

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 25 April, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions  
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

**MR. D. MALINOWSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources presents the following as their First Report:

Your Committee met on Tuesday, April 23, 1985 and Thursday, April 25, 1985 in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider the 1984 Annual Report of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

Your Committee received all information desired from Mr. Olafur P. Sigurdson, Chairman of the Board, and Mr. Carl Laufer, President and General Manager, with respect to matters pertaining to the 1984 Annual Report and the business of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

Your Committee examined the Annual Report of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1984 and adopted the same as presented.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

**MR. D. MALINOWSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Concordia, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 60 students of Grade 9 standing from the Charleswood Junior High School. They are under the direction of Mr. Crew. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

There are 45 students of Grade 5 standing from the R.F. Morrison School. They are under the direction of

the Miss Jaszczyk. The school is in the constituency of the Kildonan.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Media Secretary - salary increase

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I ask the Premier, at a time when many employees in the province are being asked to have very low demands for salary increases, and people in health care are being asked to take very minimal increases, how he can justify having his media secretary given an increase of 47 percent in just a two-year period?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the increases were, in fact, adjustments that were made in relationship to that. I'm quite prepared to defend the rationale of that during the Estimates review.

**MR. SPEAKER:** May I remind the honourable member that he should not ask a question which could be characterized as being argumentative.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** We're not arguing, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could indicate why the publication of the Order-in-Council that was passed July 4th giving this major increase was delayed from public knowledge until it was released on April 10, 1985, some nine months later.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that question as one for notice.

#### Manfor - salary of President

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

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I direct a question to the Minister responsible for Manfor and ask the Minister if he can confirm that the President and Chief Executive Officer of Manfor is being compensated at the rate of \$100,000 a year, or paid on a monthly basis at \$8,333 a month?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I can confirm that it is in that range, Mr. Speaker. I believe the member knows that the salary paid to senior officials at Manfor is a matter between those officials and the board of directors, and in the case of the chief executive officer, he comes to Manfor with a very distinguished record in private enterprise in the forestry industry and was appointed after an extensive search by a professional personnel management enterprise and has done a very credible job in turning the corporation around.

The salary that is paid, I suppose, is commensurate with his experience, Mr. Speaker, and the demands of the job.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** A question to the same Minister. Was this present Minister the Minister responsible for Manfor when this present chief executive officer was signed to this agreement?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice for a determination of the exact date.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Can the Minister confirm that the Chief Executive Officer of Manfor is being paid a disturbance allowance, a net monthly amount of \$1,000 after taxes and all deductions are made?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice. I believe the member's figures are somewhat asked.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Another supplementary to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister can advise the House if the chief executive officer is also entitled to receive a bonus for each 12-month period of his employment of \$50,000 in addition to his \$100,000 a year and in addition to his net \$1,000 disturbance allowance.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I believe there are terms and conditions within the contract that relate to performance bonuses and whether the member's figure is accurate or not, again, I will take the question as notice.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, another supplementary to the same Minister. Can the Minister confirm that after the present chief executive officer had been in employment for over 12 months, the board could review his annual salary and make an adjustment upwards? I wonder if the Minister could advise whether the salary of \$100,000 a year has been adjusted upwards, plus the various bonuses.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the salary has not been adjusted at this point. I would just like to say to the member that the member's concern obviously is what the total amount of wages and benefits that might be entitled to the Chief Executive Officer of Manfor and I will indicate categorically that we are paying a substantial amount for the services of a chief executive officer for that corporation.

Mr. Speaker, while I and perhaps many other people find these sums of money substantial and perhaps

inexplicable, I can assure the member that the search for a chief executive officer who would do Manfor proud, who would serve the purpose that he was intended to serve, that is, to take Manfor through a very difficult period in which there was a major upgrading going on, take Manfor from a position which had been somewhat lacklustre over a decade and contribute to the organization and the development of a corporation that would be to the net benefit of Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, we could have hired a box boy to do that job . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. STORIE:** . . . we chose to hire someone that would do the job . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister should not turn his question into a speech.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** A further supplementary to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister could advise whether or not suitable office and living accommodation and club memberships at both The Pas and Winnipeg are being paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba for this chief executive officer.

**A MEMBER:** In addition to everything else.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** In addition to membership in a golf club in Quebec.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice. I can only say, as I've indicated before, it was and is a difficult task to attract qualified people to a location like The Pas to take on the kind of challenge this particular individual was required to undertake.

As to the particular circumstances about memberships, Mr. Speaker, I again will take that as notice and bring back the information.

### **MPIC - delay in settling claims**

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

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Mr. Speaker, about two weeks ago, I took a question as notice from the Member for Minnedosa with respect to delay in settling claims at Autopac. I would like to report that, in fact, there were considerable - I bring this information for the benefit of all members of the House. The question was raised in the House; I would assume this is the appropriate place to respond.

There were considerable delays in January as a result of our weather. There was an 18 percent increase in the number of claims which resulted in delays of five to eight days.

The higher number of claims continued up until the last while. I understand that MPIC is back to normal and we anticipate that, as of now, the claims should be handled within a matter of a day or two, as normal. In addition, we've hired some 11 staff to expedite processing of claims.

## Manfor - salary of President

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

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I direct a further question to the Minister responsible for Manfor and ask the Minister if he can confirm that the expenses of the chief executive officer for Manfor also includes payment for his cigarettes or cigars?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, the member wants to make the point that the chief executive officer for Manfor is well paid. I will take as notice the detailed question about the member's concern and will respond back in due course.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Another supplementary to the same Minister. Can the Minister advise the House as to what arrangements are made with the Chief Executive Officer of Manfor for the supply of a vehicle, automobile?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could save the member further questions on this topic and ask him to submit his list of questions to me in writing and I would be more than happy to respond. He has an opportunity to ask those kinds of questions, I suppose, in committee as well. I make no bones about the fact that we're paying exceptionally good money for this individual.

Mr. Speaker, the kinds of negotiations that go on to attract a man of international calibre to Manfor, to take on what has been and is a significant challenge, is not an easy task. Whether there were fringe benefits negotiated, dealing with memberships or the use of a car, I have taken as notice and I will endeavour to find out; but the point has to be made to the member opposite and to the opposition, if we are going to take seriously our responsibility to run Manfor in an efficient, practical way, then we have to have management capable of doing that job, and if we have to spend the dollar to attract someone, then obviously we have no alternative.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite know that, in terms of the base salary, the salary provided the Chief Executive Officer of Manfor is not out of line with what is provided to those who are similarly responsible for Crown corporations and is far less than what is provided to senior executive officers of private corporations.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** A further question to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister can advise the House whether or not he approves of these kinds of expenditures on the expense account of the chief executive officer; and also he mentioned he would take as notice the membership in the golf course in Quebec. I wonder if the Minister could bring back the actual cost involved with the membership and green fees involved by this chief executive officer in this golf course in Quebec.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. To seek a Minister's opinion is to ask for an opinion not for information.

Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister if the Minister agrees with this participation in this golf course and, also the inclusion of cigarettes on his expense account?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question of agreement is a matter of opinion. Does the honourable member wish to ask for information?

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister then whether or not he authorizes the expenditure of cigarettes on his expense account?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the member and perhaps he should know that obviously I do not authorize those kinds of things. The individual that we're talking about is employed by the Board of Directors of Manfor.

Mr. Speaker, the member has gone to some lengths to point out that the salary and the fringe benefits provided this individual are significant. I acknowledge that that is the case, Mr. Speaker. I feel as badly as anybody else that it takes that kind of money to attract talent.

The question is, who would be the loser in the long run, Mr. Speaker, if we did not get someone who is recognized in the industry . . .

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** . . . Mr. Speaker, the fact exists that there was a major candidate search undertaken by a private professional group, the equivalent of "Headhunters." It was not myself or any other member of the government that decided to select this individual and his salary package is negotiated in the context of what other individuals in that particular situation, having those particular requirements, is going to be paid.

Mr. Speaker, I should indicate clearly that the salary that's being paid to this individual is something that he will have to earn; it is not the gratuitous kind of salary that is being paid to individual Tory members by the Conservative Government in Ottawa.

## Loans - core area

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

**MR. B. CORRIN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Co-operative Development. Recently, there have been concerns raised about loan funding and financing by the Department of Co-operative Development with respect to core area businesses and residences. I'd ask the Minister if he can give a status report respecting this matter to the House?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Indeed, there was some public commentary a week or so ago in respect to the practice of loaning for mortgages for both homes and businesses in the core area by the financial institutions. At that time, there was an indication on the part of one party that there was a practice in place called "redlining" which acted to restrict the availability and accessibility of loans to those individuals in certain geographic areas within the core area. Upon receipt of the information and the concerns, I asked the department to contact the individual and the overall credit union system to discuss whether or not such a practice did exist.

I have been informed, in fact, that no practice does exist on the part of those credit unions, that they make their decisions on mortgages and loans on the basis of commonly accepted financial criteria which includes the area in which a facility may be placed, the assessment on that, and includes the ability of the individual to repay, but that is part of a normal practice and there are no specific exclusions based solely on the matter of geographic locations.

In fact, there was a report done recently which was quoted in those media reports and upon review of that report, it indicated very clearly that local credit unions are becoming an increasingly important support of mortgage and rehabilitation loans — (Interjection) — It appears to me that they might not be interested in the role the credit union is playing in the core area, Mr. Speaker, but, in fact, the residents of the core area are and the residents of the province are.

I'll conclude very briefly by indicating very clearly that the report said that credit unions tend to be more flexible in their lending practices than other institutions and I think they have a record of which they can be quite proud.

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I do remind you of the long-standing tradition of this House of rotating from one side to the other side during question period.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Honourable Opposition House Leader that we have a long-standing, respected tradition of alternating from one side to the other with regard to the asking of questions. No such tradition prevails, Sir, with the answering by Ministers of questions they take as notice, since there are no Ministers on that side.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I will remind members that it is the member who catches the Speaker's eye who speaks in debate or at question period. I would also remind members that it is a tradition in this House that members ask three questions, usually one question and two supplementaries.

### Lord's Day Act - striking down of

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took as notice a question from the Member for St. Norbert as to the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in The Lord's Day Act case. I think it's important to answer that to the extent that I can and as definitively as I can today so that there should be no ambiguity in the commercial world as to the effect of that decision.

I am satisfied, Sir, after purusing the decision and The Retail Businesses Holiday Closing Act and The Employment Standards Act, that our legislation governing the hours of operation of retail establishments is valid and I went on to serve notice that it will be enforced so that the situation with respect to retail establishments in the Province of Manitoba this coming Sunday will be exactly the same as it was prior to the decision of the Supreme Court.

### Manfor - terms of contract of Pres.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** My question is for the Minister responsible for Manfor and it continues on the topic of the contract with the CEO of Manfor.

I wonder if the Minister can indicate why the contract does allow for the individual to also pursue other business interests while being the Chief Executive Officer of Manfor.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know the detailed reference that the member makes to the contract, but I'd indicated before that the negotiations to attract an individual of this kind were protracted, took some length of time. Individual allowances, individual clauses in the contract which permit such activity, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, were a matter of negotiation. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that the chief executive officer is at Manfor, is working full time, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition need have no fear about the dedication of the chief executive officer.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would also indicate whether or not he considers it to be a normal thing for the — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Minister is answering on behalf of what he says is the normal standard for hiring chief executive officers. In addition to the \$100,000 salary, in addition to the \$50,000 bonus, in addition to the \$1,000 per month after tax, net, in addition to the expenditures, in addition to the automobile, in addition to the office and accommodation costs, is it normal for him to get a nine-week vacation every year?

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

Thursday, 25 April, 1985

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the terms of the contract appear out of line or the members opposite would like to make them appear out of line. I have every confidence that the terms and conditions of the chief executive officer's contract are what were required to attract an individual of that calibre to Manfor to do a job.

Mr. Speaker, I can only assure the member that he is no one's brother-in-law.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order.  
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** . . . could also indicate whether there are any limitations or restrictions whatsoever to the expenses that this individual can submit to the corporation for payment.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, the line of questioning that the Leader of the Opposition is taking us on almost leads one to want to be flippant.

Without having reference to the contract in front of me, I would suppose that one would imagine that a man of some 20 or 30 years experience in private industry, the man who has been a chief executive officer of a major international pulp and paper company would be submitting expenses that were reasonable, and I have no information to lead me to conclude otherwise.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I guess we're led to assume that cigarettes, books and golf course fees are reasonable. But my question to the Minister is, did he negotiate this contract or, if not, who negotiated the contract on behalf of the Government of Manitoba?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, no, I did not personally negotiate this contract. The contract was negotiated between Manfor and the chief executive officer with the assistance, as I've indicated on many occasions, and the advice of a professional "Headhunter" organization who did, in fact, do the search - at least, that's my information. I was not involved in the original process.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, if the Minister was not involved in the negotiation, was he required to approve of this contract?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, if the member is asking was approval through Cabinet, it is . . . I'll take as notice exactly what the formal approval process was, whether it was through Cabinet or whether my signature would have been enough, I'll take it as notice.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the same Minister. Could he confirm that in the event the chief executive officer's position is terminated prior to

February 15th of 1986, that he will be entitled to continue to use the office, housing accommodation and club memberships for 60 days, that Manfor will pay for the return of his personal effects and first-class travel costs from Manitoba to Montreal and he should be entitled to purchase the automobile that he's using at its depreciated book value?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice. I assume that the member is reading from the contract so I'll have to assume that, in fact, is the case.

Mr. Speaker, to put it in context, we were asking an individual, as I've indicated on many occasions, who had a solid reputation who was being asked to take on a tremendous challenge, who was going to be asked to be located in The Pas. Obviously, the question of salary and benefits was negotiated; the full terms, Mr. Speaker, and whether in the eventuality that Manfor was to lose those services, there was provision for recompense for the fact that he had to locate here, obviously that is something that any individual who was looking at making that kind of a move would consider as part of his package.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, our concern is not with respect to Mr. Sweeney, but with respect to the competence of this government to negotiate on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister a supplementary question. Could the Minister indicate whether he and the government have entered into negotiations to renew this agreement with the chief executive officer?

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that specific question as notice. I would answer, in terms of the negotiations of this contract, when I'm able to table all of the information that has been asked over today, I will also table information with respect to the remuneration and the kinds of benefits that are available to other Crown corporation officers in the Federal Government, for example, and in the private sector.

What I have said and what I still believe to be true is that the Chief Executive Officer of Manfor is receiving a remuneration package which is not out of line with the kinds of packages that are available to other people, given the kinds of undertakings that the chief executive officer has undertaken, given the kinds of circumstances in relationship to the relocation that this chief executive officer was expected to incur.

Mr. Speaker, if members opposite want to make those kinds of comparisons, I have no hesitation in suggesting that they will find this kind of a package equivalent to what would be available to other chief executive officers in similar circumstances.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister.

My question to the First Minister is, was the First Minister aware of what can only be described as extremely generous salary arrangements and expense arrangements made with the Chief Executive Officer of Manfor? Was the First Minister aware of it and does

he, in fact, approve of those kinds of settlements at this time when his government, and indeed all Manitobans, are being asked to tighten their belts?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member is asking for an opinion. Would he wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not asking for his opinion; I'm simply asking the first question: Was he aware of this particular contract being signed by this particular executive officer of Manfor?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, all I was aware of is not the details, but in fact the remuneration being paid to this general manager was comparable with that paid to other comparative operations in Canada from east to west and that it was competitive on the open market situation with what was being paid elsewhere in the country.

### Houses, structurally unsafe - Sale of

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of MHRC concerning the sale of a house in my area and an engineer's report, which indicated that that house was structurally unsafe.

I want to ask the Minister a general question. If an owner of a property knows that a home is structurally unsafe, is he under an obligation, a legal obligation, to make that known to the next buyer?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question is both hypothetical and seeking a legal opinion.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** No, Mr. Speaker, this is not a hypothetical case. I'm quoting from a complaint concerning the fact that somebody bought a house which was then found to be unsafe in regard to a structural report. I'm simply asking the Minister whether it is possible to sell a home that is known to be structurally unsafe. Is that an illegal action?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member is asking a legal question, a question seeking a legal opinion.

Do you wish to ask a question seeking information?  
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** I'll try a final question, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to ask the Minister whether, in the sale of a home, whether it is a case of caveat emptor or whether a person has the right to inform a buyer of possible structural unsafe conditions of that home. Is that an ethical question or a legal question?

### Crown Corp. boards - Authority of

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Can the First Minister advise the House whether or not boards of Crown corporations have unlimited authority to enter into agreements with their chief executive officers?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, they do, in consultation with the Minister to whom they report.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister responsible for Manfor. Did the board of directors consult with the Minister prior to entering into the contract with their chief executive officer?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Mr. Speaker, the member is probably aware that the negotiations, as I indicated, to attract the chief executive officer were protracted and there was a transfer of responsibility for Manfor during that time.

I've taken notice specifically of the member's question, because I was . . .

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

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

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the honourable minister's answer.

The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The members obviously aren't too anxious for the information. I said I would bring it back and I would define that for him.

What I wanted to make clear, Mr. Speaker, is that we're all concerned. Some members from the backbench yell, well, how is Manfor doing? Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the reason why this international search for a chief executive officer was undertaken; that is exactly the reason why the individual who is responsible is being paid a generous salary, and I'm not going to stand up and try and defend those kinds of levels of salary. The fact is that when you're looking for a chief executive officer, you compete in an international market, Mr. Speaker. We were looking for an individual in an international market and to find the kind of individual that was required, we had to pay - obviously - top dollar.

Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the members opposite, is that there was no politics involved in this. The chief executive officer is no political crony of mine or any member on this side. The chief executive officer is a member who has an international reputation, an

outstanding reputation. We negotiated in good faith to attract that individual. The members want to make fun of the terms and conditions that were required to attract that individual. I can only tell the members . . . I want members opposite to know that I am not pooh-poohing this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the chief executive officer is being paid a generous salary. I want members opposite to be aware that I believe, in 1976, the New Brunswick Government hired this individual at a greater salary than what he is being paid for Manfor . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. An answer to a question should not be a speech.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I'll place my question to the First Minister, since the Minister responsible for Manfor eventually does not recall whether he approved the contract or not.

My question to the First Minister is: Who on the government side approved of this contract, which has assumed proportions hitherto unknown in the history of the Government of Manitoba?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I'll accept that question as notice.

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

### Sugar beet industry - reply to telex

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

**MR. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, if we can get the cackle to simmer down a bit, I would ask the First Minister a very important question, and that is whether or not he has received a response to the telex that he forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada in regard to the sugar beet producers?

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose for raising that question with me and, as was discussed yesterday in the House, time is of essence. I still have received no response.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, as has been said yesterday, we are dealing with a \$100 million industry. I would ask the First Minister if he's had any indication from the Prime Minister's office when an answer would be forthcoming in response to that telex, which is very crucial at this time.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I placed a telephone call to the Prime Minister's office asking the Prime Minister to respond urgently to the telex that was forwarded to him. I gather that today the Prime Minister is campaigning in Ontario, so I can understand if I don't received a phone call back today or a returning telex. I trust that we will receive a reply at a very early point.

### Media Secretary - salary increase

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to return for a moment to the question I accepted as notice from the Leader of the Opposition at the beginning of this question period. The Leader of the Opposition posed to me a question to the effect that my media secretary had received a 47 percent increase over a two-year period. Mr. Speaker, that is a mistaken assertion on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. There has been a 47 percent increase over a three-and-a-half-year period, so the Leader of the Opposition is quite mistaken in respect to his calculations.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired. Orders of the Day . . .

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege, Sir, which I will follow with a substantive motion.

Sir, on Tuesday night in this House I was named and asked to leave the Legislature without receiving the rights that every member has in this House.

Sir, I refer to Hansard, where the Chairman said to me, "Would the Member for Sturgeon Creek repeat that statement for the record?" I did, but there is nothing on the record, Sir, and I'm not debating that I made a statement quietly sitting in my Chair . . .

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

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** . . . oh, I know, Mr. Speaker . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** . . . and when I was asked what I said, I had the courtesy to respect the Chairman and say what I said.

Mr. Speaker, I would refer — (Interjection) — The rights of a member of this House are not funny to me and I assure you, Sir, that I would like to state that the right I did not have was that I was never given the opportunity to withdraw. I was never asked if I would withdraw the statement which is not on the record, Sir, and I quote the House Leader when he said, "I believe, Sir, that what is required then is for you, as has been the past practice, to offer the member the opportunity to make an explanation or withdraw." I was never given the opportunity to make an explanation or withdraw. I stood in my chair — (Interjection) — I stood up — (Interjection) — I'm addressing you, Sir, but I would say to the member that I have admitted that I answered the Chairman when he asked me, and it's not on the record.

I stood in my place, and the Deputy Speaker said, "Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order." I said, "May I ask why?" And I had been allowed no explanation or no opportunity to withdraw.

I would like to ask you, Sir, to take the matter under advisement. I would like you to have discussion with

the Deputy Speaker and maybe if I did have rights taken from me, discuss with him his proper duties within this House.

I would move, seconded by the Member for St. Norbert, that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Since I was not present on the occasion that the Honourable Member makes reference to, I will take the matter under advisement and consider it further.

Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the admissibility of the motion, are you suggesting that members will have an opportunity at a later date to address the admissibility of the motion?

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have taken it under advisement.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I was standing - after the conclusion of the Member for Sturgeon Creek's remarks. I submit that members usually have an opportunity on Matters of Privilege to address the admissibility of the motion. I trust, Sir, that if that opportunity is not available now, it will be available after you have had a chance to review the transcript of Tuesday's Session.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. In conformity with the usual practice in such matters, I will ask any member who has advice for the Chair on the subject to stand up and give it at this time.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate this opportunity.

I quite sincerely sympathize with the matter raised by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. In the discussion raised during the debate, Sir, which I know you will review, I think it is important to recognize that what occurred, under our rules, particularly those which relate to the demonstration of disrespect to the Chair, and the fact that that is a contempt of the House, were the relevant questions, and clearly the report to the committee by the Acting Chair of the Committee citing the infraction of which the Member for Sturgeon Creek was accused was not disputed, and it is not disputed by him here today, even though it shows only as an interjection in Hansard.

I think, Sir, that is the nub of the question of a prima facie case of privilege. I believe it was the Chair's privilege. I believe that the inability of the honourable member to withdraw his statement - and I think that the member has a legitimate point on that score - was something on which I supported his right, but on which his own House Leader, on interjection on the same page from which he quotes, denied that right, Sir, and insisted that the rules be followed. It would have only been with the leave of members to revert to the earlier opportunity that the right of the honourable member, as I saw it, could have been respected. The insistence of members on his side is what denied the honourable member the option of withdrawing.

Sir, I think, on those grounds, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek does not have a prima facie case of privilege against the Chair or against the Deputy Speaker at that point. Members on this side attempted to expedite that matter.

But, Sir, I offer to you, and for your specific attention in the two paragraphs below that quoted by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, the following statement: "If I may be of further assistance to the Government House Leader, if he wishes to proceed with this madness, then a formal motion for suspension of the Member for Sturgeon Creek's sitting privileges for the remainder of the Session is now in order." Sir, as you know, under the rules, having reached that point, only by leave of the whole House could we revert to an earlier stage in the proceedings. The demand from the Opposition House Leader was that we carry on with the madness that I agree was madness.

Sir, I submit that if there is a case of privilege, it is against all members because I believe that what happened in the House on Tuesday night was wrong. But I find difficulty assigning responsibility for that to any one member and I suggest that the Member for Sturgeon Creek does not, on those grounds, have a prima facie case that his privileges as a member were violated by the Chair of the committee, or by the Deputy Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does any other member wish to advise the Chair without getting into an argument over the specifics?

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this again, Sir, briefly. I'm not a lawyer, nor am I an expert on the House Rules, Sir, nor am I about to talk about prima facie cases. I'm only trying to talk about common sense as to the rights of a member in this House, and I don't stand up and say that I agree that it was madness, but I'd read the Rule Book to say that I don't have a case, Sir.

I can only say, Sir, and I did not want to dwell on this; I did not want to say that I was sitting in my chair facing that way, with the Chairman sitting there, when I made the remark quietly and he asked me, what did I say. The Chairman didn't say, who were you speaking to? I was allowed no explanation whatsoever. I would have given him answers if I'd had the opportunity probably. For the member to talk about what happened after the House Leader made his statement about other things, I only refer, Sir, that I stood up and said, may I ask why? I was given no answer and no privileges at any time; I was named and ejected from the House for the shortest period on record, Sir.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to add my voice to the concern, the very legitimate concern, that my colleague, the Member for Sturgeon Creek has. I would ask you, Sir, in taking the matter under advisement, to regard the matter with the seriousness I know that you, Sir, will attach to it.

Individual members take very seriously the question of suspension from this Chamber. I assure you, Mr.



Speaker, that although during the heat of the debate or the moment perhaps that isn't always evident, but it does blemish the member's record to some extent, and I know those - and I must speak of myself - that have had the penalty of suspension, even if it's only as it was in this case, very briefly, for a short time, nonetheless it's a concern to all of us.

I really think the only question that you have to concern yourself with is, did the member have - as our rules call for and as our practice calls for - the opportunity to reconsider his comments and to make a withdrawal. That, Mr. Speaker, is fairly basic.

Regrettably, that evening did not commend itself to the smoothest operation of the House or the committee. There was considerable delay in decision-making on the part of the Chair. There was difficulty in finding a Speaker, Mr. Speaker. We then had the situation where the Chairman involved in the incident had to replace himself in your Chair, Sir, and of course that added to the concern of the members of the opposition. At that point in time, I don't for a moment disagree with my colleagues that it was indeed myself that asked for this madness to stop and to put the question.

But, Sir, that does not for one moment - and indeed the Government House Leader can have it either way, I don't really care whether he thinks that I owe the Member for Sturgeon Creek an apology or the House or whoever. The point of privilege that we're addressing, the matter of privilege that I believe the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has, is the simple fact that he was not given the opportunity to reconsider his remarks and thereby avoid the penalty of being named.

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the words that were uttered by the honourable friend were that bad. I think what made it bad is they were addressed to the person that was supposed to chair and keep the decorum in the House.

I also am not a lawyer nor am I known for my knowledge of the rules; but I stand only after the words of the last speaker who spoke to say, on a number of occasions, that my honourable friend did not have a chance of something that he said in the heat of battle - that's understandable - did not have a chance to reconsider or to apologize or withdraw and I don't think that's right.

The situation was this, that it was not that loud, but from his seat, who addressed these words to the Chairman. The Chairman then turned to the member and he said, "Would you care to put that on record?" and to me that's certainly an indication that, hey, what are you doing? The member could have said, I'm not talking to you. He was the only one that thought that, or he could have said nothing, or he could have withdrawn.

I don't think the Speaker had any other option, when somebody tells you . . . It's not that the words, as I said, were that bad, but if the rule says that you have to ask the people, then the Chairman was wrong, but to say that he did not have an occasion to reconsider is absolutely false.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I thank those honourable members who have offered their advice. I will indeed take the matter under advisement.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Health and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott:** I call the committee to order.

The committee is considering Appropriation No. 8, Fisheries 8.(a).

**HON. S. USKIW:** No, we're beyond 8.(a), I think, aren't we? How far did we get down in Fisheries? We got away down to . . .

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** He hasn't got anything marked off here, so they may have had a discussion.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Oh, yes.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Okay, I'll just call Appropriation 8 - the Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. ADAM:** I know that the previous Chairman kept a list on his mind, not on a list. There was a list there. — (Interjection) — It doesn't matter who goes on first, so I will defer to the opposition, but I think I was on the list.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, you're covering Fisheries in general?

I have a few questions and concerns dealing with fish and fish management and some work that is being done by a constituent of mine, Bill Henderson, at Oak Lake and the money that he has spent over the last few years to prevent or to try to prevent winterkill in Oak Lake. I would like the Minister's response, both in the way of policy and how the department has looked at advancing some of the work that Bill Henderson has done.

We look at today's press and we've heard some of the problems at Pelican Lake where we see up to 90 percent of the fish lost because of shortage of oxygen. I would say the reverse is the case at Oak Lake. This last winter Bill Henderson spent \$20,000 to rent a pump to put into the ice a structure of poles to make an

aeration system work to put oxygen into the lake. I'm not sure now what kind of recognition he's getting from the department and the Fisheries people but for some time it was almost pooh-poohed that he was not doing anything very effectively.

Well, he's lived in that area all his life and he knows Oak Lake; he has a resort there. I think that some recognition and consideration should be given to this man and the work that he's doing and the possible application of it and the use of his knowledge in other lakes in Manitoba, particularly in some of the shallower lakes. The evidence is there.

In fact, one of the concerns that he has and that I have is that in the operation that he's carrying out, there was a little bit of abuse of the resource by people coming in harvesting it when he was using the open-water system and, in fact, has requested me to have consideration put forward to restrict the fishing when that kind of operation is taking place because it is like shooting fish in a barrel. People take advantage of them when they come to the area where they're getting air.

In fact, I would put a request forward that consideration be given by the department to reimburse Mr. Henderson and to use his expertise in other areas. I would like the Minister's comments as to how the department look at the work that is being done at Oak Lake because it's been effective. It's proven in the last number of years.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that indeed the member's comments are valid. The gentleman out there has apparently done fairly well with his program. It is paying off to some degree and is worthwhile monitoring for the benefit of the whole system.

I'm quite prepared to take a look at that, Mr. Chairman. If the person has made a contribution out of which we benefit, there may be some logic there in trying to look at sharing some of his expense, if indeed we have gained something from the work that he has done and where we would apply that knowledge elsewhere. I think that's a fair comment. I don't know if I have authority to do that, but I'm prepared to look at that.

On the other hand, the department has some difficulty in looking at the whole oxygen question, the pumping of oxygen into lakes as a means of dealing with that problem, because of the costs of doing so. It's basically a money issue, a very expensive proposition; so I'm not sure that I can commit that the department will have the resources with which to do a whole host of shallow water or lakes in Manitoba in order to prevent the killing off of fish due to lack of oxygen.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's comments. The numbers I think are correct, and I do have to give credit where it's due. I think there was a \$2,500 provincial assistance given to this man this past winter. However, when you look at the size of Oak Lake and you look at the numbers of people that use it for fishing, both winter and summer, I think it's important that the total amount could be paid because the numbers that have been given to me by

Mr. Henderson are that he spent \$20,000, approximately, of his own money so that would come to about \$22,000-\$25,000, to conserve the fish over a winter is not unreasonable, I don't think, when it comes to saving a resource.

The other question that I ask the Minister - and I do appreciate the Minister's consideration, because I'm sure that if the Minister took a look at it, that he would in fact appreciate any return of funds for the work that he's done.

The other question I ask the Minister, and that is, one of the difficulties that Mr. Henderson had was that a large number of people were coming in harvesting the fish as they were coming to the aeration system that he had developed and really was not doing anything more than abusing the resource in another way; and he, in discussions with me has requested that some consideration be given to restrict, when that kind of operation is taking place, the removal of fish from that system. I can support that because, after all, what is the point of spending the money just to allow an overharvest at that particular time?

When they say that it's like shooting fish in a barrel when the fish are coming to the aeration hole, it's not difficult for people to scoop them out in large quantities. It also inhibited some of the work that Mr. Henderson was doing. I think consideration could be given to certain times of the year shutting it right off while that kind of activity is taking place, even though it may not be that popular. I'd like the Minister's comments on that regard as well.

I would hope that the Minister, if he's not aware of or does not understand totally the work that Mr. Henderson's doing that he do take a few minutes to sit down and hear his case and see some of the work he's done. I can highly recommend the man knows what he's doing.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the program obviously seems to be very much working to the advantage of that particular lake, if what the member says is accurate. I would be very interested in reviewing that. In fact, it somewhat intrigues me to the point where I think I should go and see the site and monitor it to see just how it is performing.

Yes, there's the big question and we have that with respect to the deer question as well as the fisheries, and that is how far do we go policywise in artificially providing for marginal lakes with respect to fishery or for the deer population that is moving further and further north given favourable climatic conditions from time to time, but then which gets trapped in those situations when sort of normal climatic conditions recur.

There's no end to the argument that you can support a lot more deer if you want to artificially keep them there at huge cost to the people of Manitoba. We've done a fair amount of that this winter. So, the two are parallel situations; one in the Fisheries and one in the Wildlife area where the question of how much public expense we go to to try to keep these operations going even though, naturally speaking, they were never viable operations, either the lakes with respect to the Fishery or the deer population where they should not be.

With respect to regulating fishing during aeration proceedings on a lake, I'm advised that we are preparing

regulations that would allow us the right to close down the fishery during that critical time period and that makes a lot of sense. I thank the Member for Arthur for that suggestion.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

There was some discussion at the last sitting in regard to the pilot project with a three-inch mesh in the southern part of Lake Manitoba. I know that there were attempts, not legally, but there were attempts by fishermen many many years ago to try and use undersized mesh on Lake Manitoba for that very purpose when they were still using cotton nets and linen nets. The nets are far more efficient now with the nylon and fine thread and they can also camouflage the netting.

I'm a bit concerned, because there's some controversy there between the different groups of fishermen and, of course, I have concern about depleting our fish population and particularly those that we want to see mature to a spawning size, which takes quite a number of years. So in the decision to go ahead with the pilot project, I want to know whether or not those recommendations came as a result of recommendations from a biologist and that there was an overabundance of perch, and I don't know what size they were. When I was fishing you could get, with a three-and-three-quarter inch mesh, we would get them up to a pound, sometimes a pound and a quarter. That, I think, is getting pretty scarce now. I would imagine with a three-inch mesh, you wouldn't get a large large perch.

I would ask as well whether or not there is a sauger fishery? Is there a sauger population in the southern part of Manitoba, and if there is a sauger fishery, there must be a pickerel fishery. They generally inhabit the same feeding grounds. The sauger is a cousin, I guess, of the pickerel and of course that brings up another question. — (Interjection) — No, I think they're much closer than the tulibee and the goldeye.

It brings up another question. When the fisherman market sauger, they usually get a much lower price than they do for the pickerel. At least, that's the way it was when I was in the industry. That brings up another question. When we go to purchase pickerel fillets at the market, we see some very small fillets, extremely small pickerel fillets and they're advertised as pickerel; I wonder where are they caught and in what nets are they caught, because you certainly can't catch those in three-and-three-quarter inch nets? They have to be caught in undersized nets - or are they marketing sauger as pickerel? If that's the case, if that is what's happening, is that they're marketing sauger as pickerel, then the consumer is being shafted because the fisherman does not get, in my view, the same price for his sauger as he does for the pickerel.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, S. Ashton:** Mr. Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** With respect to Lake Manitoba, we are intending to, and have been maintaining Lake Manitoba as a pickerel fishery so that other species of course are sort of second opportunity, if you like.

The downsizing of nets to three inch, on a short-term basis this winter, was designed only for the fishing of perch for a very short period of time, which proved to be reasonably economical to do, which allowed for new income for fishermen in the area and which will probably be repeated upon full evaluation, although we're not certain at this point in time. It was done in a way that didn't involve the catching of pickerel and that is the important thing.

With respect to Lake Winnipeg, however, we use three inch nets there, generally, because it's a different fishery altogether and we don't have the same concerns as we do on Lake Manitoba.

With respect to the method of packaging and marking fish species for sale to the retail market, the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, of course, is responsible for that and I'm not able to comment on whether or not sauger is being displayed as pickerel in the supermarket or whether it's because the fillet size is small, because we do allow the catching of pickerel on Lake Winnipeg with a three-inch mesh. It could be a combination; I have no way of knowing that. I would have to assume that the three-inch mesh on Lake Winnipeg provides an ample supply of small fish to the corporation, of the pickerel species.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. ADAM:** I can understand that some small pickerel would probably come from Lake Winnipeg, that's sauger fishery. What percentage, what impact did the - the Minister responded that we were able to catch perch without any other species, but I have difficulty with that because having been a fisherman for many, many years myself, I have some knowledge of winter fishery. What percentage of pickerel were caught, along with perch or saugers? There must be some information there.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that because of the timing and location of the perch fishery last winter that we were able to minimize the amount of take of the pickerel species and that the combined species of pickerel and sauger amounted to no more than about 5 percent of the take, while we were fishing the perch, so it's a very minimal take-out of pickerel that's occurred.

**MR. A. ADAM:** I would imagine that once the fishermen have invested in gill nets for three-inch fishing, they would certainly want to continue that because they have a very substantial investment, not only in the gill nets but in the floats and the sinkers and I suppose the nets would probably last five years of operation and they would be very reluctant, I presume, not to be able to carry on with that fishery; and if it is not going to impact that adversely on pickerel, sauger's about the same size as the perch so that's not as crucial, but if it's not going to impact that greatly on the pickerel population, I presume that it would in order to proceed with that.

I've got a few more questions. One has to do with Lake Dauphin, and that is, I believe there's been a change in the gill net size there and I know that the fish being caught are a much larger size. They're three- to four-pounders and it would seem to me that you're

catching pickerel of spawning size. I suppose I could ask the question, what are the spawning streams? Are they deteriorating? I guess they probably are.

I believe the mesh size used to be four inches on Lake Dauphin and that's been changed and for the last year or two I understand that fishermen have been catching more poundage - I'm not sure if they're catching more numbers of fish, but they're getting more poundage and probably more numbers as well. Is this the right way to proceed, though? I guess that's the intention, to allow the smaller fish to grow up to a larger size. I think that's the intent; but in the meantime we are catching a very substantial number of spawners so that's one question I had.

The other one was whether or not the fish hatchery on Lake Winnipegosis is still operating and also whether or not there's any communication between the Provincial Department of Fisheries and the federal people who have established a fish hatchery on Lake Dauphin. I don't know whether there's any communication on Lake Dauphin, but last year when I raised this question with the previous Minister, apparently the provincial people were unaware that there was a federal hatchery going up on Lake Dauphin. I'm just wondering how do we co-ordinate our work with the federal people not to overlap?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, Lake Dauphin, I'm advised, is in terrible shape as far as fishery is concerned. There has been a revision upward of the net size, but as the member would probably know, we don't take fish out during the spawning season in any event. There's a major problem with respect to sedimentation of that lake. As a matter of fact, the Water Commission has been seized of that issue and has filed a report. The solution to that is one that's going to take some time and a tremendous amount of money, a scarce resource as well. It'll take some years before we're able to come to a full solution with respect to the fishery operation of Lake Dauphin.

In respect to the hatchery at Winnipegosis; that one burned down and has not been replaced, so we don't have a hatchery there at the present time. The Government of Canada has a mobile research hatchery facility. I think it's on Lake Dauphin. That is not intended to be a permanent structure as I'm aware, but rather a research facility for a time definite.

**MR. A. ADAM:** They have built, in regards to the fish hatchery at Lake Dauphin, a number of buildings there, and I believe they have also constructed rearing ponds to rear them during the summer as there is around Lake Winnipegosis. I guess the next question would be: are we putting the fry into these rearing ponds - there are quite a number of them around Lake Winnipegosis - to rear in the summertime and then turn them out in the fall into Lake Winnipegosis?

The other question was whether or not there's any communications taking place between the federal efforts and the provincial efforts in regard to co-ordinating the effort?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there is federal-provincial liaison and I don't think either one or the other works in isolation, so that we are aware of what is happening.

There is a lot of fish being released into those waters. I don't know how many million, but we have an ongoing program that does try to restock those lakes.

With respect to Lake Dauphin, I neglected to mention one very important point, and that is that the basic problem there has to do with the reduction in the size of the spawning area because of sedimentation that is taking place. That's really our problem there. — (Interjection) — It's the cultivated acreage surrounding the lake that is resulting in washing into the lake an awful lot of top soil and so on.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Mr. Chairperson, has the department considered in their liaison with the federal people, are they doing anything in the area of trout spawning and trout hatchery, because the pickerel are under extreme pressure by sport fishing which has no control on size. You can catch tiny little fellows and great big ones. With gill nets you can control the size that you want to catch, but with sports fishing that's pretty difficult. So, there is the extreme pressure on that particular species. It's a desired species. Everybody is after that particular species, not only the commercial fisherman, but the sport fishing.

It seems to me that the more trout fishery you have available, and I think the Member for Minnedosa raised questions about the trout fishery in our last meeting, it seems to me that the more areas that we can develop trout fishery, the less pressure there will be on the pickerel fishing. Would it not be possible to have discussions with the Federal Government to have them make some efforts in that direction? What are we doing in the area of trout fishery? — (Interjection) — If we could deal with everything that comes to caucus, indeed I would be very happy.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government does have a crossbreeding operation in the Interlake. That is another research program of theirs with respect to trout. We have two trout hatcheries in Manitoba in order that we might supply the lakes that we service. There is some experimentation going on with respect to brook trout, I believe it is, up in Duck Mountain area that the department is promoting at the present time.

**MR. A. ADAM:** I have only a couple of more questions.

The commercial fishing is a major industry in my constituency and I wanted to touch on fish farming a bit. I know that it has been quite successful in Japan and I think in British Columbia, and I'm not sure whether the climate here is that suitable. I know it has been done in the pothole country.

I want to ask whether or not there's been any change in eligibility for commercial licensing? I believe there are three types of licensing. There is the helper, the operators and the commercial; I think there are three units. I'd like to ask whether there's any change in eligibility there? The other question, it was quite controversial and I think the former Member for Turtle Mountain was involved, created quite a controversy in moving towards the sale of quota, if you will, or sale of licensing on the lakes which created a value and which created quite a stir, and I guess we won two federal seats over it, but be that as it may.

I would like to know on the last question whether or not there's any pressure being applied to the Minister to move in that direction, because I would not want to see that happen unless the fishermen are totally in agreement and have had their input in that kind of a decision.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there are a variety of licensing changes that take place depending on the given lake and the sort of consultative process that we undertake with the fishermen of any particular lake. Essentially, if we're looking at Lake Winnipeg as an example, with respect to the criteria, I think that hasn't changed.

There is a very serious problem. I don't know that I would be exaggerating if I were to use the term that we have a chaotic situation with respect to licensing on Lake Winnipeg at the present time. Am I overstating it? — (interjection) — No, I'm understating it, okay. We have to deal with it.

I know how the Member for Ste. Rose feels philosophically about the last point that he raised with me, but I'm very much of the view that we may have to move in the direction of assigning quotas under proper guidelines, so that one person could not capture the whole quota of the lake. I think we have to recognize that may be a mechanism that we might have to recommend. There is a trial project under way with respect to that idea at Matheson Island. Without wanting to say that we've made a decision departmentally, I would like to suggest that my opinion is that we should get on with it and resolve that issue, because it's only becoming a greater problem.

We've had, I guess, a limited experience with respect to the pilot. I don't think we should wait too long to make that decision. I will be recommending a course of action very soon with respect to that question. It may recommend a transferability of quotas within certain guidelines. It's my understanding that the bulk of the fishermen on Lake Winnipeg would prefer that option. There's been an awful lot of discussion about it. I have talked to people that I have a great deal of respect for in the industry and I'm led to believe that that probably is the most acceptable proposition at the moment, albeit there's logic in having some reservation about the way that would work. Really, we shouldn't be discussing that here because it's not yet before us, but it's fair in the sense that we're considering that option, yes.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Yes, there's an attempt to look at that possibility on Lake Manitoba as well. We might be able to understand it on Lake Winnipeg and, then again, there have to be a lot of questions raised. You have a summer fishery there and you have a very substantial investment in boats and equipment and whatnot. Lake Manitoba has, what I consider to be and always has been, a part-time fishery. It's an operation where people do it as a supplement of another income of sorts, whether it be out working and fishing or whether it be ranching and fishing or any other occupation in addition to that and, therefore, it doesn't seem practical on Lake Manitoba that one could make a full-time living at fishing. It's a winter fishery, it's not a summer fishery and it seems to me that if we were to have a summer

fishery there, the lake would be depleted in no time at all. Winter fishing is much more difficult; it's not as productive as summer fishing. If there ever was a time when we would move toward summer fishing on Lake Manitoba, it wouldn't last very long. I just raise those cautions, because I can see the problems that we could run into there.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I had a phone call the other day, a complaint about the Souris River. Apparently, there's someone along that river in the vicinity of Wawanesa that blocks off the river - I guess you can't say "blocks off," but they must put up a net or some barrier to catch fish and feed them to their hogs. Apparently this has been reported last year and this year. The RCMP don't seem to feel it's their jurisdiction and the person that was calling me naturally felt that it wasn't right that this was going on and that no fish could get down through this and make their way into the rest of the river system.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate if the member, off the record if she wishes, would give us the specific site location of that obstruction or whatever.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Yes, I will do that.

**HON. S. USKIW:** It's certainly not a legal practice.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** No, I'll do that.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Portage.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Chairman, I just have one question. I wonder if the Minister could give me some information.

What year was it that the three-inch mesh was allowed to be used on Lake Winnipeg?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm told it's sometime in the '50s.

**MR. L. HYDE:** In the '50s. Okay, thank you. That's what I wanted.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Just in the south end channel area of Lake Winnipeg.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to go back a minute just to make a comment on the transferability of licences, because the Member for Ste. Rose brought that up. I'd just like to put on the record that I'm sure that when this committee meets 10 or 15 years from now that they will come to a point where they will agree that transferability of licences was the only way to make the industry viable.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I agree sooner than that.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Maybe sooner than that. I predict it in 10 years from now it'll be very widespread, because

entrepreneurs cannot be expected to invest money and take risks if they don't have protection for the resource base that they work with. I say very straightforwardly that I believe that the Member for Ste. Rose did a disservice to the fishermen when he went out and attended meetings where public servants were out to explain a proposed policy and the Member for Ste. Rose went out and did his best to stir up opposition to that idea. That's his right, but I say that time will show that he did a disservice to those fishermen and that some of the same fishermen who opposed that idea at the time, perhaps only because it hadn't been adequately explained and all of the details worked out, some of those same fishermen now realize that that may, indeed, be the answer to their problems.

We were not approaching it from any sort of philosophical benefit for Conservatives by seeing the fishery move in that direction. What we were trying to do was see that people be able to make a living from the fishing industry. That was an idea and I think that time will prove that it was a pretty good idea basically. There may be some restrictions, as the Minister has said, that need to be placed on.

I'd like to commend the Branch for their five-year report that, unfortunately, was just laid before us a couple of days ago and I know — (Interjection) — that I for one - well, you could have held it till next week, Mr. Minister, but you're already in violation by not tabling it sooner. I don't say it by way of criticism, I just say that unfortunately I, for one, have not had time to study the report and to be able to discuss it intelligently before the committee today or in the next day or two; but I'm pleased to see that it's there. I see that, in looking through it rather quickly, that it doesn't seem to strictly conform with the legislation in the sense that it doesn't appear to me to deal with individual species that are listed in the schedule, so I only ask the Minister why that is, whether it's simply too complicated to deal with individual species at this time, whether the information simply isn't available or just what the reason is.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised by the staff that they felt it would be overly complex to do it on an individual species basis, not that it can't be done, but they felt that would be a very cumbersome approach.

I want to advise the Member for Turtle Mountain that we had received that report only on Tuesday and I had, on first blush, decided that perhaps I shouldn't table it now because I haven't had a chance to read it and therefore I would not be able to respond to its content.

On second review, I decided that would be unfair because then I would be holding it in my possession, not giving members a chance to discuss it in this committee, so I then decided to table it. For whatever it's worth, I haven't read it and therefore I'm ignorant of its content at this point in time, but it's there for your benefit.

Back to the other issue that the member raises, transferability of quotas. The people that I've spoken with, fishermen in the Lake Winnipeg area, have said to me, get on with it; we think you should go that direction. I would hazard a guess that if you had a referendum on that issue, within the rules that they have set down - there is a committee or a report on that - on how it could be done, without giving up the

fishery to one individual per se, in the long run, within those parameters they hazard a guess that 95 percent of the fishermen would support that, so I have to take cognizance of that and we will be reviewing that policy fairly soon.

**MR. R. RANSOM:** Just to add a word further on the transferability of licences, the Member for Ste. Rose may or may not be aware of the extent to which licences are transferred now, under the table, and to lay it on the table is, to me, a much more legitimate thing to do. It doesn't make much sense to me that a person who might be employed in Winnipeg, but holds a licence and is able to allow someone else on the lake to fish that licence and then to cream off the top, to me, is putting our heads in the sand if we try and hide from that. Far better to bring it out into the open and let the market function openly, rather than a black market function, which in effect is what's happening now.

With respect to the five-year report, I just would like to point out to the Minister and to the staff that the reason for asking for each species to be dealt with was that I know and others know that there isn't a great deal of information available on some of these species and, indeed, it may be repetitive. But I think there is value in stating what is known, and by implication, what isn't known and in the long run, the management of the Fishery will benefit from that kind of reporting.

I'd just like to make one other suggestion to the Minister. I put this request to the previous Minister of Natural Resources concerning the five-year Wildlife report and that was that I think we should consider an opportunity for the committee to meet and ask questions of the Director of Fisheries, for instance, as well as the Minister, in the same way that we ask questions of the Deputy Minister of Finance when we sit in committee to discuss the financial resources of the provinces. When we do an accounting for the financial resources of the province, it's acceptable for a committee to question senior civil servants. We recognize that the Minister is not a technical person and can't answer some of the questions, and it seems to me that since that report only comes once every five years, we can't do justice to it in a few minutes in Estimates review, that we really should consider that.

It might even be extended to allowing the public to make submissions the way they do to Law Amendments Committee. It's just a suggestion that I put forward to the Minister.

I'd like to ask a couple of specific questions. Can the Minister give me a report on events at Pelican Lake and Rock Lake over the past winter? I'm not asking for detail, but just what happened and where is it at today?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Both of those lakes have been winter killed, Mr. Chairman. We did do a salvage operation on one lake and at the present time we're involved with the clean-up of those lakes, which obviously is a major job, major undertaking. There is going to have to be a restocking, I presume, as a result, a major restocking that will take place.

The long-term solution, I guess, is yet to be determined or found. Perhaps the Member for Turtle Mountain has some opinion on that. I don't know that

there is one that is satisfactory or that is 100 percent proof, and if there is one, I don't know what the costs are. Obviously you have to have more depth of water in lakes to avoid winter kill and the question is, where do you draw the water from and so on. Perhaps the member wants to add further to his comments.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** First of all, I'd like to ask just on the question of stocking and then I'll follow up on the other. Are there plans set at the moment for the restocking of Pelican or Rock Lake? The indication is that there are plans set. Can the Minister just give me a rough indication of what that program will be?

**HON. S. USKIW:** The plan is to stock Rock Lake with adult pike and pickerel fry in both Rock and Pelican, several millions of fingerlings.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** With respect then to Pelican Lake, first of all, there was a plan being developed at the time that we were in government that would have seen water diverted from the Pembina River through an intake channel and also there was to be an outlet channel put in place as well to prevent unduly high levels of water.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Would the member clarify whether he's referring Rock or Pelican Lake?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I'm talking about Pelican Lake where there was a plan in place and, indeed, land was acquired and I think even some of the materials had been acquired. My question to the Minister is not about the construction of the thing but whether or not the staff and he feel that that sort of project would be beneficial to the fishery? I recognize that nothing is likely to be 100 percent effective, but would it be beneficial to the fishery? Can they give us any kind of indication about whether they think it would reduce the frequency of winter kill by 50 percent or 80 percent or 20 percent - any kind of assessment?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, yes, the member is absolutely correct. There was a project that was on the books some few years ago and due to prioritization that project was not proceeded with. I guess the monies were either lapsed or reprioritized or whatever. It is true had that been proceeded with that Pelican Lake would be in a better condition than it is at the moment and would reduce the frequency of the problem of oxygen that we've had to experience there from time to time. To what extent, I don't know. Would it eliminate it or not? It depends on total drainage into the area too, I suppose, the total volume of water coming in. In essence, yes, it would substantially improve that lake's fishery.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I assume that the same sort of comment might apply to Rock Lake then, that if there is any raising of the level there that it would have a similar effect - and the Minister is indicating perhaps that they would appraise that differently.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, yes, the difference with Rock Lake is that you would have to raise it

substantially in order to get the same benefit. A two-foot rise in that lake would simply inundate a lot of acreage which would contribute to further reducing the oxygen in the lake because of the plant life and so on that you would be adding to the lake, so it would aggravate the situation, certainly not help it any unless you went - how many feet? - you'd have to go five or six feet up on Rock Lake to achieve results. I don't know whether that's practical or not given the shoreline situation.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Just a couple of other things then, Mr. Chairman.

I think the Fisheries people deserve some commendation for undertaking the kind of salvage operation that they undertook this past winter at Pelican Lake. I know they ran some serious risk there, of course, that if there had not been a winter kill, they were not going to look very good. There was some unhappiness locally, of course, with people who have a vital interest in the management of the resource. I guess the only thing that could be suggested would be that another time they might try and communicate a little more widely beforehand about what is under way, but I think it did turn out quite well and there were a lot of people involved in that and they felt pretty good about being able to get involved directly in some hands-on kind of handling of the resources.

I think a final question then has to do with the situation in Turtle Mountain as to the lakes there and whether or not they are proceeding with the rearing experiments. I'm not even sure that "experiment" is the proper term anymore. It may be an operational situation now for rearing walleye in some of the small lakes in Turtle Mountain.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we're not doing any rearing of pickerel in the area, but we are trying to develop two additional lakes through an aeration experiment, Adam and Bower Lakes.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Was there not an experiment conducted two or three years ago where walleye were raised, perhaps released, into Lake Bower as fry and harvested in the fall for transfer to other lakes and that it was very successful in that they got rapid growth over the summer and no predation?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, I'm advised that there may have been some experimentation but the attempt now is to develop a real fishery in the area. It's a much more serious venture at the moment.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** I can appreciate that has some benefit directly for Bower, but with respect to raising fish for transfer and stocking of other lakes then, are they doing that same kind of thing in other lakes? When you have a situation like Lake Dauphin that the Member for Ste. Rose was referring to, if you've got enough of those lakes and you can transfer enough fish into it that have been reared somewhere else, they can survive as adults.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, yes, just to show that I don't leave the wrong impression, we are rearing more

pickereel in that particular region. We are also committing more staff to that particular fishery, so that we recognize the importance of doing something in the area.

With respect to the question of the salvage operation, we're very pleased with the fact that we had a lot of local initiative and support for that program. I think that's a real credit to the local community as well.

I want to compliment the Member for Turtle Mountain on one thing that perhaps many are not aware of and, that is, it's come to my attention that the five-year report was really an innovation of his when he was Minister of Natural Resources. It was a very worthy objective and, hopefully, its worth will be realized as we peruse those reports and carry forward to the years ahead.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Malinowski:** The Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Every time the Minister of Resources, regardless of political stripe, goes to Swan River I'm sure they get bombarded with enquiries about restocking some of the lakes in the area. I know the Minister has been up to Swan River recently. I'm just wondering if he can bring me up-to-date on what is planned for the coming year with respect to restocking fish in the lakes in the Duck Mountains and perhaps the Porcupine area as well.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the effort in that area is to rehabilitate Two Mile Lake and Glad Lake into a substantive trout fishery. Two Mile and Glad.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, I believe the other day we were talking about some funding in the Fisheries through the Canada Federal Agreement. Are there any programs for restocking lakes under this agreement?

**HON. S. USKIW:** No.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** With respect to Destination Manitoba, has there been any funding from that area spent in the Duck Mountains or anywhere in the Swan Valley area?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Not for fish, Mr. Chairman, no.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Did the department not submit an application - perhaps it was denied - but through some funding from the source of Destination Manitoba?

**HON. S. USKIW:** There doesn't seem to be any knowledge of it, Mr. Chairman. If the member's aware, perhaps there may have been something.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Perhaps it was in another area, not necessarily in the Fisheries, so I'll leave it at that.

With respect to Two Mile Lake and Glad Lake, did you indicate the types of fish that will be . . .

**HON. S. USKIW:** Trout.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. A. ADAM:** Thank you.

The Member for Turtle Mountain put some comments on the record in that I had done a disservice by attending some of the meetings when they were trying to convince fishermen to move toward a licensed value or whatever was the designation or the name of it.

I want to put on the record that I only attended a couple of meetings, as I recall, and it was at the invitation of fishermen in my area that wanted me there and what they were saying is, you're our representative and we want you there. I recall at one meeting - I'm not sure if it was Waterhen and perhaps the director was there, I don't remember exactly - but one of the fishermen stood up and said, we want to hear our representative speak here this evening and we want to hear his views.

My response was that it was not my meeting; I had not set up the meeting and that I didn't feel that I should be speaking, but they insisted that I did speak and I was invited by those who were in charge of the meeting to come up and speak and I did. I spoke my view and I still have that opinion, as far as Lake Manitoba is concerned. I would question at this point in time whether that would be the right direction to proceed, as far as Lake Manitoba is concerned.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, our pressure on that issue has risen in the Lake Winnipeg fishery. I don't know of any move on the Lake Manitoba fishery from the fishermen themselves, so that if we're going to address the issue, my guess would be that we will apply it on those lakes where there seems to be a will or support for that kind of a program.

It's certainly in the initial stages. It may be that subsequently other fisheries may want to follow suit, but it's not our intent to impose something on a fishery that people don't want.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have too many questions, but being involved with the Environmental Department, it comes to mind about the picture I saw in the paper of the dead fish at Pelican Lake. I heard the reason for it and I'm not about to be critical, but I would like to know what the department is doing about the disposal of the dead fish. Can the Honourable Minister advise?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm not certain what the final disposition of the dead fish is, but the disposition of it is governed by a local health officer who makes a decision on methodology and disposal. It could be disposal into the garbage or the nuisance grounds or it could be that they're converted to other uses, but it's governed by the health officer's recommendation.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Not to make any big issue about it, Mr. Minister, but we do have regulations covering dead animals and we've got some pretty strict regulations concerning dead cattle and how they must be disposed of and I can understand the reason for the disposal of the dead. I would think that maybe fish should come somewhat under the same sort of a policy,



and I was just wondering whether the Minister would be prepared to advise whether he has contemplated a policy of handling dead fish, or is he going to leave the responsibility in somebody else's hands. Then again, Sam, I don't want to make a big issue about it, but I have to be concerned about the environmental part of it.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Let the Minister answer the first question and then . . .

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Tell that member down there to keep his nose out of it because it's none of his business.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Order please.  
Mr. Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there's really no analogous situation between livestock and fish with respect to the need to protect the public from disease. In the livestock area, there is a problem for which the legislation and regulations deal with the issue. With respect to fish, there is not an equivalent concern healthwise. A lot of the fish are eaten up by the birds before you can get at them, so environmentally, other than the smell, it's not a serious thing. Notwithstanding that, how we dispose of them is governed by health authorities, so that the environment or public health issues are addressed.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** I would think that these fish could be of some benefit to hog farmers or mink ranchers or people of that nature and I know that there's a great difficulty in trying to bringing them in from the North to the south, particularly after they're dead, but I was trying to find out whether there were any regulations and the Minister has put my mind at ease concerning the health hazards not being anywhere near comparable and I'm prepared to accept that. Thank you.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There's been considerable work done with crossbreeding speckled and lake trout and splake in the Northern areas. Has there been any movement? Are there any lakes in the southern part of the province that they've planted splake in? I think maybe one lake in the Turtle Mountains?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Williams Lake is one lake which we've put them into.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Has it been successful?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** In the sport fishing, has the Minister given any consideration, or is he thinking about giving any consideration to increasing the possession limit to possibly a two-day limit, instead of the one-day? I'm thinking of the money we're spending to attract tourists up here, and to have them come 1,200 miles and allow them to take home four pickerel just seems a little . . . As a personal viewpoint, I think a two-day possession

might eliminate some of the tendencies or the feelings of the odd fisherman to maybe try and get that extra day's limit home with him, undetected, shall we say.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the information I have is that that policy was in effect some years ago and was discontinued because if it were to continue it would deplete the lakes much too quickly. It had a negative effect on fish stock in the lake.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I think maybe you're being a little naive there, Mr. Chairman, when you've got four conservation officers covering the whole western part of Manitoba. I don't think there's anyplace that was not taking two-day's limit if they get a chance.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that's a fair comment. My staff advise me that we still rely on the honour system to quite a degree.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** That brings us to the honour system. What about a size limit? I have always thrown back small fish; I don't see any point in keeping an eight- or ten-inch long pickerel. If you don't get a decent sized pickerel to make a fillet out of it, you might as well put it back and hope you'll get it again next year.

What is the reasoning behind taking the size limit off?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised that it tends to depress the size of the stock of the fishery. That was discontinued some years ago.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** It's okay if I continue to do it though. There's no objection to it?

Just a final question, Mr. Chairman. I fish Clear Lake quite a bit with very, very little success and I just wondered - there are other people that go up there and always come home with their limit of pickerel and nobody can find out where they go. I was just wondering under the new Freedom of Information Act that's going to be brought in if we might somehow be able to find out where the hell they're going.

**HON. S. USKIW:** No . . .

**MR. D. BLAKE:** He's not going to answer.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there's any change in the commercial fishing in Red Deer Lake, Swan Lake, or Dawson Bay, Lake Winnipegosis? Has there been any recent changes in the commercial fishing in those lakes?

**HON. S. USKIW:** No, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. E. HARPER:** I want to ask the Minister - and it's in regard to Limestone. I travelled through all the communities and particularly the communities that are

close to Limestone were questioning us as a working group about the fish. They wanted to find out what the Department of Natural Resources is doing in terms of protecting, I believe the brook trout. Then they had some information relating to fish ladders. I was just wondering what programs are being anticipated for the construction of Limestone.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we are doing a fair amount of co-ordinating work with respect to that issue. There are impact consultants working on that and our input is made through that vehicle.

**MR. E. HARPER:** The only reason I said we had asked these questions quite some time ago and then they have been put through some channels, so we haven't got word back yet, so I was just wondering where this was at. I know the Natural Resources had some input. I was saying that we had put these questions through appropriate departments and appropriate people and we hadn't received any information. I was wondering where this was at.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I see, okay. Well, Mr. Chairman, we'll endeavour to track that down and advise the member.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure whether that's the document that I have here. This is in response to his previous question here. We have the answers for him.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Natural Resources Fisheries—pass?

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman, I expect the Member for Emerson was finished his questioning on Fisheries. He's at a medical appointment.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

The member is concerned about his opportunity. There will be another one later on the Salary. The only disadvantage of that is that there are no staff at that time.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I think we can pass it and go on to Wildlife for tonight Mr. Chairman. We won't get into it now, I don't expect. By the time you get the formalities done, it'll be time for Committee rise. You can pass this item.

**HON. S. USKIW:** You can pass Fisheries.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Yes, so then Fisheries . . .

**HON. S. USKIW:** Read out the resolution.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Resolution No. 125: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,707,500 for Natural Resources for the fiscal year ending the 31st Day of March, 1986—pass.

The hour is now 4:30 p.m. and I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour. The Committee will return at 8:00 o'clock this evening.

## SUPPLY - HEALTH

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 7, Manitoba Health Services Commission, Administration - Mr. Minister.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Pembina wanted to know the number of employees at the Commission and also at the Cadham Lab that were over the \$40,000.00. There has been no change in 1984-85 and there has been no change, or very little change, over the period of years. There hasn't been any big change in job classification or salary increase, so therefore I'm not repeating them. They're exactly the same as of now.

On Administration, 6; Executive, 2; Internal Audit, 1; Administration Division, 4; Urban Facilities Division, 2; Rural Health and Ambulance Services, 3; Personal Care Homes, 2; Construction and Operational Planning, 4; Insurance Division, 4; Health Information System Division, 8; Air Ambulance, 1, for a sub-total of 37.

Now the Laboratory and X-ray Services . . . 7 - that's out of 209 and 6 out of Cadham, out of 96.5, for a total of 50.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday night we had been engaged in some debate concerning a letter that the Minister of Health had sent out to all chairmen, hospitals, personal care homes and health centres in which the Minister of Health had suggested that the reason the government was only going to have 0.8 percent growth in revenues was mainly because of the projected loss in equalization payments; and he also attempted to make the point that the EPF funding for health and post-secondary education at the federal level was \$100 million less than Manitoba's share. He then went on to make an observation that, while technically correct, was designed to leave the impression that Manitoba was somehow losing \$200 million because their average income, average capacity to raise revenue, was \$200 million short of the all-provincial average.

As I say, while technically correct, it's irrelevant to any sort of discussion with the health care institutions because that all-province average has never been the basis for equalization in Canada, but because the Minister of Health foolishly accepted the advice given by the Minister of Finance and put it into his letter without justifying it, then I think he used his position as Minister of Health to leave an incorrect impression with the chairmen of hospitals, personal care homes and health centres.

We then were treated to the rather lengthy piece of bafflelegab by the Minister of Finance, trying to justify the statement that went out in this letter because it had been raised with him that, far from having a \$25 million increase in revenues, indeed the Provincial Government had had a much greater increase than that in revenues; and of course that they actually had included \$72 million in his revenue projections from equalization. He didn't assume that he was going to lose that at all - and indeed, he ended up with \$50 million.

Of course, in the revenue projections that were tabled before the House, it became evident that the increase

in established programs financing funds from the Federal Government this year were up \$57 million, while the total increase in education and health spending was only up 61 - hardly justification to go to the health care institutions and tell them that this is why we're not spending more money.

The Minister of Finance said that changes had taken place, that when he made that statement earlier on, that was the best information he had. Well, perhaps. We recognize that there are changes that take place, that there are adjustments, but I have to point out to the Minister of Health, to the House, because I'm sure the Minister of Health is already aware of it, that in the letter dated April 22nd that went out from the chief budget officer to the hospitals, non-proprietary personal care homes and health centres - in the letter that went out, he unfortunately quoted from the Minister's letter of January, saying that government revenue is expected to grow by under \$25 million or 0.8 percent - this statement as of April 22nd.

That is a most unfortunate statement going out to say, in effect, that the Minister's letter of January 7th was indeed true. Well, of course it's not true and we know that at this point the government has far greater revenues coming in, aside from any tax increases that they impose. So, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the only reasonable thing for the Minister of Health to do at this point is to write a letter to all of the people that received the previous two letters and say, these are the increases that our government has received by way of revenues from the Federal Government in equalization, in EPF, in growth in our own taxes and in new taxes; and in light of all these considerations, in light of all this revenue that we're getting, we are sticking with certain priorities. The Minister has the right and his government has the right to make those priorities, but I believe it would only be fair to the health care institutions to lay the facts before them as to what revenues the government has and what the decisions the government has made with respect to funding for health care institutions.

I hope that the Minister of Health will consider that very carefully because he has said on many occasions, Mr. Chairman, that the problems and the crisis that the health care system in this province is faced with is going to require the attention of government, of opposition, of the users, of the administrators, of the professionals in the system, of everybody in the system; and I don't believe that the cause of helping to maintain a quality health care system into the future is going to be helped by giving information to the administrators of health care institutions that misleads them as to the reasons for the government making the decision.

I would ask the Minister if he would write to those same people, lay out the facts and simply say, these are the decisions that we, as the government of this province, think it's necessary to take.

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

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I'm sure the Minister of Health will address that last portion. As I'd indicated previously, the letter referred to as the January letter was done on the basis of information provided from the Department of Finance and I would assume that,

obviously, the later letter went out with someone not taking a look at the facts as they had been updated.

I should go over some of the numbers though that have been presented in the House.

The Budget, '85-86, indicated a total revenue increase of \$153.5 million. That included a \$72 million equalization which had not been included and very clearly was excluded from the January letter and it of course included our taxation increase. So when we get down to it we were at considerably less than a 2 percent outage in terms of what we expected in January and where we were in April without those two adjustments. I think that everyone here understands why those adjustments were made.

What I'd ask the opposition to do is follow its own suggestions, however, with respect to looking at global amounts of money available. When you look at global amounts of money available as per the 1985-86 Budget, federal source revenues including all of federal source revenues that they collect for us, revenues that they provide to us under agreements, etc., increased, according to Budget documents, by \$24.3 million total, including the EPF payments, including the equalization payments, including income tax payments, including the corporate income tax, the whole works. All of the federal source payments increased by \$24.3 million and that was, Mr. Chairman, before the cut in equalization. — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Turtle Mountain doesn't like that but that's a fact of life. That is looking at the whole forest and not one tree, not picking out one tree. Taxpayers understand that; they look at the bottom line. They don't look in the middle of the page somewhere and see one increase and nail their hats on that one increase; that's not the way they work and that's not the way they budget and that's not the way this government budgets. When you look at the bottom line for all of that federal funding after the cut of \$22 million from that \$24.3 million increase, our total federal source revenues increased this year from last year, according to our predictions today, by \$2.3 million.

We have that wonderful group over on the other side suggesting that somehow that is such a magnanimous of increase in funding that we should never ever again suggest that the Federal Government should be responsible for anything happening in this province. That is the most ludicrous proposition to be put forward by any opposition I would suggest in many many years. That demonstrates the total bankruptcy of the arguments made by the opposition. They're taking one figure. They're saying there's a \$50 million increase or whatever the number is in Established Programs Finance. They ignore all the other figures and they say, well, all this should be dumped into Health somehow, although on the other hand they say it shouldn't because you should look at your overall revenues. Then they say, well, let's put it all into Health and then, of course, we would be down by approximately \$50 million for all our other programming from the Federal Government.

We have the Member for Pembina, of course, in about as close to a dishonest fashion as any member in his House could come without being dishonest, suggesting that we were out by eight-fold or something like that in terms of our calculations of revenue in January. That is just absolutely ridiculous. It is false; it is inaccurate. I think it's an abomination on this; the Legislature to have

people making those kinds of statements to us. Those statements simply are not in accordance with the facts.

It seems to me that every time they start talking about equalization and Established Programs Financing, they seem to try to make a point of doing it when I'm occupied somewhere else. They try to do it with the Minister of Health who is not the Minister responsible for those programs and they know it full well, but they want to play these silly little games in the Minister of Health's Estimates because he doesn't have the staff here who are available to deal with the issues that they raise here constantly in my absence and in the absence of my staff. I ask you, wait for my Estimates when I have my staff here and my documents here. We will deal with EPF; we will deal with equalization. We will deal with those issues. We have dealt with them fairly; we have dealt with them openly; we have dealt with them to the benefit of Manitobans.

I want to make one other point. The Member for Turtle Mountain suggests that when we talk about the \$200 million shortfall that never in history has resource revenue been calculated in equalization. Well, of course, on that he's wrong again as he has been on so many other things. I would refer him to Mr. Courchene's book on the evolution of equalization payments. I think that would do many members of the Legislature some good. I refer to Page 52 of that book on equalization payments. I'm going to quote a bit.

"The second significant alteration over the 1972-77 period occurred as a result of the mushrooming of the world oil price in 1973 and 1974. In the fall of 1974, the Federal Government announced that energy royalties and revenues would no longer be equalized in full." Making it very clear that before that time they were equalized in full, he was wrong when he suggested that somehow it had never been historically the case that was done. The Government of the Day in Manitoba at that time opposed that move. I believe the Sterling Lyon Government opposed that move but I will check.

There was a Blue Paper presented to the Minister of Finance federally by the Minister of Finance provincially in 1981. I think we will check the record and find that governments in Manitoba for the past decade and more opposed that and said all along that you look at the average — (Interjection) — The Member for Virden wouldn't know the meaning of that. Governments in this province have consistently said that when you average up to the national standard, you do that in accordance with the formulas that have been developed, and we have a formula that would take into account all resource revenue if only it wasn't based on five provinces. If it was based on 10 provinces, all resource revenue would be in and we wouldn't be having these kinds of problems.

When we make that kind of a statement in our letters, such as the January letter, it is absolutely correct. We were referring to no formula. We were referring to the fact that we believe that equalization — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Pembina says nothing about the Domtar grants to Quebec, the millions of dollars spent on tobacco-raising subsidies by the Federal Government for his friends from Quebec and Ontario, subsidies that put people in the hospitals here in Manitoba and put costs on to our Minister of Health. He says nothing at all about the petro-chemical industry and its \$15 million subsidy that was given by the

Mulroney Government into Montreal after the election. He says nothing at all about time after time after time federal subsidies into places like Quebec and he continually stands up here and criticizes us when we say we should get our fair share here in Manitoba. I think that's shameful behaviour on the part of the Member of Pembina. I think he should grow up and he should stand up for Manitoba. I think he should stand up for Manitoba and for fairness. What we're talking about is only fairness.

Mr. Chairman, talking about fairness, we heard the other day the Federal Government telling our people that a commodity that is grown in three provinces can't be part of a national package because it's not national. There are only three provinces. Well, how about the Autopac? Ontario and Quebec grow the cars, so to speak. They are subsidized. We can't buy foreign cars because that would do those companies out of profit. How about our bus industry here in Manitoba? Do we get the other side of that benefit? No, of course not. It goes to Quebec; it goes to Ontario. Those people are saying that's perfectly fine to keep on subsidizing industry out there when we say we want fairness here, when we say as the quid pro quo in Confederation, we expect the glue of Confederation, and that is equalization, to be dealt out — (Interjection) — You bet. We're into the glue of Confederation . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** . . . I think the Member for Lakeside would agree with me. You know, we have many of those kinds of regional programs that benefit one region against the other. We have grain benefits, we have agricultural stabilization benefits and so on and so on, one of the things that at the end of the day, means we can live together a little better as Canadians, is the Equalization Program that evens things out among the provinces that benefited from those national programs - because we all pay for those national programs - and puts us into a little better position relative to the provinces that benefited more than we did, because some provinces do benefit more than we do from Confederation.

Central Canada has traditionally benefited considerably more from Confederation than have provinces in the hinterland like Manitoba. We must stand up strongly to continue to impress successive federal governments, it's not this Federal Government who made the terrible change in equalization this time around, we've said all along it's the previous government.

At the same time we have to caution members opposite not to get carried away with the rhetoric on that issue — (Interjection) — the Member for Lakeside says he thinks I'm right. He was saying in the House — (Interjection) — well, I think he's usually reasonable. Once in a while he's wrong though.

Just the other day in the House the Member for Lakeside indicated that we had agreed to this arrangement in 1982 and, of course, he knows that we had not.

**A MEMBER:** How many more minutes of bafflelegab does the honourable member have left?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** I have a meeting at 3:30, so you don't have to worry.

He knows that statement was incorrect. I'll spend the evening reading your remarks in Hansard, don't worry.

But the Member for Lakeside stated the other day that we had agreed with the Federal Government to this change in equalization. He knows that he was wrong and I'm sure that during the course of this debate he will stand up and indicate that he was wrong, because clearly we fought against that change throughout, to the extent of our government appearing before the Federal Finance Committee to speak against it several days before it was passed, and the other people who were against it were the federal Tories. The federal Tories supported us on it.

The federal Tories were saying it's wrong to do these kinds of things to Manitoba and these people on the other side keep saying, what a wonderful thing it is for Manitoba that we're getting only \$22 million less in equalization payments next year than we got last year, even though our need under the formula has increased by something in the range of 70 percent; and they say that's wonderful and they say that it's even greater that the year after we're due to receive another \$25 million cut in equalization and they say that that is just wonderful. They say that is really magnanimous.

We say that that's not fair. We say that it's not fair. We say that what is fair is to provide us at least with what we received the previous year unless the formula indicates that we should require less, and of course the formula shows no such thing. — (Interjection) — No, we don't complain at all if the formula begins to show that we have become so well-to-do that we no longer need as much and if you have an NDP Government for another five or six years, I'm sure that will happen.

In the late 1970s, the Member for Virden probably doesn't know this, but never has equalization grown so fast in this province as during the years of the Lyon administration when the formula just so dramatically increased because of the incredible difficulties they placed this economy into.

We hope though, in the next five years or so, we can turn that around; but meanwhile . . .

**A MEMBER:** Who brought it up? Who signed the letter?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** . . . as long as the members want to talk about equalization I will, between meetings, be showing up here as a bit of a "truth squad" to keep them a little bit in line, to keep their worst excesses - and I refer especially to the Member for Pembina - I'll keep his remarks in mind and make sure that they are rebutted as they should be, because he never bats more than about somewhere in the range of 10 percent, and that's too bad.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister of Finance has attempted to explain away why he can't be quite factual with his public

presentations in Finance; and he tries to say that we've got to work in co-operation with the Federal Government, we've got to stand up and fairly present the Manitoba position because if we don't fight for Manitoba we're going to lose every time.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance should know that one of the first ground rules of establishing any kind of credibility, when you are negotiating with the Federal Government, is at least to have your facts straight and your figures correct. That is exactly why we got to this debate in Health Estimates, where the Finance Minister had to come in and attempt once again to bail out their most senior Minister for signing a letter that isn't factual and sending it out to chairmen of hospitals, personal care home boards, health centres, the administrators of same, the MHO, the Nursing Home Association of Manitoba and the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance stands in this House and lectures us, lectures us poor mortals over in the opposition on how errant and wayward we are and he lectures us about getting our facts straight. He lectures us about having the proper information and making a true presentation of the facts. I might remind you, Mr. Chairman, this is the same Minister of Finance who, in his presentation of the Public Accounts, was one of the first ones in the time I've been here where a Minister of Finance, since I've been an elected member, ever presented the Public Accounts of Manitoba where the Provincial Auditor would not endorse them and the Minister of Finance is standing up and telling us on this side of the House that we have to be factual, that we have to have our figures correct, when he's the Finance Minister that the Provincial Auditor would not sign the Provincial Accounts of Manitoba? That's like a corporation going to their shareholders with their financial statements unsigned by their auditor because they're not factual and true.

How many financial officers in a corporation could get away with that and not be fired in the private sector? None. But this Minister of Finance did it. His Auditor wouldn't sign his financial report as to the factual presentation of the finances of the Province of Manitoba; and this group over here, this New Democratic Government says, well, that's fine, that's fine, he's doing a good job. He's distorting the figures; he's leaving an impression that's wrong on the people of Manitoba. That's what he's attempting to do. That's what we want to do; we want to cover everything up, distort, change the presentation, we want to fool the people.

Mr. Chairman, that's the stage we were at on Tuesday afternoon, when we asked some very elementary questions of the Minister of Finance on how he could sign his January 7th . . .

**A MEMBER:** Minister of Health, not Finance.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** . . . I'm sorry. I got a little carried away on the Minister of Finance, yes. We started Tuesday afternoon by asking the Minister of Health how he could sign a January 7th letter which was not factually correct and to the Minister's credit he said, well, I didn't develop the information on that; that came

Thursday, 25 April, 1985

from Finance; so therefore we got the Minister of Finance in here to attempt to justify why he gave those wrong figures to the Minister of Health to sign. He didn't justify it; he didn't justify it at all, Mr. Chairman.

Then last, I believe, Tuesday night before we got into the unfortunate adjournment of the House at a premature hour, the Minister of Finance was even chastising me, and if you care to check the record, he was saying, you know, I was really out to lunch on my criticism that their revenue figures were misleading in the Minister's letter of January 7th, and that I should know better. The Minister of Finance is telling me I should know better, that these things change, they're a moving target, and that they were the best estimates he had. I'll even give him credit, I'll even give the Minister of Finance a small amount of credit, and I will say that as of January 7, 1985, when he wrote this letter for the Minister of Health, that maybe their revenue was only expected to grow by \$25 million. I'll give him that kind of credit, but certainly it doesn't justify him using a non-existing formula on equalization. It never has been used or existed, but that's another issue.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister of Finance to have been a big enough man to at least admit that the following letter that went out on April 22, 1985, which perpetuated the false information of the January 7th letter should have been corrected, because in the April 22nd letter, those same people, the chairmen of the boards of hospitals, non-proprietary personal care homes and health centres, and I believe the administrators of the same organizations, the Manitoba Health Organization and the Nursing Home Association of Manitoba, all got a letter April 22nd - and the Manitoba Health Services Commission - repeating incorrect information, leaving a wrong impression, leaving a false idea of where the province's finances are and attempting to blame the Federal Government, by implication, for lack of budgetary constraint or lack of budgetary ability.

Mr. Chairman, I did some further checking, and the April 22nd letter should have said instead of government revenues expected to grow by under \$25 million or .8 percent, it should have read government revenue is expected to grow by over \$130 million or 4.2 percent. That would leave an entirely different impression to those chairmen and administrators of all of our health facilities in Manitoba as to what they were facing in terms of their budget-making process and in the ways in which they would have to attempt cost containment within their facilities.

But, Mr. Chairman, that isn't the information that went out on April 22nd, the information that went out on April 22nd went out in the same incorrect figures that were presented on January 7th.

Now I'm going to ask the Minister whether it is his intention to follow up this April 22nd letter and to point out that his January 7th letter was an error, because they didn't have complete enough figures at the time - if he wishes, that would be fine by me - and to present to those same people the true facts. I would hope that the Minister would do that, because, you know, the Minister in his speech to the UMM said that there were many challenges facing the health industry, and that these challenges were going to be faced in an atmosphere of co-operation and knowledge so that they could work together, the people involved in the health

care system, the taxpayers and the government could work in this tripartite group to solve these problems. Well, you can only solve problems when you know the facts. Unless the Minister sends out the facts in a letter very very soon to straighten out the wrong information that was sent out, those people can't meaningfully contribute to this dialogue the Minister wants to foster on the problems facing the health care community.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance, this afternoon, got into another spiel for a little while in which he said that, you know, we pick one figure out of the Estimates and we say, well, because it's gone up, then the government should have spent more money on Health. Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll just touch on that briefly. The figures that I gave this afternoon contradicting the alleged \$25 million growth in revenue included all of the financial estimates that the Minister of Finance mentioned today. The \$131 million of increased revenues include income tax, tobacco tax, liquor tax, as well as the EPF transfer payments, the equalization transfer payments, and all Federal Government contributions.

Mr. Chairman, the argument that the Member for Turtle Mountain and myself made the other day, on Tuesday afternoon, was that this government, this party, this political party, the New Democrats, when they sat in opposition constantly made the argument that EPF funding is for health and education, and therefore a government is erring if it doesn't put that money into health and education. We simply pointed out to the Minister of Health, for his own information, that the increase in spending this year to his Department of Health and to the Minister of Education's Department was 93.3 percent funded by EPF transfers and transfers directly to Health, 93.3 percent financed, so the province put in 6.7 percent of new money into Health this year in these Estimates, and then they want to bash the Federal Government. I mean that's the incredible part about it.

Sure, they're dying and starving for an election issue that'll give them some credibility, but they can't get it out of EPF transfer payments. They can't get it out of the equalization argument, and so they've got to realize that the people of Manitoba are just a whole lot more sophisticated and more intelligent as to the manipulations by the Minister of Finance and the facts and figures he attempts to put out as truthful. It won't work, Mr. Chairman, and I tell the Minister of Health it won't work.

Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out two days ago, that 93.3 percent of the increased budget to Health and Education come from EPF transfers and transfers to the Department of Health, but when you add in the Provincial Government's own payroll tax, which if we use the original nomer that they put on it, being the Health and Education Levy, you add another \$7.4 million, I believe - I'll check my figures - yes, they're budgeting another \$7.4 million in the payroll tax and user fees in the Department of Health add another million dollars. So there's almost \$8.5 million of new revenue in fiscal'85-86 in this estimate year that could go toward financing of health costs and has not to date gone there. As a matter of fact, if we follow the figures through, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education have donated over \$5 million of EPF funding, transfers to Health from the Federal Government, user

fees in the Department of Health and the payroll tax to other department and to other functions of government.

Now the Minister indicates in his letter - well, it's not the Minister's letter, it's the Chief Budget Officer's letter of April 22nd - that they will be adjusting as contract settlements are made, so presumably we're not finished with the Estimates of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and we will see the Minister bring in Supplementary Supply if we're still in Session, or pass a Special Warrant if we're out of Session to cover additional costs. So my argument will not probably this year result in \$5 million, as I've indicated a few minutes ago, being gleaned from Health and Education to the Jobs Fund or other places. It will probably have to be Special Warranted into the Department of Health because I believe, if I've got my notes someplace here - yes, here they are - I believe the Minister said the other night that a 1 percent settlement to the nursing profession would add \$5 million to the MSHC global budget. — (Interjection) — Okay. Well, I think it's about 80 percent, so they probably had \$4 million then because close to 80 percent would be salaries.

So for every 1 percent of a settlement with the nurses - and I hear via the grapevine that the settlement is projected to be 2 percent for this fiscal year - there will be certainly \$7.5 million that the Minister would have to - in following the April 22nd letter from the Budget Finance - will have to add to the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to ask the Minister if he will write a letter to the same mailing list that has received the January 7th correspondence from him and the same people that received the April 22nd - because I'm assuming they're the same - the April 22nd correspondence from the Chief Budget Officer, write a letter to them and explain to them the error of repeating the quotation from the Minister of Health's letter of January 7th and point out to them that indeed revenues for the province are growing at a projected 4.2 percent in excess of \$130 million, and that the EPF funding has increased by some \$57 million, and the Minister, if he chooses to make the argument, can still ask them to make whatever budgetary cutbacks they deem will not lower patient quality too much and that's entirely his choice, but I'm simply asking him if he will write to those same organizations and give them a factual presentation of the revenues of the Province of Manitoba, to straighten out the misconception that is there as a result of his January 7th letter and his April 22nd departmental letter.

If the Minister could do that, I think it would add greatly to the atmosphere of co-operation and consultation that he and his government alleged to seek so ardently.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that - I'm certainly not faulting the Member for Pembina - but I was hoping that he would have talked maybe a little less because I would like to give him the last word and we agreed that at 4 o'clock we'll be presenting the five-year Capital Program.

I think the sanest thing that was said today, Mr. Chairman, from either side of the House was by someone whom you did recognize at all, and was the Member for Niakwa who said where's the Estimates

of the Department of Health? I think we've talked about everything. Finance, sure I wrote the letter and I'll come to that and the real question of Health, and God knows there's enough problems in Health. There's enough concern in Health that we'd have enough to discuss. Maybe I should take that as a compliment that things are pretty well in Health and we've got nothing to talk about so we'll argue the question of finance.

I resent very much being told repeatedly that I want to mislead, implying motives to me that I want to lie, to give the wrong impression or mislead the people of Manitoba because I don't think that's in my nature. I've been accused of a lot of things but I haven't been accused of that. I think that even the members from the other side are saying that I made my point very clear when I spoke to the Union of Municipalities.

In every speech that I've made I've made it very clear that we had to get together, that it was something very serious. We were at a crossroad in the Health field, that if we wanted to protect and keep and retain the good service that we had which is second in general, second to none in Canada and in the world probably, that we would have to get together and have a different direction.

Then it's obvious. Look at the record. I've chosen this year, a year before the election, to start charging for the first time in the history of Manitoba the people in mental institutions, in chronic hospitals. That's hardly like somebody that's trying to mislead the people before an election. I don't think that will stand at all. I could understand saying that I showed poor judgment, that my facts were not correct, but to say that I set out to mislead people, I refute that and I resent it very much.

Now the letter. I wrote the letter. I signed the letter. I have last week and I do now accept full responsibility for doing so. In my experience in government and Cabinet, I got the information that was compiled by another department. I had confidence that the information was correct. I took it for granted that the information was correct. I don't apologize. If it's wrong, I go down with my colleague, the Minister of Finance.

If the Minister of Finance wants to know how many personal care homes we have, he doesn't set up or send his staff to count any personal care homes and any beds, he just calls and he gets the information from me. If I give him the wrong information collectively or as part of the team, I accept responsibility but he has to face the group and accept part of the responsibility and I do that.

I defy anybody to say that the letter that I signed was not correct, is not absolutely factual on every single issue at that date in the letter that I signed. Now especially coming from me I have been told by members of the MHO, by members of groups, we've had letters of congratulations for the fair and direct - over the years, not just this year, the last two or three years - and direct way that we approached that and they have accepted that. In fact, we were told to go ahead and do that.

Now, this letter, the two points of contention, is that we say that we're going to lose \$72 million, cutting equalization payments, that we might lose. At that time we didn't know. There is no doubt in my mind that I was joining the Minister of Finance in putting pressure on the Federal Government. It was very scary after reading the news that it leaked, or a stolen document

or whatever, quoted Mr. Wilson's advisor to say no, nothing at all. It was scary.

We organized and either the people, the leader could be accused of hypocrisy or he doesn't agree with the Member for Pembina because I think he joined our people in going to Ottawa and putting on pressure. I think at the time at least they gave lip service to say, yes, we've got to stick together on that. Members of the Commission - I'm talking about the board not staff - members of different institutions accompanied the Minister of Finance, not the Minister of Health. The Minister of Finance flew out to Ottawa to make a presentation. It was as politics is all about - I don't relish that part, I think there's too much of it but it exists - it was a pressure thing for the Federal Government to try to unite Manitobans and say hey, and I think it was fair, it was just and it was honest to say here, we need that money.

Now, it says, "Those transitional arrangements expire this year. Unless they are extended, Manitoba will suffer the \$72 million cut in equalization payments mentioned above." It doesn't say \$200,000, it says 72.

Now let's look at this and say that it is misleading. I certainly didn't think it was misleading. I didn't check on the veracity of these words to see the accuracy of these words, of 200 million short, but it says even without the cuts, even if you had all that is coming to you according to the formula and if you extended the formula, federal equalization support would fall over 200 million short of the amount required to bring Manitoba's resource capacity to the all-provincial average. It doesn't say anything about formula past-present. It makes a statement because, in my way, that's what Canada's all about. When a senior government, and we might as well be all a union of governments if we are all on our own, we are trying in this country to have at least a minimum of services to the people across Canada, across the land, no matter where they are. We have one of the programs that came in is the pension and there were others, so the people would have the same amount, and then there was the hospitalization and Medicare.

Now when that was started, the partner, the two-funding, the one that initiated that, set up a formula of 50-50 cost-sharing, and that was changed later on. We were the only province, if I remember, that constantly fought to re-establish that. We said we're ready to pay our share, but you should pay. That wasn't coming. We were told quite clearly that, no, they wanted to cap it. We said, well, at least, if we're going to have that, let's have something that will be across the land, equalize that, and we want that, and that was the statement that they wanted.

I don't see anything wrong with that all, and if my honourable friend doesn't want to accept it, at least he should accept my word that that had no intention of misleading anybody at all. It is something that we felt should be done and it is telling him that even we would - that's the important thing, to show the share we pay. We've got less money but we're probably spending more than most provinces in the health field. That was one thing that wasn't mentioned at all.

The second paragraph was absolutely true. Manitoba faced an extremely constrained revenue situation. As far as we're concerned, nobody has denied that. In fact, the Member for Pembina said, yes, maybe he was right.

There was another letter - I signed this letter and I accept full responsibility - signed by an officer of the Commission on April 22nd. That letter, by the way, was written sometime in March. I've just checked. It was held, and four weeks after it was supposed to go. The reason why it was held, there was some concern with another problem, nothing to do with this at all. It was held by the Commission. They checked with Finance four weeks after, I'm told. It was the same information, but then they erred; it was a mistake. I accept the responsibility also because I take credit for all the good things they do. It doesn't mean I'm not going to chastise the person that's responsible.

The situation is that it was a mistake. It was checked; we should have checked again and I admitted that. The Minister of Finance admitted that; it is there for everybody to see on there. It was a mistake.

My honourable friend last week went all over the place and I thought it was a bit unfair. He talked about the situation about people from Saskatchewan. Well, the only person in Saskatchewan is the troublemaker that wrote this letter and I'm thinking of sending him back and maybe cover the leak that we had, I don't know. That's the only person from Saskatchewan that we had, so I've got nobody from Saskatchewan and I've got, as far as I know, no big contracts.

The situation is that is something and then you can come back and say, well, you're spending money and maybe that's true, but this is not the place to discuss that. The thing is if I've got too much personnel, if we're paying a fair salary in that department, that's the time to do it because we can argue the whole thing all over. I'm not saying that the member hasn't any right to do that, but I don't think this is the time to do it.

I'll have to take a rain check on this because I do want to make this commitment. I have an embargo on it, a press conference that I had till 4 o'clock and I think it wouldn't be fair. I don't want to prolong this thing but I want to explain the thing, I have a few more words to say. I can say this though, before closing, that Health spending from '71-77 to '81-82 was a 63.7 percent increase; and during that time the funds from Ottawa was a 56.7 percent increase, and from '81-82 to '85-86 the Health spending increase was 46.3 and the share from Ottawa was 37.9.

So following the reasoning of my honourable friend, Health spending was held to the growth rate since 1981-82, Health spending in 1980-85 would be one million, seventy dollars more - would be in total one million, seventy or 65.4 million less - one billion and seventy, less than budgeted for 1985-86. I have more that I could say on this but, Mr. Chairman, at this time I wonder if we would have the Page pass the information that I have for all the members. I would hope that would be placed on every desk and I would like to make this presentation with the understanding, of course, that this is not being passed and we'll be getting back to that at the time.

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to announce government approval for the Manitoba Health Services Commission's Five-Year Capital Program, a program which includes continuation of \$115 million current construction, \$215.7 million in projects to be started during the next year or year-and-a-half and \$7.2 million to upgrade existing facilities through the year, for a total of \$338 million of actual programs that passed



for construction that should start within a year or a year-and-a-half.

If you add the projects approved for architectural design, then the total construction cost would be \$604 million - no, I'm saying if that construction went up, what has been approved. The document you have before you is a continuation of the format I have used for the past several years. Some of the projects that we had anticipated as being started during the 1984-85 fiscal year has been somewhat delayed. There has been no change in government approval for these projects and the delays are due mainly to the administrative and design consideration.

In addition to meeting health needs, these projects will have a major impact in stimulating the construction and design industry. In line with ongoing government policy, the projects will stimulate the economy through the creation of meaningful jobs. All projects have been reviewed and are designed to address the immediate and long-range health needs of our citizens.

The projects shown below will cost an estimated total of \$338 million and in addition to major hospital replacement will provide 301 new personal care beds and 412 replacement beds for older facilities.

It is estimated that the projects currently under construction will have generated 460,000 days employment for the construction and design industry when they are completed. The projects to be started within the next year to 18 months will stimulate 900,000 days employment for the construction and design industry.

The project approved for architectural planning only will result in 44,800 days of employment for the planning and design sector of the building industry. The five-year Capital Program includes continuation of projects presently under construction totalling \$115 million and approved in previous years.

The last column gives you an idea when we expect that the place will be open, the project will be finished.

The Brandon Salvation Army - replace 66 beds at Eventide and Bulloch Booth with a new 60-bed home including space to accommodate the transfer of the Brandon Mental Health Centre day care space to a downtown location. It's expected to open in mid-1985. Concordia Hospital - expansion of the emergency, outpatient, NFA and ICU areas, late 1985; Dauphin Hospital - extensive renovation and replacement of the existing hospital, mid-1986; Misericordia Hospital - phased redevelopment of the older portions of the hospital to bring those buildings up to a current standard, and that, of course, is being phased in as fast as they're ready. Neepawa Hospital - expansion of diagnostic and other areas, mid-1986; Park Manor - increase activity and dietary space and new connecting link to EPH, mid-1985.

St. Boniface Hospital - upgrade and consolidate services, late 1986; Health Sciences Centre - several upgrading projects to upgrade the neonatal ICU, radiology, communication and air handling, mid-1986.

Then there are the projects that have been approved for construction starts at various times during the next year to 18 months and are valued at an estimated \$215.7 million. They include the date now, it's not of course the day it opened, but the day that construction should start.

Dauphin - construction of a new public health building following as further phase to the hospital project now

under way, early 1986; Steinbach Hospital - expand emergency outpatient and diagnostic areas and replacement of existing 12 extended treatment beds with a new 20-bed unit, late 1985; Pine Falls - renovation and replacement of hospital wings followed by the construction of a new 20-bed personal care home, mid-1985; Brandon Fairview - 160 new personal care home beds to replace the existing hostel beds and major renovations, early 1985.

Deer Lodge - redevelop the hospital as a geriatric facility following transfer of the hospital from the Federal Government. And, of course, as you all know, the capital costs will be provided by the Federal Government that were supposed to at least get this thing started in five years and that should start in early 1985.

Portage Personal Care Home - replace the existing substandard home with a new 60-bed personal care home under auspices of the Portage Hospital Board, mid-1986; Portage Hospital (1) - necessary hospital renovations and upgrading including life safety, to be integrated with the personal care home project, mid-1986; Grandview - replacement of the existing 18-bed hospital, late 1985; Gilbert Plains - a new 30-bed personal care home with clinic space and closure of existing hospital, mid-1985; The Pas - transportation and service link of the St. Paul's Personal Care Home to hospital, early 1985.

Souris - upgrade diagnostic services and improve fire safety, mid-1985; Flin Flon Hospital - diagnostic unit upgrade, mid-1986; St. Boniface Hospital - the further phase of a staged redevelopment program, mid-1986; Selkirk-Bethel Personal Care Home - upgrade the facility to provide a heavier level of care, late 1985; Dauphin Personal Care Home - 25 new personal care beds, early 1986; Neepawa-Eastview Lodge - building upgrading including life safety and other improvements, late 1985; Virden-Sherwood - building upgrading including life safety, mid-1985; Brandon Laundry - consolidate laundry services at the General Hospital. Now the existing equipment will be used. That should start in early 1986; Brandon - of course that's the one that's been announced so much, it's a 100-bed psychogeriatric facility, early 1986, and I hope it starts fairly soon; Foyer St. Boniface - and let me say before anything else is said that it is not located in the City of St. Boniface, nor even in the Constituency of St. Boniface.

**A MEMBER:** Where is it?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It's in St. Vital. In fact, it's taking 70 beds away from St. Boniface.

Foyer St. Boniface - replacement of the existing 70-bed facility with 120 new personal care beds, early 1986; Gillam - hospital upgrading, mid-1985; Manitou - new 20-bed personal care home, clinic and multi-use beds to replace the existing hospital, mid-1986; Municipals Hospital - phase I of a major redevelopment, mid-1986; power house reconstruction, late 1985; Ste. Rose - Dr. Gendreau Home - improvements to service and activity areas and life safety upgrading, late 1985; Klinik - a new clinic building, early 1986; Whitemouth - 20-bed personal care home, multi-use beds and clinic space to replace the existing hospital, early 1986; Winkler-Salem Home - replacement of the older wing,

58 beds, including hostel beds with 65 new beds, mid-1985; Health Sciences Centre - major upgrade of standby power; upgrading projects to provide for interim measures during the redevelopment phase including; pediatric, ICUs, O.R., Children's O.R., General Centre, ophthalmology, adult radiology and kitchen, and that of course is being phased.

Now, I believe that there was an addendum note to indicate that there was inadvertently, in Winnipeg, the thing has been left out. That, of course, just keeps on with the program as announced last year. The construction of 50 additional personal care beds and extensive renovations to the existing. This should start construction by mid-1985.

Approval is also provided for the early tender call on a number of smaller projects associated mainly with plant and building code upgrading in health facilities at an estimated cost of \$7.2 million.

Now the government has also approved \$13.3 million for architectural planning to be carried out during the current fiscal year for projects worth and estimated at this year's dollar, \$266.4 million. That, of course, has not been approved for construction; I want to make that quite clear. I think you must be used to the five-year program now. The only thing it approves is the \$13.3 million and next year, maybe not all of them, it won't be all ready.

Now these projects, following finalizing of architectural plans, must come back to the government for approval before proceeding to the construction stage. I might say though, that even at the first stage, the functional program as you've seen because we've been on that enough years, and that is taken very seriously, they're the ones that we recommend, and normally although they have to receive approval at different steps, normally they go through. You're creating expectancy, you're working with these people, you spend money on architectural fees and you usually go ahead. But we know that nothing cannot be stopped. I think when there was a change of government in 1977, there was a freeze on everything that wasn't too far advanced; it was frozen for a time. So that is possible. I want to make sure nobody thinks I'm misleading anybody.

Other projects presently in various stages of planning and architectural design or approved to proceed to this stage during this year are as follows:

Virten Hospital - replacement of the existing 32-bed hospital with a new 25-bed facility; Benito - 20 new personal care beds, plus multi-use beds and clinic to replace the existing hospital; Swan River - hospital upgrading and expansion; Swan River - replace the existing 53-bed hostel with 60 new personal care home beds; Citizens' Health Action - a new or renovated clinic building; Red Cross Building - upgrading or replacement of the existing building; Grace General - hospital regeneration.

Vita - hospital replacement and additional personal care home beds; Gimli-Bethel - replacement with a new 80-bed facility; Brandon Hospital - major redevelopment and upgrading, mechanical upgrading; Middlechurch Home - replacement of the hostel beds; Elkhorn - new 20-bed personal care home and multiuse beds and clinic to replace the existing hospital; Erickson - a new 6-bed health care facility including 20 personal care home beds to replace the existing hospital; Fred Douglas Lodge, replace the existing hostel beds; Golden

West Personal Care Home - replace the existing hostel beds; Morden Hospital - major upgrade of emergency and outpatient areas; Victoria Hospital - fire safety upgrading and other building improvements; Luther Home - increased activity area and other improvements; Selkirk - 100-bed psychogeriatric facility, that of course, again, was announced in the department for a second year now; Health Sciences Centre, planning for the main service building to provide radiology, primary care, emergency, burn unit, operating rooms, delivery suite and intensive care units; freestanding Psychiatry Building; 40 forensic beds and services.

By giving approval for architectural planning on the above projects, the government will maintain maximum flexibility in timing the health construction to best respond to economic conditions of the province.

In addition to the foregoing programs approved by government, I have instructed the Manitoba Health Services Commission to continue to work with facility boards and communities in determining and refining the functional programs of the following hospital and personal care home projects.

I want to emphasize here that it doesn't mean that it is only that list, that it is restricted to that, but this is the one that is at least a proven principle, the direction we can go to even things up, to cover the province as much as possible, taking into consideration the guidelines, the needs and so on, and the advancement and the need for these changes.

Now there is Shoal Lake - upgrading of the hospital; Manitoba Odd Fellows - replacement of hostel beds; Health Sciences Centre Laundry, upgrade the existing laundry; Boissevain - replacement of hostel beds; Killarney - replacement of the hostel beds; Deloraine - replacement of the hostel beds; Beausejour Hospital - major upgrade and addition of extended treatment beds; Minnedosa Hospital - replacement of the existing 35-bed hospital; Stonewall Hospital - replacement of the existing 18-bed hospital; St. Pierre - replacement of hospital and additional personal care home beds; Wawanesa Hospital - replacement of the hospital with a multipurpose unit juxtaposed to the existing personal care home; Winnipeg Municipals - Phase II of a major redevelopment; The Pas areas - expansion of diagnostic areas and improved patient areas.

These projects will be submitted to Cabinet in subsequent years for consideration and, if approved, will proceed for construction, first of all going through architectural planning, of course.

In addition to these projects, funds will be considered for planning for the ongoing programs of health facility regeneration, upgrading and life safety improvement each year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I kept for the last is what I consider probably the most important and the most difficult at this time. I think that we've had to recognize we have certain problems. Amongst them, of course, was the question of the viability of the smaller city hospitals, such as, Concordia which, no doubt, was built at the time with a service area capable of handling more beds. So that is something which must be done to make sure that Concordia plays the role it wants to play and should play.

One of the problems at Concordia, why I say a small hospital, is because of block beds that you see because of people that have been panelled for admittance to

personal care homes. It is more noticeable when you have less beds and when there is a fairly large portion of it, and it certainly interferes with the work of the medical staff and so on. So that has to be taken into consideration.

There is no doubt that the waiting list for personal care home placement is increasing. There is reason for, it's an older population. There is difficulty in that people are living longer, there is less discharge. I think also, we have larger staff and more people are panelled earlier and that adds to the . . . There are a number of reasons but, nevertheless, it is something that we can't ignore.

It is also the question of beds being needed. The beds taken in this case are being needed for elective surgery. I am not saying what we said before, that we have to change the pattern, all right, all that goes.

Now I was faced with this, Mr. Chairman. We can decide to wait until all the planning is done; that would be dangerous. On the other hand, we don't want to waste money if we are going in a different direction. If you remember at the bottom of the list last year there was the functional programs for Concordia Hospital. That was something I kind of discouraged the hospital in the talks I had with them to go ahead and build acute care beds. I still think that we have to be very careful. The first thing is to make sure these acute care beds are used for people that need acute care, not personal care home beds.

But, because of all the concern that I mentioned, and I said that we should plan, and because of some of the information in the committees that have been set up also, I felt that the best way was to refer this to the committee. Of course, that was why we got the information from Dr. Evans, for instance, that information, and that's all it is, at this time will be passed on to this group. I have asked the Health Services Review Committee to review it and advise me. Now it is not something that is going to be done to appease people that are concerned. There will be a time restriction. This committee is to recommend to me the options that they will to consider. We will not tie their hands, in other words, should we have acute beds, what do we do to have these hospitals more meaningful, to do what they are set up to do. Mr. Chairman, this is a serious matter though, these concerns.

That committee is made up, to give you an idea, there are two members from the MMA; there is a member replacing MARN; there is a Dean of Medicine; Associate Dean of Medicine; social preventative medicine, another doctor; the urban hospital teaching - that's an administrator; and urban hospital non-teaching; rural hospital; College of Physicians and Surgeons; the Manitoba Health Services Commission; the department; and it will be chaired by the Chief Planner and Researcher for the Department and Commission, Mr. Dave Pascoe.

They have been asked, as I say, to bring a recommendation within two months or so. It would have to go to Cabinet for any other approval. We will go as fast as we can. We should start the architectural drawing as soon as we decide how we are going to go. As I say, we won't tie their hands, they will be able to tell us should there be personal care beds, should they be extended treatment beds are needed, probably more than anything else, and also acute beds. In the past,

we have never wanted a personal care home - I am talking about the city now - juxtaposed to a hospital. They will look at that to see if that should be done.

They will look at the facilities, for instance, at Concordia, the service area. It might be that they could have a recommendation of a combination of things; let's say, that they might recommend 10, 15 acute care beds, and new beds in Concordia, maybe 50 or 60 extended treatment beds, or they could recommend the three freestanding personal care home beds.

We are also looking at a certain area. We had some discussion with different groups - that is apart from that which they discussed before for replacement beds - and the needs of the Sharon Personal Care Home, but we're not as advanced as we want to be on this. That, we have approved up to 250 beds. We know they won't be wasted, we know that we need more beds, but as I say the makeup - and the committee, if the committee said, no, you shouldn't have any beds, if that's their recommendation, we certainly would have to consider that. I doubt if that would be the case.

Now, we have estimated that at \$17.5 million. Now, how did we estimate it? It's an estimate of course only, and let's say of the 250, if you add one-third of acute beds, one-third of personal care beds, and the last one-third of extended treatment beds, because of course the construction is not all the same, there's quite a bit of difference. That, we hope will give us the flexibility. We're convinced that with the planners, the information that we have and so on, that it's not going to be a panic operation that we'll build something and that we would have to start all over if we were going in a different direction. We're convinced that is not going to be the case. We're convinced that's going to help with the situation. Of course, as I said, this program would be useless if we did not start by worrying about prevention, and worrying about not for admittance services in the hospital, for early discharge, for home care, for Meals on Wheels, and all these programs, so I think that we're progressing quite well.

We know there's a big job ahead. It's a real challenge and again I would hope that we could work and get the co-operation of everybody in setting up this program.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, in the Minister's final remarks he said that the \$17.5 million was an estimate which will result in roughly one-third acute care, one-third personal care home, and one-third extended treatment beds. Could the Minister indicate the estimated number of beds in total that could be made available with this \$17.5 million?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I thought I mentioned that. I want you to understand, what we're saying, what the approval is, is this, that we will ask this committee to work together with the facts that we have, with the need that we have, to make a recommendation. I will not have to wait and say, well, that's finished for this year. We will rush - in fact, if we even had some ready-made legislation, depending on the decision, if it's attached to a hospital, and if it's a mixture of things, it'll be different. But let's say if it was a standing personal care home and if we had plans we might try to start working as soon as possible on this.

Now I'm saying that we've approved up to 250 beds, but we did not specify what kind; and to give a general idea the Commission just said one-third of each, that doesn't mean that we're anticipating that it's going to be one-third of each, but just to give you a general idea of what it would be. That's how they arrived at 17.5, but the beds that are approved are up to 250 beds, and this stands on its own, it has nothing to do with the rest of the program.

This, I must admit, I must confess, was because of the situation that we're in and I think that we can't just plan in a normal manner, I think we have to catch up.

I wonder if this was brought in at this time, Mr. Chairman, to give the person to have the weekend and so on to look at it, and I don't think it will be discussed even tomorrow, if we go into Estimates; it will come up next when we're in Personal Care Homes and Hospitals.

I wonder if you could call it 4:30 p.m., Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 4:30 p.m., I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and the committee will return at 8 o'clock this evening. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The time being 4:30 p.m. and Private Members' Hour, the first item on the agenda for today is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 20, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 30, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Stand.

## PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

### RES. NO. 5 - RESTORATION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

**MR. SPEAKER:** Under Proposed Resolutions, Resolution No. 5.- the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has 20 minutes.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At the outset I am going to be expressing some opinions. They are my opinions, I do not wish in expressing these to knock or to have them interpreted as ridiculing or holding any other person's opinion in ridicule or disrespect. Because on an issue such as this, and there are several issues that come before us from time to time, that we all have to take a very deep careful consideration on, and we have to sometimes

express opinions, and sometimes they don't necessarily meet with agreement or universal acceptance.

So, in trying to deal with an issue, why I have come to the conclusion that I have, and I may perhaps tread on some of the arguments that other people have advanced, either for or against this resolution in this House, I hope that they will not take any of my remarks personally because they are not intended to be.

In dealing with the resolution it says there shall be "restoration of capital punishment"; and the main reason being advanced in support of this motion, as I read it, is that the vast majority of Manitobans require it.

Weil, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why, just because a vast majority of people want something, is it really the function of this Legislature or any Legislature to give it as a matter of right because it is a simple majority or a vast majority requires it?

My concern is that there are two points here, and I would like to deal with both of them. One is the perception of the public dealing with, either the abolition or restoration of capital punishment; and the role of an elected representative in trying to interpret and provide government and decisions for society. There is, as indicated, a vast majority of public opinion that wants this reinstated.

I think that is an oversimplification because any of the opinion polling that I have seen done on this issue have been simple one-line questions, and anyone that knows anything about public opinion polling knows that you have to carefully gauge and ask a series of questions to find out the true feelings of the public as it relates to an issue. Because the issue here, based down to its very fundamental facts, is should the community take a life of an individual who has taken a life? Now, that's a very simple question and probably if just asked that way or in any other form, as long as it reflected that issue, you would get a majority of people saying, yes. But then if you went on to start qualifying or quantifying that answer I think you might find a body of opinion emerging that would take you away from the vast majority of Manitobans wanting it. Because if you said if it was your son, would you believe the state should take your son's life? - probably the answer would be, no.

If someone was drunk when this took place, should they have their life taken? The answer probably would be, no. So I would think that if one carefully tried to analyze the true public feeling of this very sensitive issue that you would not find the vast majority of Manitobans wanting them to have a life taken for one who has already taken a life.

Also, if anyone has seen the recent mini-series on television called "A.D.", you see how society first started, and it was not a very civilized group of individuals that first walked across this land, and they were fighting for their very survival. But that movie depicted the time when Christ came onto this planet and the change in religious beliefs, and it seemed to me that when one looked at the simple way that life was either taken away or given, when you saw how the gladiators performed in the forum in Rome, or how the Christians were asked to fight the animals and whether they should survive or be killed, depended on whether a thumb went up or a thumb went down. I think one is saying that perhaps that's what we mean for

restoration of capital punishment. Should life be taken based on a simple question that the vast majority of the public want it? I suspect not, but I don't mean to ridicule the public because I think there's a much bigger issue here and the issue is one of fear, of uncertainty in our community, and the concern for the amount of violence that we presently have in our community.

Society has slowly moved from simple small communities into large urban centres and with it has come an increased pace of activity, pressures, competition, speed, all of these have added up to a very highly complex, highly integrated and, to a degree, very frustrating society at times with people, and it often leads to explosive action. Some of that explosive action ends up in the costing of lives. But, really, should we be dealing with this issue of taking life because society has changed? No, I suspect and I will argue that civilization has moved forward as changes have come along and that civilization now is looking at the concept of life and the taking of life in a much more different way than we did in the Roman times or even earlier. Because I think that society puts now a far higher premium on life and the preservation of life than we did at one time in the taking of it.

The simple fact of restoration of capital punishment will not stop the loss of life. I think that's a very basic question. I know a lot of people say that person will never commit another crime, will never take another life, but that I think is not justifiable in saying we should take your life. Because we are still going to lose lives. I think one has to look at why are we losing lives as a society and try to take steps to prevent them from occurring? But life will be taken from time to time, and I think we are judged in how we respond to the taking of life. The simple fact that we have removed the judgment of someone who has taken a life from that of the public domain, from that of the public arena, and put them before a jury system, a judge, a trial by judge and jury, not a single person going thumbs up or thumbs down, that entire system removed from the rage or the uncertainty or the concerns or the anger that one feels for taking of life and moving it into a separate system, removed from emotion and passion and guaranteeing that a fair system of trial and judgment is enforced. That is a big step in the civilization process. It's something that we cannot easily undo or should we undo. And that system adjudicates the laws that we pass and we should not be putting laws back into the system or tinkering with that system that ensures that public life is protected, that any life is given its fair chance before judgment is tendered on that.

Because I'm afraid with the type of motion that is being brought forward and the reasons for its suggestion is that you will be doing away with the trial-and-jury system. You will be saying a loss of life and, bango, your life should go. Now I think that is perhaps an oversimplification, but I'm concerned that if you start dealing with what a mob wants or an enraged citizenry want that you're going to start taking away some very fundamental safeguards or restrict those safeguards to ensure that due process is carried out and the individual has his day in court.

There are some bigger issues and they're issues that I won't be dealing with today, because they don't touch directly on the matter before us, but I think what the

public is upset about is not only the frustration and the fear that they feel, but it's this whole question of punishment, parole. There's a belief out there that as soon as the crime is committed the guilty party is home long before the injured party can return to their normal life. That is perhaps something that we as politicians who make the laws, and we as politicians who appoint people to adjudicate on what the laws should be as far as parole is concerned, or what methods of punishment should be metered out under circumstances, maybe that's an area we should be looking at.

But the whole question of punishment and parole and prison, prison reform, that's another issue that perhaps we should be concentrating on and debating on. Because I think that lends itself to part of the outrage the public is now feeling on this very issue of whether or not someone's life should be taken.

Also involved in here are the questions of rights and privileges of the individual versus society. I think that there is a perception that the people who are in jail, the prisoners, have far greater rights than the ordinary citizen does. And there's a constant balancing between whose right should prevail, those of the inmate, those of the criminal or society. And that's a juggling process that we as elected representatives must deal with and it's a shifting thing, because as time changes and civilization changes and hopefully moves forward we have to strike the laws and the rules by which society is governed.

And that brings me to the area - the second point of the debate that I want to deal with is the role of the elected member in dealing with this type of question when brought forward either in a resolution like this or a large petition. Are we here merely to reflect a majority of the people who put us here? Because what is the majority? When an MLA is elected, so many people can vote; of that portion, only a certain percentage elect to exercise their franchise. The successful politician is the individual who gets the most votes. When someone receives a petition with 20 names on it, does that petition reflect the majority opinion of the community? And do you respond to that 20 people as if they are the majority opinion in your community? I would think not.

But for those who believe that you just listen to those who wish to talk to you, or those who pretend that they represent the majority opinion, then you really don't need an elected representative. It would be far simpler to install a computer in everyone's home and every morning certain questions could be asked, and depending on the type of the question you could say a 51 percent of the answer came in a certain way, that's what the government would do that day. Because, really, I think that those who are advancing the argument that I reflect the wishes of my constituents, I reflect the vast majority of the voters out there or citizenry, I think are doing themselves and the community and this institution a disservice. Because we are elected, what for? I would submit that we come to make decisions; we reason; we hear; we take advice; we take counsel; then we make a decision. And this House does it on a collective basis, whether it be by a majority vote, it be a collective decision in Cabinet and that produces some legislation before us, but each individual in his own way must exercise his own reason.

I can't help but feel that if this House were asked to pass or impose the death penalty like it's being asked, and we knew an individual who was sitting perhaps over there, that this House would actually vote to have that person's life taken because they have committed a crime by taking someone else's life. I don't think when faced with the reality of making that tough decision and passing laws that would affect people's lives this way that an elected representative would make that decision. Some might, and I respect them for it. I don't agree with them. I think it is our job to listen, to reason, to exercise judgment, and I don't think society moves forward if we just merely say, well, the vast majority want it. So for those reasons, I probably will not convince anyone to move one way or another on this issue, but as I see it, the role of an elected representative is to make a decision on what affects his people, the community he lives in, and the role that he must play, and they must play in civilization. I feel that by trying to restore a death penalty in a certain area, or to a certain group of people, is a step backwards. It is not a positive contribution to our community or to this civilization and, therefore, I cannot support this motion. I do not believe, as the motion reads, there should be the restoration of capital punishment. For those reasons, I will be voting against it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I am very pleased to take an opportunity to speak my words as a member of this House. I am particularly pleased to have had the opportunity to follow such a reasoned argument as put forward by the Member for Fort Garry. It is far too seldom that we have arguments, and especially recognition of the role that we, as elected members representative of democracy, have in a Legislature.

We can run; we can follow a mob, we can follow a current and public opinion, we can try and play politics with any number of events, but when we try to massage public opinion or to use public opinion to our own gain at the polls in dealing with matters of civil rights, in dealing with matters of human rights, we do a fundamental disservice to the heritage of the British parliamentary system of government.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of capital punishment has really only been current in most western societies for, say, the past century. It has been hotly contested really only in the past quarter-century, and the moves toward abolition really started in the '50s, and through the '60s in particular. It wasn't until the '70s that many governments actually had the courage, and legislators the courage to follow their judgment of what they thought was best in a civilized society that would lift their society to further heights, rather than take a path which would drag it back into an era which we are very pleased to have been now a bygone era.

When one looks at the number of nations in the whole world who have totally abolished capital punishment one only comes up with a list of some 26 nations. Most of these nations are fully legitimate in their claim toward the total abolition of the death penalty. There are some

that have adopted, but yet their governments still allow extra-judicial executions. In particular in the list, I refer to the country of Honduras.

Of those who have there are Austria, Denmark, Finland, West Germany, France, the Vatican, Iceland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands. One of the newest has been the Netherlands, it was just in 1982. France only adopted it in '81; Canada in '76; Nicaragua, oddly enough, in 1979; Norway in '79. And Portugal, almost immediately with the passing of a fascist regime in that country, the new democratically-elected regime in 1977 abolished capital punishment. They knew how misused the issue of capital punishment can be when it is available on the books for a government which is intent, not so much on the rule of law, and enforcing the rule of law with the death penalty, as they are to subvert any kind of opposition to that government.

When one looks at nations who have abolished it for all what could be called ordinary criminal cases, in other words, for murder, even for treason within the countries - some may include treason still - most of the 19 countries I'm about to list now, and I'll just pick some of those, have abolished it except during times of war and in times of civil insurrection. These countries include Canada, off the top, Australia, Brazil, Cyprus, Israel, Italy, Mexico, New Zealand, Spain, Switzerland and the United Kingdom as a sampling. Once again, in here we have a nation that has probably killed more people in the past four or five years through extra-judicial death squads than any other nation, that is El Salvador. Somehow or other, get's classified in that same group because, in law, capital punishment is illegal in that country, as well, but tell that to the followers of Archbishop Romeras.

The United States prior to, I believe it was, 1976 had in effect abolished capital punishment. In 1976, the court ruling came down from the Supreme Court declaring the States, I believe, that the death penalty, as was in existence in the States at the time were all unconstitutional. Since then, 38 states have come up with new laws to try to get around the unconstitutionality in the United States so that they, once again, have the death penalty.

The retentionist countries, the ones that are straight 100 percent capital punishment do not read like a list of people that we want to come anywhere close to associating ourselves with. They include, as some examples, Bulgaria, Upper Volta, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kampuchea, Jamaica, Kenya, North and South Korea, Soviet Union, Uganda, Vietnam and Yugoslavia. The United States, for all intents and purposes, with 38 states out of 50 having capital punishment now can certainly be considered in that.

Let us look at the reasons that society wants to have capital punishment reinstated, at least some members of society want to have it. Let's look at some of the consequences of us getting into it. In Canada, the actual homicide rate in this country has reduced on a per capita basis from back when we brought in capital punishment was brought in the actual number, not just on a per capita basis, but the actual number of murders after the bringing in of capital punishment dropped substantially from 614 in 1976 down to only 493 in

1980, and that has increased up, but still not to the levels of pre-capital punishment at the end of 1983. On a per capita basis in Canada, in 1975, it was 3.09 per 100,000 for the homicide rate; it is now 2.74 per 100,000.

In other jurisdictions where they have capital punishment they generally do not have a record as good as that. The nations, and the States in particular, that have capital punishment have, in most instances, had increasing rates of homicides. So the idea that capital punishment is a deterrent really cannot be substantiated in fact. What it is, in essence, is vengeance, not deterrence.

The Member for Elmwood calls it justice. He goes along with the nations that I listed, of the Soviet Union, of China, of pretty well all the East Block nations, most of what one could only call today the fascist countries in Latin America and in other jurisdictions of the world who have the policies that the Member for Elmwood calls justice.

Mr. Speaker, one also looks and must look at the rate of murders. In the United States, for instance, police and prison guards are not less apt to be murdered in the states with the death penalty than they are in states without the death penalty. It has absolutely no impact as far as deterrence for the shooting of police or prison guards. Their rate of homicide has increased, it's now up to 8.3, three-and-a-half, almost four times ours in Canada.

Between January and April in '84 when the steamroller really started to roll, in particular in Texas and most in the State of Florida, they had executed more people in that three-and-a-half month period, four-and-a-half month period, than at any time up to and including from 1976. So in a period of three-and-a-half or four months in 1984, they had executed more people than they had in the previous eight years, the appeals, the number of people on Death Row, as well. There is a tremendous amount of discrimination when one has the death penalty. You have to be one of the minorities, I suppose, to really appreciate that but, for minorities in this country they had best take a very close look at what is happening in the country closest to us, that of the United States.

Forty-one percent of all the people on Death Row are black, and yet blacks represent only 12 percent of the population of the United States. If a black kills a white man, he is far more likely to get the death penalty than any other crime, any other circumstance. By December 20, 1984, they had 1,464 prisoners in the U.S. on Death Row. In 1983, there were 1,311, so they went on an unprecedented, in modern times, rampage of executions, and yet the number of people on Death Row increased, and the murder rate increased.

As well, if one looks at who is on Death Row, one sees that some 62 percent of those people are unskilled, service or domestic workers; 60 percent were unemployed. This is something that shows very clearly, even in Canada. Although the overall murder rate has not changed substantially the actual number of murders has increased, but it has been very closely correlated to the economic conditions of the country. The vast majority of homicides in Canada are domestic disputes. It's the frustration and the sickness that unemployment begets people in the role that it has in destabilizing the family unit and relationships.

In Texas, court-appointed lawyers for those convicted lose three out of four cases of people who are on Death Row. For people who can afford their own lawyer outside the court-appointed system, the success rate is one in only three go to Death Row, versus three out of four go to Death Row with the court-appointed lawyer, so there's obviously a difference in quality of the judicial defence that is offered to the people.

In Texas, I mentioned earlier that the blacks who kill whites are much more likely to go to Death Row to be executed than any other crime. In Texas, Mr. Speaker, blacks who kill whites are 87 times more likely to get the death penalty than if a black kills a black man - 87 times. And if someone can come to us and say that does not show a blatant example of racism, I don't know what does.

In Florida, a similar situation, not anywhere near as dramatic, in Florida it is five times as likely to be convicted and sentenced to death if a black person murders a white person than if a black person murders another black. I don't have any stats, unfortunately, where a white kills a black, but I would suggest and suspect that the rates would be in the hundreds of times more likely for a black who killed a white, than a white who killed a black, to end up with a death penalty, with a death sentence.

In South Africa, we were all shocked back in October of 1983. I got this out of the London Observer. It shows a South African farmer with a black man from that country standing beside him moments before he was summarily executed by this white farmer. The white farmer got six years imprisonment. The chances of him serving those six years are remarkably remote. But South Africa, along with China, Iran and Iraq, accounts for 80 percent of the reported executions by states. There are an awful lot more than is actually reported but, of the ones who are officially reported, those four nations represent 80 percent of them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a gross injustice to civilization, to civilized man, to our role as legislators, it is actually an insult to our roles as legislators. I think, to even bring this kind of subject back to try and win and score political points, as the Member for Elmwood is certainly one of the classical political opportunists, he's gone after almost every, what he calls, hot cases that he can possibly come up to be able to raise in the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, on this one in particular, I would like to close off with a quote I just received from Amnesty International, from a prisoner which Amnesty International is trying to free from the prisons in the Soviet Union. I'm sure each and everyone of you here - at least you should be, I'll be shocked if you aren't - are fully aware of the situation of Mr. Andrei Sacharov. Andrei Sacharov has written, and this is a quote from Mr. Sacharov: "I regard the death penalty as a savage institution that undermines the moral and legal foundation of society. I reject the notion that the death penalty has any essential deterrent effect on potential offenders. I am convinced that the contrary is true, that savagery begets savagery."

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would hope that members of this Legislature if this issue comes to a vote will stand, obviously not in unison - there are a couple of members opposite who, for sure - will vote in favour of the reinstatement of society's premeditated killing of other members of society.

Recently the Canadian Law Association met in Bridgetown, I believe that's in the Barbados and a very noted criminal lawyer in Canada, Edward Greenspan, had the following comment on capital punishment. "I have always hated capital punishment," he stated. "To me, it seems a cruel, brutal, useless barbarianism. The killing of an individual by the State is deliberate and is done without any personal grievance or feeling. It is the outcome of long, premeditated hatred. It does not happen suddenly and without warning, without time for the emotions to cool and subside, but a day is fixed a long way ahead and the victim is kept in a continued, prolonged torture up to the moment of execution."

Mr. Speaker, society as a whole, Canadian society, would become a victim if Canada was ever to move to reinstate the death penalty.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In participating in the debate on the resolution proposed by the Member for Elmwood, I think it does give us an opportunity to give consideration to some of the things that have been taking place in our society in the past few years.

I think there is room to challenge some of the comments that were made by the previous speaker, some of the information that I have available. I think, as well, it's important to debate some of the comments made by the Member for Fort Garry.

As elected officials, we do have a responsibility to carry out as responsible members, not necessarily always agreeing with what popular opinion is in the community. But one has to look very carefully and listen very carefully to those people in our society that are put in charge of the protection of our society and the safety of our society.

I am extremely concerned, as a member of the Legislative Assembly and as a person who believes in a free society with a police force or law enforcement people who are hired, who are employed, who give a lifetime dedication to the security and safety of each and every one of us, to our children, and I do not think that we should pass by lightly by using statistics or using comments from other countries - I think that's an internal situation that we have to deal with - because we have certain countries that the member previous to me referred to, have different elements of things happening, and I'm sure which cause different behavioural patterns within those societies.

I am not convinced, as some people are, that there is not an element of prevention in the use of the death penalty when it comes to conviction of first-degree murder. I have not heard an argument to this point, that hasn't totally convinced me that there isn't some. However, let's take the argument that is put forward, that it is in fact an issue of justice, rather than an issue of prevention.

What are we talking about when we talk about first-degree murder? Well, until I did a little bit of looking at it, Mr. Speaker, I was not quite up-to-date on it as possibly I should have, but as I understand it, first-degree murder according to the criminal code, probably has been read into the record by others, but I think

it's important to start on this basis, that first-degree murder is a planned and deliberate murder; the paying up, or hiring of someone to kill another person. Let's just stop and look at that.

Let's just stop and look at the premeditated murder that somebody in society has made their mind up that they're going to take the life of another person. That's their decision. They have made a decision that they are going to take, or have taken, someone else's life. Their mind is made up, Mr. Speaker. That is what they're going to do. And when that decision is made, Mr. Speaker, then I think we have to try to say, what can we do to either stop that person, or how can we stop them? How can we change their mind? How do we know that that act is going to take place? What goes through the mind of the person that is going to kill another person, or have that person killed? Do they think that they are going to eliminate that person without paying any penalty, or without having justice prevail? What are some of the other areas? And I'll get back to the penalizing of the offense.

Murder of a police or a custodial officer killed in the line of duty. Those individuals that are putting their lives on a line, I think, deserve at least the consideration of the backing of legislators. I think we should take the opportunity to debate it. I don't think we should pass over it lightly. I think we should take very seriously the fact that, if there isn't the backing of legislative people, then who in their right minds would take on such a profession? Mr. Speaker, who in their right minds would take on such a profession if they in fact don't get the backing of the legislators of this country?

I have to take their argument very seriously because I want the maintenance of a society under the kind of system that we have. I want the judicial system to work. I want the freedom to move without having to worry about the kind of actions that we could get into without the protection of the police officers. And if, Mr. Speaker, we don't come to grips with it, who will be the judge if you are stopped some evening and there has been a premeditated murder, or an individual who has committed homicide at large, and the police officer stops your automobile and there happens to be a false move bait, and the officer who is apprehending that individual has a question in his mind that there is going to be some kind of activity to take his or her life as a police officer, what will be the response of that police officer? I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the judge and jury will be right there. And there could be some tragic mistakes made in our society unless we deal with it.

I, Mr. Speaker, don't blame the enforcement officers for taking that kind of action because nobody backing them up, Mr. Speaker, the judicial system becoming softer in society, so we really have to come to grips with that very aspect of it.

The Member for Inkster didn't really deal with the issue. He tried to talk about discrimination in other countries. He tried to make reference to the fact and the way in which certain people would be treated versus other ones in the situation, but he really didn't come to grips with the hard-core problem that we have with this issue. The fact, that if somebody pre-plans to murder a person, take their life from them, that what justice they should get. What justice is it to lock a person up for 25 years in solitary confinement on death row, or whatever you want to call it? Is that justice,



Mr. Speaker? Is that not taking away of the life, the spirit of a person? Give consideration to that, Mr. Speaker.

To be locked up like an animal in a cage for 25 years without parole; to be locked up until you die behind bars, Mr. Speaker. Is that not a form of death penalty? Is it not? Tell me. I honestly think it is. Are we doing them a favour by putting them in that kind of situation? I don't know, Mr. Speaker, that's a question I'm putting forward.

I, as a young person, had the opportunity when I was in Air Cadets, to play ball out at the coast against some people who were in prison. And as a young person, as a 15- or 16-year-old boy, I was an extremely startled person when I saw the kind of conditions - these weren't the criminals; these weren't the murderers that we were playing ball against, these were the lesser offenders - but we did have an opportunity to see where the hard-core murderers were kept, Mr. Speaker.

They were kept in a cold, hard, stone building with several barriers of hooks and barbed wire, and lived in cages that were operated by mechanical instruments, hard and cold. To put a person in that kind of a system, in that kind of a situation, for 25 years, Mr. Speaker, is no less punishment, in my mind, than to take that person's life for taking another person's life. I, Mr. Speaker, had not had anybody tell me that it is. I am not convinced that it is, to lock a person up in a cage for 25, or as many years as some people get for capital punishment, that that is any better treat to give them than taking their life. I agree, it is a form of savagery, if that's what you want to call it, to take a person's life; I agree with that, I think it is.

But, Mr. Speaker, when you see what's happening in society today - I've been listening a little bit to what's happening on the Peter Warren show the last few days - we have a lot of savagery in our society. We have a lot of people who I think deserve nothing more than to be treated that way. How else do we deal with it. How else do you deal with society that has I think degraded to the point that it has?

I am not happy to see another person lose their life. I am not very struck on that, and I would hate to have to be the person who carried out the action to take that person's life, but there aren't the kind of answers coming forward from those people who are not supporters of capital punishment; there aren't enough answers coming forward to say that there is a better way.

Some of the other reasons for first-degree murder - that's a murder committed in the course of certain criminal acts, hijacking, kidnapping and sexual offences - again, let's look at some of those. What about hijacking in our society today? What about it? Not only are some people prepared to hijack an airplane and take one or two lives; they, Mr. Speaker, are prepared to wipe out the lives of hundreds of people - hundreds of people - for their own goals.

I haven't had anybody come forward from the side of the argument saying that there is a way we can stop hijackers, that setting an example by taking the life of a few hijackers wouldn't deter it or stop it, because I think it would, Mr. Speaker; I think it would. That is one particular case where I think the hijacking incidents in this country, in this world, would be slowed up somewhat if the application of capital punishment were used in those situations.

Let us talk a little bit about kidnapping and sexual offences. Again, Mr. Speaker, put yourself in the shoes of a family who have had that kind of an act take place to them, and how would you feel toward the person who took the life of a young child of your family for that kind of an act. You would feel very bitter. But I would feel as equally bitter, Mr. Speaker, if the politicians of this country had the kind of recommendations coming from the police commission and the defenders of our society and that the politicians did not take on the responsibility of debating it and coming forward with what would appear to be one of the only solutions to that, and to give some kind of peace of mind that justice prevails.

My colleague from Fort Garry - and I'll have to debate a little bit with him on it - said that we are sent here, yes, to make our decisions. We have to reflect to a certain degree all the people in our constituency. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that should happen but, as well, I am a supporter of a free vote. I'm a supporter of a free vote on such a major issue. I think that each and every one of us have to come to grips within our own mind, dealing with our constituents. I don't feel that I should be forced by the party Whip, or by party policy to maintain the line on this particular issue. I don't think the members of the House of Commons should be either, Mr. Speaker, because each and every one of us in our own minds have to deal with this very major issue in society; we have to deal with it.

I have to stand and justify my position when it comes to telling and supporting the protection officers in our society that I agree with them; that, yes, I have not been convinced that putting a person away for 25 years in a stone house with all the iron, giving them no access to freedom in our society, I have not yet been convinced that that is any less punishment than taking that person's life for premeditating the murder of another person. I have not been convinced by any debate in this Assembly; I have not been convinced by anybody in the House of Commons.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is, I guess, backing up in society if you want to say so. But, if it takes backing up in society to give peace of mind to people who have lost family because of sex offenders, or because of someone who was hired to get rid of the person, Mr. Speaker, on premeditation, then I guess that maybe the way we have to go. But, I am certainly not going to be sold very easily that justice shouldn't be enforced through capital punishment.

I will go to the fourth one which is here for first-degree murder, and that is murder committed by a person previously convicted of first- or second-degree murder. Well, let's take a look at that one, Mr. Speaker. A person in society has committed first-degree murder, either through a sex offence, hijacking, kidnapping, murder of a police officer, custodial officer and/or planned or premeditated. Not only one life had they taken in society, but two or three or four, Mr. Speaker.

Now, tell me that that person should be allowed to continue to carry out such an act. I mean that has to be, in my mind, the final argument for support, and if it's savagery, Mr. Speaker, that we take that life, or that society takes that life, than it is no worse than the allowance of that person to continue to take lives of other people. I call it an equal balance, but I think it's our responsibility to a free society, to those people who

**Thursday, 25 April, 1985**

---

are trying to protect that free society to enforce that kind of a law.

I would hope that members of the government in this Assembly would set aside their political philosophy and deal with it as persons in their own right in doing just what they feel is absolutely right in their own mind and, if they continue to carry out the same feeling, then I don't hold it against them, but let's at least have a free vote on this.

I think the member's resolution, as it states here, is not too difficult to support because what he's saying:

"WHEREAS a person who commits murder in the first degree deserves the death penalty; and

"WHEREAS Manitobans overwhelmingly support the restoration of capital punishment;" - and I don't disagree with it, I'm sure the people of Manitoba feel very much that way.

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommend" - recommend is what he's asking us to do - "to the Government of Canada that the Criminal Code be amended to provide capital punishment upon conviction of first-degree murder."

At least, Mr. Speaker, if that were the case, then it would have the opportunity to be debated in the House of Commons where it should be debated. I think it

should happen; I think it should be debated in the House of Commons; and I think each member in the House of Commons should put forward their own personal view as a reflection of their constituency, not totally directed by that, but as a reflection of, not only the majority of the people in their constituency - but I want to deal for just one minute, if I have one minute - and that's with the minority in their constituency. The minority in their constituency, in this particular case, would be those people who have lost a loved one because of a first-degree murder attack. Yes, a minority, they're a minority, and they should have the same kind of reflection from us as the majorities get in our great days of minorities.

So, I'm thinking of those kinds of people, Mr. Speaker, when I speak here this afternoon and, at this particular point, would have no difficulty in supporting the resolution.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Are you ready for the question?

Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed)

The time then being 5:30 p.m. I am leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene in committee this evening at 8 o'clock.