or discussion on this topic.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS (Cont'd)

**MR. SPEAKER:** May I draw the attention of honourable members to the gallery on my right, where we have 60 students of Grade 6 standing of the West Park School, under the direction of Mr. Ken Doell. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, the question before the House, moved and seconded that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Is that agreed?

### MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise and utilize my opportunity for a grievance at this point in time to address a subject that I believe needs addressing and make some comments and offer some observations that I feel the Opposition would like to make relative to an important issue in Manitoba and in Canada. My grievance is not related, Sir, to any particular events that have been transpiring during this legislative Session. It is directed specifically, Sir, to a public issue, that being the state and condition of the Canadian Health care system and Manitoba's part in that system and, more precisely, the condition surround-

ing Medicare at the present time.

I chose today to utilize my grievance opportunity because of the fact that there are difficult negotiations and difficult discussions and indeed difficult circumstances at work, in various jurisdictions across Canada at the present time, with respect to the Medicare situation and with respect to fee schedule arrangements between various provincial governments and their respective medical associations.

Certainly there has been no resolution up to this point in time of the 1982-83 fee schedule to be in existence in Manitoba for our medical profession, but over and above that, Sir, there are serious activities occurring in medical professions in other parts of Canada. Most notably, Ontario and Quebec that reflect a deepening problem where The Medical Services Act is concerned, where the whole universally insured Medicare system in Canada is concerned. Thus I choose to offer some observations and certain comments at this juncture rather than doing so in a different forum or in a different format later in the Session.

I've said before in this House in this Session, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that Medicare in Canada at the present time represents an endangered species and that, indeed, the whole universal hospitalization system that we have in place in the country is in serious trouble. I want to address myself specifically at this opportunity today to Medicare, to the medical profession, to the difficulties and the challenges facing doctors, facing the medical profession, facing consumers of medical care and facing governments who have the primary responsibility for making the decisions that affect the environment and the climate for medical practice in this country.

I think that we face three possible scenarios a few years hence, Mr. Speaker, where Medicare and hospital care in Canada is concerned. Two of them, I think, are distinct possibilities. One of them, which would be the one that we would hope for, is a receding possibility, in my view, unless some serious steps are taken.

The two scenarios that, I think, are distinct possibilities are this one: (A) A health system in Canada in which private hospitals have reappeared and in which the majority of our doctors are conducting their practice entirely outside of Medicare. If that happens, of course, there will be Canadians all over the land who will be both shocked and bewildered and they will wonder how it is that we are experiencing a sudden collapse of our cherished free health care system, free so-called. They will wonder why governments didn't do anything to stop it, they will wonder how come this erosion and elimination of that system of which we have been so proud has suddenly "vanished." There will be a lot of Canadians who will be very sorry but who won't be shocked or bewildered, Mr. Speaker. They will be very sorry, but they won't be surprised because they saw it coming in 1982, and, in fact, many have seen it coming much earlier than that.

The other scenario that, I think, is a distinct possibility, which I classify as scenario (B), is a health care system in Canada in which beds and services are rationed, in which many hospitals are about to be closed, in which doctors are all on salary governed by binding arbitration, and they are locked into the system if they wish to practice in this country, and they

are strictly regulated as to the numbers of procedures, tests and operations that they can perform each year. It goes without saying that in that situation, in that environment, we will have a very unhappy, very uninspired and, I think, extensively diminished medical profession insofar as happiness goes the profession will be even unhappier than it is right now, Sir.

The possible third scenario is, of course, the system that we aspire to and have hoped we had put in place since 1958 and 1968 in this country when the two fundamental foundation stones of universal hospitalization and universal medical care were implemented. That is a rational, universal Medicare system in Canada that meets all those great objectives that we had carved out for it in terms of social security, accessibility, prudent management and professional excellence.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think it's almost too late for that third scenario, and I think that Canadians had best start preparing themselves for one or the other of the first two scenarios that I sketched. Because the problem, as I've said before and I intend to continue to address, and I know the Minister of Health is cognizant of the challenges that are implicit in my remarks, the challenges that I'm attempting to address, the problem is that Medicare and universal hospitalization are truly threatened in the 1980s, in the 1990s, society has changed, economics have changed, attitudes have changed, expectations have continued to operate at a fairly high level, realities have changed and the willingness to face reality has not necessarily changed. Compounding that problem is the fact that when it comes to discussion of challenges or difficulties facing Medicare and facing the health care system, nobody really seems to care. A handful of professionals care, a handful of politicians care and certainly the doctors care, but in general nobody really seems to care. They don't care essentially because they don't believe it. It's not that they're not interested in the subject, but they simply don't believe that there is any threat to the Medicare system or to the universal health care in this country. They assume that if there are any problems, by any stretch of the imagination, "Government" will address them, "Government" will fix them.

Part of the reason for this is because in the ongoing difficulties that Medicare and the medical profession have faced, and governments have faced in the last 10 years with respect to professional satisfaction, both in terms of the spirit and in terms of the remuneration available, there have been very declamatory and, I think, very simplistic solutions bandied around.

On the one hand, we've had governments, all governments, I don't absolve my government of this any more than I absolve any other government in Canada of it, we have had governments assuming that all that needed to be done was to strike a very substantial increase in the fee schedule and the doctors would be happy. That's been the position of many provincial governments.

We've had the Federal Government offering solutions such as a ban on opting out and a ban on extra billing. That's been the Federal Government's solution to the whole problem; outlaw activities such as that, not stopping to think for one minute that either of those things would just make the situation worse, that the opportunity to opt out and to extra bill provides an

outlet for a very deep disenchantment in certain segments of the medical profession. If the Federal Government is going to remove that safety valve, remove that outlet, they better have something to put in its place to contain the generic head of steam which exists and will always exist in a profession like medicine under extensive regulations such as is implicit in any workable Medicare system.

Then we've had the solutions proffered by the medical profession itself which have ranged either from new avenues of flexibility in billing to the principle of binding arbitration. These are the solutions that have been offered and declaimed across the land in this dispute and debate for the last 10 years and so the public comes to the conclusion, quite legitimately, that there are solutions out there, that all we require is for the good intentions of both parties to sit down around a table and endorse one of those so-called solutions. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that they are not solutions, not one of those suggestions, not one of those proposals is a solution to the problem of Medicare.

The suggestions such as I've cited which have been freely offered are merely strips of bandaid that would stop some of the hemorrhage for a little while but would obscure the real wound, the real difficulty and in fact make much more difficult any meaningful search to get at that real problem because they would provide a sort of a false sense of complacency, a false sense of assurance on the part of the public and on the part of politicians that the matter had been addressed. I don't want to go into detail on the subject of binding arbitration and I know it's being considered and should be considered by any government. It's been asked for by the medical profession sincerely and legitimately, but I just want to say that my position with respect to binding arbitration in this area can be summed up on three levels.

First and foremost, I believe it has to be explored out of legitimate consideration for the medical profession's grievances. The present government is exploring it, the previous government had assured the Manitoba Medical Association that we would explore it.

Secondly, I don't think it's good for the public, the taxpayer, who elects representatives to come into this Chamber and apply some sense of conscious, some sense of administration to his or her money, his or her taxes, because it takes that decision out of the hands of those elected representatives, puts it in the hands of a disinterested third party and, in fact, flies in the face in my view of the whole basic principle of responsible government. I know that there is binding arbitration in place in society at the present time; certainly in the private sector I have no objection to it. I think it creates grave difficulties for principle in the public sector. I am aware that it does exist in the public sector at the present time; that doesn't make me agree with it. I can see it as a useful solution to an individual's specific problem, a specific issue, but to entrench it as the manner in which these kinds of difficulties are going to be resolved is contrary, as I've said, in my view to the fundamental principles of responsible government.

Third, I don't think binding arbitration is in the best interests of the medical profession, Mr. Speaker, and



I've tried to convey this message to them. It may solve a problem today or tomorrow. It may provide them with a certain satisfaction, a certain financial improvement, a certain windfall, if you like, this year or even next year but I have no hesitation in predicting that downstream within five years doctors will be unhappier under binding arbitration than they are today. I believe that it is impossible, particularly in today's economic times and the economic times that we are going to face for awhile in this country, to contemplate a system of unconditional binding arbitration. There will have to be conditions imposed on it. For one thing, the opportunity, the right to opt out, will have to be eliminated but more importantly than that, Sir, I think that regulation and control will have to be brought in to the medical field if there is to be binding arbitration.

I think that there will be a system of schedules set up under binding arbitration ultimately, not the first year, but by the fifth year, almost regardless of whatever government is in office, that will say to specialists that you can perform so many procedures a week and so many procedures a month, 250 of those procedures a year and that's it. You can perform so many general physical examinations per month. That is all that is going to be permitted under any schedule that invokes binding arbitration as the way to arrive at doctors' fee settlements and salary schedules.

So I think it's indeed shortsighted of anyone to think that there is any panacea in it. I think it will be harmful to the public; it will be harmful to the medical profession and, as a consequence of that, it goes without saying by definition that it will be very harmful to the quality of health care in general in Canada. Those are my objections to it, but I repeat that I feel it has to be explored. The medical associations in various parts of Canada, particularly the one in Manitoba, has made a sincere and legitimate request for it and appeal for it, so it must be explored. I would not fight it to the death. If the medical association and the government want it, I am not going to stand up here and fight it forever, but I just want to cite those considerations. I am not suggesting that neither side has thought of them; I am not suggesting that they are unique inspirations, by any means, but I do want to cite them and let both government and the medical profession know that the Opposition has thought about them and they are very important in any exploration of this topic.

So, those are the so-called solutions to the Medicare problem that we have been faced with, Mr. Speaker, none of which go to the basic problem at hand. There really are solutions to the Medicare crisis; there really are solutions to the malaise that I think is now threatening the Canadian health care system. There really are people who understand the problem and who know what needs to be done, but it has proven impossible so far to get the message across because of the simplistic, declamatory so-called solutions to which I have referred that have had so much exposure and so much attention. Those declamatory superficial solutions have discouraged any meaningful search for the real problem. They have obscured the real issues.

We don't have to look very far, Mr. Speaker, today to see that there are very very serious wounds, serious hemorrhages in our whole universal health care sys-

tem. They are very clear in the hospital services component, but I don't intend to deal with them today. The most obvious indications, the most obvious indicators, the most obvious public evidence, is found in Medicare and in a dissatisfaction with it that is reaching a flash point, Sir, right across the country among medical associations in every province. We've seen it in variant forms from Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland right through to British Columbia, Vancouver Island. That restiveness, that unhappiness, that resentment and resistance expresses itself in extra billing, in opting out, in demands during long and bitter and protracted fee schedule negotiations that are deliberately excessive. Deliberately excessive in order to make specific points that for small "p" political reasons their advocates deem necessary. We've seen it expressed, we see it currently expressed in threatened strikes, in job action tactics, office closures, withdrawals of service, articulated defiance of provincial legislation and in today's current events, in the medical scene in both Ontario and Quebec.

The worst thing about it is that this restiveness, this resentment, this insipient rebellion is the outward sign of a very deep disenchantment in the medical profession, Mr. Speaker, that cannot help but damage the general quality of medicine in the country. That's the worst thing about it, that when you have that kind of a climate or environment in effect, there has to be fallout in the form of damage to the quality of medical care in the country.

In fact, Sir, I think it can truthfully be said that doctors are ambivalent about Medicare, they like it in many cases. Many of them like it very much. They like it because they get paid, moreover they get paid on time. More than a few of them, unquestionably, enjoy much better incomes than they would if Medicare were not in place, if they were still operating under the so-called system of the good old days when they had to chase patients to collect their accounts and collect their bills.

The problem, though, Sir, is that the doctors dislike themselves for liking it. Essentially, it's a system that implies conformity and regulation and standardization, so it's unsympathetic really to the old classic image of the North American doctor who is a combination professional plus independent businessman, something of a freewheeler in terms of his or her professional activities, choices, and decision making, someone who has always made his or her own decisions.

The underlying philosophy of Medicare comes into conflict with that underlying philosophy so that while many medical professionals like Medicare for the neatness and cleanliness that it brings to their fiscal and financial business operations, they're uncomfortable with themselves for liking it because it flies in the face philosophically of their own professional and philosophical spirit. It's very hard for many doctors to accept what they perceive to be an erosion of their professionalism and their autonomy. They live with it, of course. They live with that problem as all of us in our respected professions live with problems that attend activities in those professions.

In the case of the doctors, it's perhaps more difficult because of the historic and classical picture, image and representation of the physician, of the doctor and

of the free science of medicine. They rationalize it by reminding themselves that it not only provides them with insured accounts and insured income, but it also provides all Canadians with financial peace of mind where health care is concerned, and the medical profession is deeply committed to that concept. That's something that the profession endorses wholeheartedly. There's that nagging sense there that they have been compromised and that perhaps to a certain extent they have surrendered and it bothers them and in my view, following long discussions of the subject with many persons both in and closely related to the medical profession, it explains, Sir, a part of the profession's demonstrated restiveness with Medicare. This conflict of emotion explains part of the profession's unhappiness with the fee schedule.

Certainly, there is sincere dissatisfaction with fees and with the stubbornness of Provincial Governments. Certainly, that is real in part, but it's only partly real, it's part gesture. In its latter capacity as gesture, it's really an outlet for that guilt complex, for that conflict of feelings. This doesn't mean, and I want to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, that widespread medical disenchantment with Medicare is insincere and it provides no excuse for governments or politicians to dismiss it lightly, to ignore it and to pass it off as unimportant.

On the contrary, in my view, it reinforces the case for a sensitive consideration by politicians of the doctors' disenchantment, because it's certainly not abnormal for people to feel somewhat bitter and somewhat resentful when they've suffered a reduction in stature. That's a perfectly normal human feeling and if anybody should understand it the politicians should. He or she faces that possibility, that potential, every time he goes to the electorate and so if anyone should understand that human frailty, it's the politicians.

Doctors have suffered a reduction in stature under Medicare and it is heard. Some of them don't care, that's true; some of them don't care, but many do and what's more important, what politicians and the public have to recognize is that as a lobby group the profession does care. It does care about that diminution in its stature, in its professional standing and its sense of its own worth and importance. It's very hard for them to say it. How do you say those things without laying yourself open to unfair comment, perhaps even ridicule.

So, they say other things; the doctors say other things. They carry on the battle by complaining about the bureaucracy of Medicare. They carry on the battle by complaining about the fee schedule, about the need for more flexibility in billing privileges, and now, about the desirability of binding arbitration. These complaints are genuine, Sir, I'm not suggesting that they're not, but they are also a smoke-screen. They're also a euphemism for the deeper grievance and that deeper grievance is the regimentation that they have seen imposed on their science, what they consider to be a great and free science.

Doctors don't believe that Medicare fairly takes into account either the long years that they've put into academic study and training to achieve their expertise or the long days and nights that they put in at operating theatres, emergency departments, offices,

housecalls, or wherever. They resent the fact, for example, and I think this is very important, that under Medicare medicine has become one of the few occupations in free enterprise North America that offers no financial recognition whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, either of excellence or experience. Few governments have thought about that since Medicare was implemented in Canada in 1968.

Almost everywhere one goes to pursue a career, experience, seniority, talent is recognized but not under the Medicare fee schedule. The fee schedule pays a fixed amount for procedure; it doesn't matter whether the doctor performing it is an acknowledged leader in his field or whether he graduated from medical school yesterday. It doesn't matter whether he's been in there for 20 years learning how to perform that particular procedure or that operation and has all that experience, knowledge and exposure or whether he's simply a run of the mill, relatively mediocre professional. So this is a very sore point when one looks at the unhappiness that doctors have with Medicare. It's not just that the fee schedule doesn't satisfy them in percentage terms, it's that the fee schedule reflects a system of regimentation that recognizes no quality other than volume. It recognizes none of those things of the professional spirit to which all of us, I think, in life aspire and which all of us feel very keenly, perhaps some more keenly than others, but certainly which the medical profession as a profession has always very keenly felt. There's no recognition of that whatsoever and that's a very serious shortcoming in Medicare, the way the fee schedule is structured.

Further to that, a great many doctors do not believe that Medicare makes for very good medicine. They think that the overall effect of Medicare has been bad for the style and the substance of medical practice in Canada. They think that overall it has reduced it to a counterpart of the industrial assembly line. They see it really as a system that's destructive of true professionalism; they see it as having been responsible for the rise of a kind of treadmill medicine; and that treadmill medicine implies, depends upon and demands high volume and mass production. The patient, Sir, simply becomes a unit rather than a person. Technological procedures and expensive tests replace the doctors' personal time and attention. The doctor has to move on to another unit and another; he's got to because the fee schedule is built that way. The system by its very nature demands that of him; it generates high throughput. Once you've established that environment, it feeds on itself. Once that environment is in place, then in order to survive in it, you've got to play by the rules, you've got to meet those demands, you've got to measure up or you're in trouble, because the only thing that the fee schedule rewards is volume. So, the net results, there is a general style of medical practice that is declining in this country.

The profession is also bitter that Medicare, to a large extent, has shut it out of any meaningful decisions in terms of policy making where health care, medical care and delivery of that care is concerned. They've been reduced in their view to functionaries where these issues of basic health policy are concerned. Now that's not entirely avoidable. I think that under any system where government is paying the

bills a certain amount of that reduction in input and involvement is inevitable, but I think the doctors have a point when they say that there remains a role of a relevant nature for their profession in helping to formulate health care policies in the country. I think the way the system is structured and the way it operates at the present time that essentially is denied them; that to a very great degree that ambition to participate is regarded as something of a nuisance by the system.

Finally, Sir, I know and so does the Minister that the doctors truly dislike — I would suggest that's even too mild a word — the doctors truly hate the annual or biannual rounds of fee schedule negotiations that go on every year. They find it demeaning to have to get into the adversarial, union-style bargaining atmosphere that goes along with those kinds of negotiations. They're very uncomfortable with the confrontations that they have to get into with their governments, with their politicians, the people that they have to live with next door, on the street, every day.

They also, Sir, find it very unfair, I think, and they find it very embarrassing that there is so much public discussion of so-called average incomes and comparisons between their counterparts in other provinces and themselves. That's again inevitable in any such process of public adversarial bargaining, but the medical profession finds that very embarrassing and very uncomfortable. So they genuinely detest those annual or biannual confrontations. All these things, Sir, add up to the real explanation, the real reason for the medical profession's disenchantment with Medicare and its continuing struggle against the rigours and the restraints of the system in my view.

There's certainly genuine professional conviction that fee schedules are too low and that billing procedures are too rigid, but as I've suggested before the real crisis of Medicare — to use the Honourable Monique Begin's term — the real crisis of Medicare is not so much a crisis of the fee levels as a crisis of the spirit. It is, Sir, a professional gloom and it's a billowy gloom. The medical profession sees that gloom as threatening their professional joy, their professional satisfaction, their reason for being doctors. That gloom is engendered by the effects that they perceive Medicare to be having in a whole range of ways upon both the doctor and the health care system on both the artisan and the art. I think if that gloom is allowed to spread, it'll do inestimable damage to the quality of medicine in this country.

So my position at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, and the position of the Opposition, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, for whom I speak in Manitoba is that as the Minister of Health of Manitoba and as other Ministers of Health across the country today face this annual or biannual rite of spring that we always go through where fee schedules are concerned with the medical profession that they look at and consider modernization of Medicare. It can't be done overnight but they look at and consider a phased progressive modernization of Medicare. Even the message that politicians, that governments, understood some of the grievances of the medical profession and were prepared to address those grievances I think would have a very salutary effect on the profession and on relations between the profession and government. There are a number of things that can be done, I think,

to modernize Medicare and save it and make it work and also to reinforce the reasons for being a medical practitioner, for being a doctor in Canada, to continue to encourage young men and women to enter medicine as a career avenue.

I think that first and foremost, Sir, there has to be clearly expressed commitment to the preservation of Medicare in a statement that goes beyond motherhood. There have been motherhood statements made about Medicare before. I think that statement has to address contemporary realities. It has to acknowledge Medicare's weaknesses as well as its strengths. It has to acknowledge Medicare's vulnerability and its costs and its fragile nature. It has to acknowledge the competing interests that it always has to accommodate. It has to acknowledge all those realities that will always threaten Medicare. At the same time, it must reassert the importance of Medicare, the absolute essentiality of maintaining Medicare and therefore, declare its recognition of the fact that Medicare's strengths and weaknesses have to be examined so as to produce a reform and a modernization that will equip it to meet the 1980's and the 1990's.

Secondly, I think government should establish a forum in which the medical profession has the opportunity to lay its grievance cards fully and candidly on the table and to offer its proposals publicly on the health care system and on what it believes Canadians should be pursuing in terms of their health care system. The profession should be prepared to do that and to offer the reasons why. If it is not prepared to do that, then it would be missing a golden opportunity to get at the real crisis of the spirit that I'm talking about here.

Thirdly, I think that governments, and here I refer mainly to the Federal Government, should desist from making threats about unilateral changes to Medicare, such as the threats about banning extra billing and opting out, because all they do is polarize positions and move people into entrenched postures that make the whole search much more difficult.

Fourthly, Sir, I think that the Health Ministers of Canada have got to look at a reform of the Medicare fee schedule. I think they have got to look at methods by which that fee schedule can be redesigned to provide recognition of individual experience and seniority, recognition of individual talent and input, and recognition of individual quality and achievement. That must be done sooner or later and I think it should be done sooner.

Fifth, Sir, and probably more complex than any . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. The Honourable Minister of Health.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** There has been an understanding that we won't go into Private Members, so we will quit at 11:30. I think we are prepared to give the member a few more minutes to see if he can finish his remarks.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Member for Fort Garry have leave to continue? (Agreed)  
The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank all members of the House for that indulgence. I only have one or two final remarks I wish to make and I appreciate the opportunity to be able to conclude the statement.

Fifthly, Sir, and I think perhaps most complex of all, but still it has to be done. In order to reinforce Medicare and modernize Medicare, we have got to reform the whole hospital system. The Minister and I have discussed that subject to some degree already in this Session. A great deal more serious discussion of that topic remains to engage us and all who are interested in the Canadian health care system.

Of the 30 cents of every dollar that Provincial Governments spend on behalf of their citizens, their residents, every day of the year, Mr. Speaker, on health care, only six of those cents go to Medicare; another six cents go to public health, preventive health, personal care home programs, mental health programs, a range of services of that kind; and 18 cents goes to the hospital system. In other words, if you take a look at the provincial budget, you take a dollar that the Provincial Government is spending, every dollar that it's spending, every day, on behalf of its citizens, 30 cents approximately, give or take a cent or two depending on the year, depending on the province, 30 cents of that approximately goes on health care. Eighteen of those 30 cents goes on the hospital system, six on Medicare, six on a spate of other services.

There is not going to be a bigger share of that dollar available to Health Care Ministers, so the things that have to be done have got to be done from within that 30 cent segment. In order to achieve greater effectiveness and greater return and greater impact from that 30 cent segment, it's obvious, Mr. Speaker, that Health Ministers, governments across the country, have got to look at that 18 cent hospital component and look at ways that those dollars can be spent more effectively and look at ways that perhaps some can be infused into the Medicare side of the spectrum. I believe it can be done through modernization of the system, but not without a great deal of soul searching, difficulty, debate and trauma. That should not be permitted to discourage us or to scare us off, however, Mr. Speaker. It has to be done now, in the 1980's, in order to reinforce and save the system.

So, I conclude, Sir, by suggesting in brief recap form that those five steps are steps that I think should be addressed by provincial Health Ministers and Health critics and other persons interested in the health situation across Canada today and the Federal Health Minister. I think the Federal Health Minister should take the lead in these initiatives, but failing that, there is no reason why the provincial Health Minister can't do it. They can do it; they can address these challenges at their inter-provincial meetings and they can go to the Federal Health Minister with recommendations and with requests for leadership and representation and encouragement.

Those five steps; first, the clear commitment to preservation of Medicare, which means acknowledging all the difficulties and spelling out the challenge clearly to Canadians that modernization of Medicare is required to save it.

Secondly, a forum for the doctors to lay out their

grievances so the problems that they have in living with Medicare are honestly and candidly put on the table and explored and not obscured by superficial proposals that tend to cover things up, rather than to explore them.

Thirdly, a moratorium by the Federal Government on declamatory threats about unilateral changes to the Medicare system.

Fourthly, a reform of the Medicare fee schedule in this province and in every province to build into it provisions that recognize professional talent and professional achievement and seniority and expertise that reward persons for excellence; that eliminate the present system, which is totally egalitarian and treats everybody under the fee schedule exactly the same way; that make it worthwhile for specialists, professionals in this field to try and do a better and better job, not just a faster and faster job.

Fifthly, Sir, a very serious commitment to look at the hospital system; look at the status quo; look at the entrenched dynamics that keep it operating the same way; conforming to social demands and social realities of the 1950s and the 1960s, when it has to be prepared to meet the realities of the 1980s and the 1990s. Modernizing and reforming the hospital system is essential to reinforcing the whole health care system, of which Medicare is such an important component.

I thank the members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, for providing me the extra few moments to conclude my remarks, and respectfully request of the Minister of Health, who has been kind enough to listen to my comments today, to perhaps read them at his leisure in Hansard when they appear and consider whether they have some validity or not.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question before the House is that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Is that agreed?

**MOTION presented and defeated.**

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** May I suggest, Sir, that you now call it 12:30 and I'd like to move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that the House be now adjourned.

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