

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 10 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 Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Committee on Rules of the House.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on Thursday, November 8, 1984 at 10:00 a.m.; Thursday, December 13, 1984 at 10:00 a.m.; Monday, January 21, 1985 at 10:00 a.m.; Tuesday, February 12, 1985 at 10:00 a.m.; Tuesday, February 26, 1985 at 10:00 a.m.; Monday, March 18, 1985 at 10:00 a.m.; and Tuesday, April 9, 1985 in Room 255, Legislative Building to consider matters referred.

On November 8, your Committee elected Mr. Mercier to replace Mr. Sherman, who had resigned from the House. On December 13, your Committee accepted the resignations of Hon. Mr. Penner and Mr. Fox as Members of the Committee and elected Hon. Mr. Storie and Mr. Eyler to replace them. On January 21, your Committee accepted the resignations of Hon. Mr. Storie and Mr. Eyler as Members of the Committee and elected Hon. Mr. Penner and Mr. Fox to replace them. On February 12, your Committee accepted the resignation of Hon. Mr. Penner as a Member of the Committee and elected Hon. Mr. Mackling to replace him.

Your Committee considered the question of the interpretation of Rule 46 (no Member to speak twice) and recommends that no change be made to the Rule.

Your Committee considered the use of high-powered telephoto lenses in the Press Gallery and recommends that no restrictions be imposed on their use.

Your Committee recommends that during the summer of 1985 the Clerk's Office review the Rules of the House to identify those provisions which require amendments to overcome inconsistencies and other deficiencies and, if time permits, to identify procedural developments in other jurisdictions which could be adopted in Manitoba.

Your Committee also considered the provision of agendas and supporting material to the News Media and recommends that a proposed agenda be circulated with the notice of meeting and that supporting background material be distributed to the News Media at meetings as each topic is reached on the agenda.

Your Committee recommends that when it is again necessary to reprint the Rules of the House, a full examination be made of the various different processes by which this may be done.

Your Committee reviewed the Rules and Authorities on which previous Speakers' Rulings were based for

the period of October 24, 1954 to February 27, 1962 and recommends that no changes be made to the Rules and that an ad-hoc sub-committee consisting of the Government House Leader, the Opposition House Leader and the Clerk of the House review the remaining Rulings and advise your Committee of any changes required or any problems encountered.

Your Committee considered the correction of printing errors in the annual statutes (bound Volumes) and recommends that the corrections be made by incorporation of the appropriate provision in The Statute Law Amendment Act with a notation in the preamble that the amendments are necessary due to printing errors in the annual statutes.

Your Committee recommends that the Clerk's Office include a Legislation Progress Chart in the Votes and Proceedings on a weekly basis as soon as it is feasible to set up a word processing program to do this.

Your Committee considered the matter of a guaranteed minimum debating time for constitutional matters and recommends that the consideration of this matter be deferred.

Your Committee considered a no smoking policy to apply to Committee meetings and recommends the following:

- a) THAT no smoking be permitted at any meeting of a Committee of the Whole House, including the Committee of Supply and the Committee of Ways and Means, or at any meeting of a Standing or Special Committee of the Assembly;
- b) THAT the policy set out in clause (a) apply with equal effect to Members of the Assembly, members of the general public, representatives of the news media and House officers and staff present at meetings described in clause (a); and
- c) THAT notwithstanding clauses (a) and (b) where a Standing or Special Committee is meeting outside the Legislative Building any such Committee may decide whether or not to permit smoking at its meetings.

Your Committee considered changes to practices in Private Members' Hour and recommends the following:

- a) THAT the following amendments to the Rules respecting the consideration of business in the Private Members' Hour continue in effect on a trial basis for the duration of the current session of the Legislative Assembly;
- b) THAT present sub-rules 3(4) and (5) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:
 - (4) At 5:30 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday and at 12:30 o'clock p.m. on Fridays, the Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put.
 - (5) When the House is adjourned on Friday at 12:30 o'clock p.m., it shall stand adjourned unless otherwise ordered until the following Monday afternoon.
- c) THAT present sub-rule 19(2) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(2) The order of business for consideration by the House, day by day, after the daily routine shall be as follows:

Government Business
(Monday through Friday)

Orders for Returns and Addresses for Papers
Committee of the Whole House, for consideration
of Bills

Report Stage, Bills reported from Committees
Government Bills - Third Readings, Second
Readings

Government Motions

Private Members' Business

4:30 to 5:30 p.m. on each Monday, Tuesday,
Wednesday and Thursday

Monday

Private Members' Resolutions
Private Bills
Public Bills by Private Members
Orders for Return, Addresses for Papers,
referred for debate

Tuesday

Private Bills
Public Bills by Private Members
Private Members' Resolutions
Orders for Return, Addresses for Papers,
referred for debate

Wednesday

Orders for Return, Addresses for Papers,
referred for debate
Private Members' Resolutions
Private Bills
Public Bills by Private Members

Thursday

Public Bills by Private Members
Private Bills
Private Members' Resolutions
Orders for Return, Addresses for Papers,
referred for debate

d) THAT the Rules of the House be amended by adding the following new Rule immediately after Rule 22:

Time Limit on debate

22.1(1) The total time allowed for the consideration of any Private Members' Resolution and any amendment thereto shall not exceed three hours.

Termination of debate

(2) When the time allowed by sub-rule (1) has expired the Speaker shall terminate debate on the item being considered.

e) THAT present sub-rule 33(3) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(3) Notwithstanding sub-rules (1) and (2), speeches during Private Members' Hour or during debate on a private member's order called by the Government pursuant to sub-rule 20(2) shall be limited to fifteen minutes.

Your Committee has agreed to the following permanent changes to the Rules and recommends them to the House to be effective on concurrence:

Procedure in unprovided cases

1. THAT sub-rule 1(2) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

1(2) In all cases not provided for in these Rules, by sessional or other orders or by the usages and customs of the Assembly, the usages and customs of the House of Commons of Canada as in force at the time shall be followed so far as they may be applicable to the Assembly.

Limitations on extension

2. THAT sub-rule 10(5) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

10(5) — When pursuant to sub-rule (4) the Speaker has directed that the division bells continue to ring beyond fifteen minutes:

- (a) the time for the division bells to be turned off once set shall not be altered;
- (b) no further extension shall be granted in respect of that division; and
- (c) no such extension shall exceed twenty-four hours.

Of Government Orders

3. THAT sub-rule 20(2) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

20(2) — When government business has precedence, the government orders and private members' orders may be called in such sequence as the government determines.

Business not to stand over

4. THAT sub-rule 21(4) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

21(4) — Any debate on a motion made under sub-rule 27(1) is terminated when the House adjourns on the day of the debate and shall not be continued or resumed at the next or any subsequent sitting of the House.

Adjournment of debate

5. THAT the following new Rule be added immediately after Rule 26:

26.1(1) When a motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means or Committee of Supply has been proposed a member may raise a grievance respecting a matter which is of concern to the member or to the member's constituency.
Member to speak once only on grievance

(2) A member may not speak to a grievance on more than one occasion during a session of the Assembly.

Debate terminated same day.

(3) Any debate pursuant to this Rule is terminated when the House adjourns on the day of the debate and shall not be continued or resumed at the next or any subsequent sitting of the House.

Speeches during Private Members' Hour

6. THAT sub-rule 33(3) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

33(3) — Notwithstanding sub-rules (1) and (2), speeches during the Private Members' Hour or during debate on a private member's order called by the government pursuant to sub-rule 20(2) shall be limited to twenty minutes.

Formal Vote in Committee

7. THAT Rule 65 be amended by adding thereto immediately after sub-rule 7 thereof the following new sub-rules:

(7.1) — where, immediately following the taking of a voice-vote, two members demand that a formal

vote be taken, the members shall be called in, both sections of the Committee of Supply shall meet together and a count-out vote shall be taken.

Both sections of the Committee of Supply to meet (7.2) — For the purposes of taking a count-out vote pursuant to sub-rule (7.1) both sections of the Committee of Supply may meet together in or outside the Chamber.

Voting to be completed

(7.3) — Where, pursuant to sub-rule (7.1), a formal vote has been commenced before 10:00 o'clock p.m. but has not been completed by that hour, notwithstanding sub-rule (9), the conduct of that vote shall not be interrupted and shall be continued until it is completed whether or not those proceedings continue after 10:00 o'clock p.m.

"Count-out" vote

(7.4) — For the purposes of sub-rules (7.1), (7.2) and (7.3) "count-out" vote means the counting aloud by the Clerk of Committee of the members rising to vote for and against the question when a formal vote has been demanded.

8. THAT paragraph 65(9)(a.1) be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(a.1) — Where two members demand that a formal vote be taken, the Chairman or Deputy Chairman of the Committees shall defer the vote on the motion until the next sitting of the Committee of Supply in the Chamber.

Proceedings in Committees

9. THAT Rule 68 be repealed.

Voting in Committees

10. THAT the following new Rule be added immediately after Rule 73.1:

73.2 All questions before a Committee shall be decided by a majority of votes excluding the vote of the Chairman of the Committee and when the votes on a question are equal the Chairman shall cast a deciding vote.

11. THAT Rule 81 be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Filing of Petitions

81(1) — Any member wishing to present a petition shall file the petition with the Clerk at least twenty-four hours before presenting it to the House.

Note: A person wishing to have a petition presented must do so through a member.

Time for presentation

(2) A member presenting a petition shall do so from his place in the House during routine proceedings when the Speaker calls for the presenting of petitions on any day during the Session.

Debate prohibited

(3) On the presentation of a petition, no debate shall be allowed on or in relation thereto.

Member answerable

(4) The member presenting a petition is answerable that it does not contain any impertinent or improper matter.

Member's endorsement

(5) The member presenting a petition shall endorse his signature thereon.

Form

(6) Petitions shall be in writing and may be in the form set out in Appendix "A" and, subject to sub-rule (7), shall be signed by each of the petitioners.

Signatures where more than 3 petitioners

(7) Where there are more than three petitioners, the signatures of at least three of the petitioners on the page on which the prayer or part of the prayer of the petition appears is sufficient execution of the petition.

Petition for expenditure not permissible

(8) No petition shall be received if it prays for any expenditure, grant or charge on the public revenue, whether payable out of the Consolidated Fund or out of moneys to be provided by the Assembly.

Receiving petitions

(9) On the day following the presentation of a petition, if in the opinion of the Speaker it conforms with the practices and privileges of the House and complies with the Rules, the Clerk shall lay the petition upon the Table and the petition shall then be deemed to have been read and received and may be read aloud in the House if required by the House; but, if in the opinion of the Speaker the petition does not conform with the practices and privileges of the House and does not comply with the Rules, he shall report that fact to the House.

Where petition not received

(10) Where the Speaker reports that, in his opinion, a petition contains matters in breach of the practices and privileges of the House or does not comply with the Rules, the petition shall not be received except upon resolution of the House.

No debate on petition

(11) On the receiving of a petition or on a motion to receive a petition under sub-rule (10), no debate shall be allowed on or in relation thereto except if it complains of some personal grievance requiring an immediate remedy, the matter contained therein may be brought into immediate discussion.

12. THAT Rules 82 to 89 inclusive be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Application of Chapter

82 Except where a provision of Chapter XIV is inconsistent with a provision in this Chapter, this Chapter applies to all Bills, whether Public or Private.

Introduction of Bills

83 Every Bill shall be introduced upon motion for leave specifying the title of the Bill.

Bills validating letters patent, by-laws and agreements

84 Where a bill for validating, ratifying or confirming any letters patent, by-law or agreement is presented to the House, a certified copy of the letters patent, by-law or agreement shall be attached to it.

First reading not debatable

85 Where a Bill is introduced by a member upon motion for leave, the mover of the motion may give such explanation as will enable the House to understand the purport of the Bill, but the question "that this Bill be now read a first time" shall be decided without amendment or debate.

Second reading after printing

86(1) Unless otherwise specially ordered or allowed by the House, each Bill shall be printed and distributed in the House before second reading.

Bills to be marked "Printed" on Orders

(2) No Bill shall be read the second time unless it has been printed and distributed to the members

at least two days previously, and has been subsequently marked "Printed" on the Orders of the Day, signifying that it has been printed and distributed.

Bills amended in Committee may be reprinted

(3) Where a Bill has been amended in a Committee or at Report Stage, it may be reprinted as amended in the discretion of the Committee or in the House, and when the Bill has been sent to be reprinted, it shall be marked on the Orders of the Day "Reprinting Pending" and shall not be further proceeded with until that mark has been removed and the word "Reprinted" substituted, signifying that the Bill has been reprinted and distributed.

Reprinted Bills to be indicated

(4) Where a Bill is sent to be reprinted, the word "REPRINTED" shall be printed in large type on the face of the reprinted version.

Three readings before passing

87(1) — Every Bill shall receive three several readings, on different days, before being passed.

Urgent cases

(2) By leave of the House, a Bill may be read twice or thrice, or advanced two or more stages in one day.

Two readings before committal

(3) Every Bill shall be read twice in the House before being referred to a Committee or amended.

Committal to Committee

(4) Every Bill, after having been read a second time, shall stand referred to a Committee and all petitions before the House, for or against the Bill, shall stand referred to that Committee.

Order of consideration of a Bill

88(1) — In considering a Bill or any Committee of the House, whether Standing, Special or of the Whole House, consideration of the title, the preamble and the first clause, if it contains only a short title, shall be postponed and after every other clause is considered by the Committee in its proper order, the first clause, if it contains only a short title, the preamble and the title shall be considered last.

Chairman to sign Bill

(2) The Chairman of a Committee to which a Bill is referred, shall sign with his full signature the House copy of each Bill reported by the Committee on which the amendments and corrections to the Bill, if any, are fairly inserted and shall also initial the several amendments or corrections made and the clauses added by the Committee.

Report on Bills

(3) All amendments made to a Bill in any Committee shall be reported to the House, and every Bill reported from any Committee, whether amended or not, shall be received by the House on report thereof.

Report Stage

(4) Unless otherwise ordered by the House, the Report Stage of any Bill reported from any Standing or Special Committee shall not be taken into consideration prior to forty-eight hours following the presentation of the report of the Committee with respect thereto.

Report from Committee of the Whole

(5) Notwithstanding sub-rule (4), a Bill reported from a Committee of the Whole House shall be

received and forthwith disposed of, without amendment.

Notice of amendment at Report Stage

(6) Subject to sub-rule (8), no motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause or provision of a Bill shall be entertained on the consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill unless notice of the motion has been given to the House before the Order of the Day for consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill has been called.

Request for 24 hours deferment for amendment

(7) Where a written notice of a motion to amend, delete, insert or restore any clause or provision in a Bill is given prior to the consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill, and the Order of the Day for consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill is called before the end of the first sitting of the House after the notice is given, any member may request that the consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill be deferred until after the end of the first sitting of the House after the notice is given and, unless the House by a vote, unanimous except for that member, refuses the request, the consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill shall be deferred until after the end of the first sitting of the House after the notice is given; but, if the consideration of the Report Stage of the Bill is deferred once under this Rule, the consideration of the Report Stage shall not again be deferred, except by resolution of the House.

Amendment without notice

(8) An amendment in relation to form only in a government Bill may be proposed by a Minister of the Crown without notice, but debate thereon may not be extended beyond the provisions of the clause or clauses to be amended.

Note: The purpose of this sub-rule is to facilitate the incorporation into a Bill of amendments of a strictly consequential nature flowing from the acceptance of other amendments. No waiver of notice would be permitted in relation to any amendment which would change the intent of the Bill, no matter how slightly, beyond the effect of the initial amendment.

Debate on amendments

(9) When the Order of the Day for consideration of the Report Stage of a Bill is called, any amendment of which notice has been given in accordance with sub-rule (6) is open to debate but no motion to amend the amendment shall be accepted except by consent of the House.

Limitation on speeches

(10) Where debate is permitted on an amendment, no member shall speak more than once or longer than twenty minutes, during the proceedings on the amendment at that stage, except that the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, a Minister of the Crown or other member sponsoring a Bill and the member proposing the amendment may speak for not more than forty minutes.

Combining the amendments

(11) The Speaker may select or combine amendments or clauses to be proposed at the Report Stage and may, if he thinks fit, call upon any member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the subject

of the amendment as may enable the Speaker to form a judgment upon it.

Deferring recorded division

(12) When a recorded division has been demanded on any amendment proposed during the Report Stage of a Bill, the Speaker may defer the calling in of the members for the purpose of recording the "yeas" and "nays" until any or all subsequent amendments proposed to that Bill have been considered. A recorded division may not be so deferred from sitting to sitting.

Motion following Report Stage

(13) Where proceedings at the Report Stage on any Bill have been concluded, a motion "that the Bill, as amended, be concurred in" or "that the Bill be concurred in" shall be put and forthwith disposed of, without amendment or debate.

Third reading

(14) Where a Bill has been amended or a debate has taken place thereon at the Report Stage, the same shall be set down for a third reading and passage at the next sitting of the House.

Third reading where no amendment

(15) Where a Bill has been reported from a Standing or Special Committee, and no amendment has been proposed thereto at the Report Stage, and in the case of a Bill reported from a Committee of the Whole, with or without amendment, a motion "that the Bill be now read a third time and passed" may be made in the same sitting.

Recommittal

89 Where the Order of the Day for third reading of a Bill is read, any member desiring to recommit the Bill shall move to discharge the Order and to recommit the Bill; and, upon such a motion being resolved in the affirmative, the member shall give notice of the instructions to be given, but those instructions shall not be taken into consideration before the next sitting of the House.

13. THAT Rules 104 to 121 inclusive be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Deposit on filing petition for Private Act

104(1) At the time of filing a petition for a Private Act, the petitioner shall deposit with the Clerk in cash or by cheque, draft, money order or other remittance, payable to the Minister of Finance of Manitoba, the sum of \$250 plus an additional sum of \$10 for every 450 words or fraction thereof contained in the Bill in excess of 4,500 words.

Fees respecting Private Acts or incorporation

(2) Before a Private Bill for incorporating a joint stock company with proposed authorized capital of more than \$100,000, or for increasing the authorized capital of a joint stock company, is reported by the Committee to which it is referred, the petitioner shall deposit with the Clerk additional fees of \$25 for each \$100,000 or part thereof by which the authorized capital exceeds \$100,000 or is increased, as the case may be.

Remittance for special petitioners

105(1) Where the petitioner is an institution, organization or association with charitable, religious or benevolent purposes, and is not carrying on, or intending to carry on, business for gain, the deposit may, subject to sub-rules (2) and (3), be remitted to the petitioner.

Limitation of remittance

(2) No remittance of any deposit or fees paid in connection with a Private Bill shall be made:

- (a) except upon the recommendation of the Committee to which the Bill has been referred; or
- (b) if the Assembly, by resolution, orders that no remittance be made to the petitioner.

Maximum remittance

(3) The remittance of any deposit or fees paid in accordance with this Rule shall not exceed the amount of the deposit or fees, less the actual cost of printing the Bill.

Publication of notice by Clerk

106 The Clerk shall publish in the first issue of each month of the Manitoba Gazette a notice setting out sub-rule 107(1).

Notice of application for Private Bill

107(1) Every petitioner for a Private Bill shall publish, within twelve months prior to the presentation of the petition for the Private Bill,

- (a) in one issue of the Manitoba Gazette; and
- (b) at least once in each of two weeks during the twelve month period aforementioned in an issue of a newspaper published in the English language and having a general circulation in the area of the province in which the persons or a majority of the persons, who would be interested in or affected by the Private Bill reside;

a notice, in the form set out in Schedule "A-1", signed by or on behalf of the petitioner and clearly and distinctly specifying the nature and object of the petition and any exceptional provision proposed to be inserted in the Bill.

Where a Private Bill left on Order Paper at end of session

(2) Where a Private Bill remains on the Order Paper for First or Second Reading when the House is prorogued or dissolved, it may be introduced at the next session of the Legislature without publication of further notice under sub-rule (1).

Proof of publication

(3) Prior to the presentation of a petition in the House, the petitioner shall file with the Clerk a statutory declaration proving to the satisfaction of the Clerk, the due publication of the notices mentioned in sub-rule (1).

Report by Law Officer

108(1) Before any Private Bill is considered by the Committee to which it is referred, a report shall first be submitted to the Committee by the Law Officer or the Deputy Law Officer stating that he has examined the Bill, and has noted by section in the report any exceptional powers sought and any other provisions of the Bill requiring special consideration.

Model Bill for incorporation

(2) Every Private Bill for an Act of incorporation or an amendment of any such Act shall be drawn in accordance with the Model Bill as set out in Appendix "B", with such variations and additions as to form as may be approved by the Law Officer.

Reference to applicable general Acts

(3) Every Private Bill for incorporating a corporation shall be so framed as to make any general Act relating to the details of the corporation applicable to the corporation except as provided

in the Private Bills and special grounds shall be established for any proposed departure from the provisions of any general Act of for the introduction of other provisions respecting those details.

Procedure where notice insufficient

109 Where a Committee finds that the notice published under Rule 107 is insufficient either as regards the petition as a whole or as to any matter therein that ought to have been specially mentioned in the notice, it shall recommend to the House the course to be taken with respect to the matter.

Notice of sitting of Committee

110 Notice of any meeting for the consideration of a Private Bill by a Committee shall be published in the Notice Paper and posted at least two days before the meeting on the notice board for the House.

Appearance of interested parties

111(1) Every person whose interest or property may be affected by any Private Bill may and, when required to do so by the Committee, shall appear before the Standing Committee to which the Bill has been referred touching his consent or opposition to the Bill or may send his consent in writing, proof of which may be demanded by the Committee.

Where no consent of interested parties

(2) Where the consent of a person whose interest or property may be affected by a Private Bill is not produced to the Committee, the Committee may require the petitioner for the Private Bill to serve a copy of the proposed Bill on the person and notify the person of the time and place where the Committee will again consider the Private Bill.

Proof of age

(3) The Committee to which a Private Bill incorporating a company has been referred may require proof that the persons whose names appear in the Bill as composing the company are of the full age of majority and in a position to effect the objects contemplated and have consented to becoming incorporated.

14. THAT Appendix "A" be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

- Appendix "A"
- Appendix "A-1"

**APPENDIX "A"
MODEL PETITION**

To the Legislature
of the Province of Manitoba

The petition of the undersigned of the
. of humbly sheweth.

That (here state the object desired by the petitioner).

WHEREFORE your petitioner humbly prays that The Legislature of the Province of Manitoba may be pleased (to pass an Act for the purposes above mentioned).

And as in duty bound your petitioner will ever pray.

Signature

(and seal, in the case of a corporation with a seal)

(Date)

**APPENDIX "A-1"
FORM OF NOTICE OF
PETITION TO THE ASSEMBLY**

Take Notice that (Name of petitioner). . . . will present to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the present (or next) session of the Legislature of Manitoba a petition (here state the object desired by the petitioner).

DATED at the of in the Province of Manitoba, this day of , 19 . . .

Name and address of petitioner or solicitor for petitioner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that the report be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS
AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This morning I received a few copies of the mid-term program evaluation of the Winnipeg Core Area Agreement. Now, I would like to table one and give one to the opposition. I expect to have more copies later on and I'll see that there are more copies for each caucus, including the Independents.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Film Classification Board for the year ending March 31, 1984, and I also have a Ministerial Statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday and Thursday of last week, the Honourable Sinclair Stevens, Federal Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion and Chairperson of his government's Cabinet Committee on Economic and Regional Development, was in our province to take part in the second annual Canada-

Manitoba Economic and Regional Development Agreement Ministers' meeting.

I'd like to give the House a brief report on that meeting, which I attended with my colleagues, the Minister of Energy and Mines and the Minister of Co-operative Development.

I also have tabled documents which were released at the conclusion of the meeting, a joint communique, and a 1985 workplan for the Economic and Regional Development Agreement System in Manitoba called the "Course of Action: Year Two."

Last week's meeting was the first formal Economic and Regional Development Agreement Ministers' meeting in which the new Federal Minister has participated. I believe Mr. Stevens will be holding similar meetings with the other nine provinces over the next few months.

Last week's meeting also marked the fourth occasion on which I have been able to meet bilaterally with Mr. Stevens since he took on his new responsibilities.

At the first of those meetings in October of last year, Mr. Stevens expressed keen interest in Northern Manitoba and in the economic development initiatives which our two governments are undertaking in the North.

At that time, and at subsequent meetings, we also had lengthy discussions on the economic benefits of renewed northern hydro-electric development both for our province and for the entire country.

Those earlier discussions explain our agreement to hold last week's Economic and Regional Development Agreement meeting in Gillam and our agreement in the 1985 Economic and Regional Development Agreement workplan, to sign, before the end of next month, a Canada-Manitoba Memorandum of Understanding for Hydro-Electric Development Project Co-ordination.

While it would be premature to discuss the contents of the federal-provincial Hydro Development Memorandum of Understanding in detail, I can advise the House that its general purpose will be to ensure that the Federal and Provincial Governments work as closely together as possible to, in the words of the Course of Action, "emphasize employment benefits for Northerners, to maximize industrial benefits and to manage environmental and other socio-economic concerns."

The Hydro Development Memorandum of Understanding is one of several important federal commitments which Mr. Stevens confirmed at the Gillam meeting.

Members can refer to the Course of Action for the complete list which includes federal commitments to sign a new Tourism Development sub-agreement by the end of April and a new Industrial Development sub-agreement by the end of June. Those will be the ninth and tenth Economic and Regional Development sub-agreements for our province.

Priority is also being given as well to a new federal-provincial Memorandum of Understanding on Science and Technology and to work on potential joint initiatives in such areas as trade development, health care products and services, energy conservation, and co-operative development, including employment co-operatives.

Mr. Stevens also undertook, as lead Federal Minister for the Canada-Manitoba Economic and Regional

Development Agreement system, to convene a special meeting within the next month with the Federal Minister of Transport and the Manitoba Ministers on progress to date under the Churchill and Transportation Development sub-agreements and, specifically, the concerns which my colleague, the Minister of Highways and Transportation has expressed about possible CN layoffs in our province.

Mr. Speaker, as I told the members of the media who were present at the news conference Mr. Stevens and I held on our return from Gillam last Thursday, I felt our meeting was an excellent one and demonstrated, once again, the importance of federal-provincial co-operation to the economic future of our province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think that one best sums up this ministerial statement by the actions of this government, that all too often have now become a standard way of proceeding. First they tell us, and then they tell us they told us, and then they tell us again.

Mr. Speaker, what's happening here is really nothing new and the Minister is really not telling us any great things that are happening that weren't happening before. The agreements, the federal-provincial agreements, as far as tourism, as far as industrial development, was all part of a package signed some seven-eight years ago, and this government is just extending that package.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to members opposite that it's interesting to note that when they were in the opposition and we signed the Enterprise Manitoba Agreement and helped small business with small grants, they were the members who were berating and chastising us for signing that kind of agreement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we've got them merrily trooping along the same route and giving even bigger grants to larger businesses while smaller businesses are saying, how come we're left out of the whole scenario? Why aren't we included?

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing happen here is while we appreciate the concern that the Federal Government is showing with regard to Manitoba in the development of either Hydro resources or Trade and Technology - these are all things which I believe all Manitobans want to see happen because we want to see permanent long-term jobs created here - but let the government not get up and from time to time and say, look what good boys we are, look what we're doing - when a lot of things were happening before.

I want to say to members opposite that when it comes to making ministerial announcements, when the Minister, in his own announcement here, said he had a press conference announcing this before and then coming to the Legislature to present it again - I'd appreciate it if he'd have something new and concrete to propose rather than stuff that he's already put forward in press conferences.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Minister.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I'm pleased to table later in the House today, an agreement reached between Manitoba and eight United States utilities on the principles for negotiations on a major electricity sale.

These utilities are: The Madison Gas and Electric Company of Madison, Wisconsin; The Wisconsin Electric Power Company of Milwaukee, Wisconsin; The Wisconsin Power and Light Company of Madison, Wisconsin; Wisconsin Public Power Incorporated of Sun Prairie, Wisconsin; The Wisconsin Public Service Corporation of Green Bay, Wisconsin; The Upper Peninsula Power Company of Escanaba, Michigan; The Minnesota Power Company of Duluth, Minnesota; and The Northern States Power Company of Minneapolis, Minnesota.

This export sale initiative is the result of over two years of intensive work by the parties in examining and evaluating the benefits and costs associated with the purchase of hydro-electricity from Manitoba and the alternatives available to the Wisconsin utilities. The feasibility studies generally concluded that the export of Manitoba Hydro electric power would provide significant economic benefits both to Manitobans and to the American buyers. At the same time, no major social, environmental or political barriers could be identified with such a sale.

As a result, the study and research stage is now complete and negotiations have commenced at a meeting which took place within the last two weeks in the United States with representatives of the eight utilities.

The main principles which will underlie the negotiations are:

- (1) Manitoba would sell the power and energy equivalent to the production from Conawapa, the next hydro-electric generating station following Limestone on the Nelson River, an amount of about 1,300 megawatts;
- (2) The term of the sale would be 15 to 35 years with the sale to commence in the 1996 to 1998 period;
- (3) The export sale would call for the construction of new transmission facilities to a location in Minnesota and/or Wisconsin; and
- (4) It is the intention of the parties to reach agreement on a Memorandum of Understanding on the proposed transaction or to conclude negotiations by October 15, 1985.

Mr. Speaker, the Statement of Principles refers to similar discussions now taking place with the Minnesota-Wisconsin Power Supplies Group and the Western Area Power Administration involving the sale of the output from a new major hydro-electric generating station, beginning in the 1995-98 period.

Successful negotiations with any one of these three groups of utilities will mean the advancement of

construction of the Conawapa Generating Station which will bring further long-term economic benefits for Manitobans. It is estimated that Conawapa would take 10 to 12 years to complete and would create about 9,000 person years in direct construction employment and 16,000 person years of indirect related employment in manufacturing and other Manitoba industries.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we would anticipate making a significant profit for the people of Manitoba from a sale related to Conawapa.

Mr. Speaker, the recently concluded sale to Northern States Power has clearly shown the advantages that exports of hydro-electricity can bring to Manitoba. The early construction of the Limestone Generating Station and the very substantial profits associated with the Northern States Power sale are benefits that are welcomed by all Manitobans. These are the benefits that a sale from Conawapa will also bring.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Manitoba is proud of its accomplishments in this area and looks forward to the further development of our renewable hydro resources for the benefit of all Manitobans.

With the permission of the House, I would now like to table the agreement reached between Manitoba and the eight United States utilities, the final signatory of which was received on April 2, 1985.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in the Minister's last paragraph, he indicates how proud this government is of their accomplishments. All that has been accomplished to date is that my file on Memoranda and Letters of Intent is growing bigger and thicker. Every once in a while we have to throw some out, of course. This same Minister that brought us Letters of Intent and Memoranda of Understanding with power-intensive users like Alcoa, with hopes for a completion of a power exchange involved with the MANDAN line. Mr. Speaker, only today, I understand that the Nebraska people are very concerned about having to appear before a show-cause hearing in the State of North Dakota to show why the route permit for the now defunct MANDAN Project should be allowed to stand and that it likely will be cancelled.

I remind this same Minister that project was geared to start up in September of 1984 - that was a year ago. Mr. Speaker, I hope, and I hope for Manitobans that if and when some of these agreements come to firm reality that, first of all, all true costs are included. I do not want to see Manitoba become the Newfoundland of the Prairies. I don't want to see us exporting our heritage and our future and our opportunity for permanent jobs to Nebraska, to Minnesota, to Wisconsin, or to anywhere else but Manitoba.

I remind the Honourable Minister that after \$3 billion are spent, and Limestone and Conawapa are in place, there are 30 to 40 permanent jobs left in Manitoba. That's all it takes to operate those projects. It may be great to supply that source of power to the Americans, but what about expressing some concern for creating those jobs right here in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, that

continues to be the fundamental difference between our position and that of the government. We see the opportunity for the use of that great natural resource, water, that we have for providing jobs in Manitoba. That's first and foremost.

Mr. Speaker, I am in no hurry to give away or barter away those resources for such vague phrases as "significant profits" when it's highly doubtful whether there are any profits to be taken, and whereas they are prepared to seduce the public into believing that construction of the dams in themselves can provide the last thing, the flywheel of economic development in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe, I know that my constituents in the Interlake, many of them who have helped build the power projects that are now in place; starting with Grand Rapids, with Kettle - they are calling me right now and asking about jobs. These are marginal farmers in the Interlake who supplement their incomes by going out to these Northern projects.

Mr. Speaker, little comfort do I have for them when we talk about 1996, 1998, when we talk about possibilities of significant profits from property and all the other taxes are rising in this province. This Minister is setting a record in making this kind of announcement. The people of Manitoba will be watching, as we will be watching, with a great deal of interest as to whether or not he is as quick to make the announcements when things don't come to fruition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

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 26 students of Grade 7 to 10 standing from the St. Peter's Youth Group in Unity, Saskatchewan. They are under the direction of Mr. Grégoire. On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Health services cutbacks - Confidentiality of medical records

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health indicate to the House whether Manitobans who choose to present problems dealing with services provided by his department, and in presenting those problems and allegations of cutbacks to the Minister of Health, through members of the opposition, will find themselves treated as the Minister of Health treated one constituent in Manitoba - a constituent of the Member for Transcona - in that the retribution for drawing the government's attention to a problem will be having their complete medical records brought out in public and medical expenses and funding from Department of Health programmings made public,

in retribution for daring to complain to the Minister of Health and to his department?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, first of all the member should start by telling the truth . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. L. DESJARDINS: He was the one that brought a certain person who made allegations, who made accusations, who had gone all over the place to try to pretend that this government was not interested in people that were sick. At no time did I give the medical report. All I did, as I stood in my seat, was give the information of how much money we had spent on that individual. And if that presents itself again, I will do the same thing.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I would ask the honourable member to ensure that his questions conform with the normal guidelines for Oral Question period.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health chose to reveal departmental expenditures last night on an individual whose problems I drew to his attention. I did not ask for that information the other night. The Minister, in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Does the honourable member have a question? If so, would he please pose it?

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure the House that similar treatment to Manitobans, who draw to this government's attention, whether it be by members of the opposition or by the media, can they be assured that their records of government support will not be made public in such a callous way as the Minister of Health did last night?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I go on record today as saying that during my Estimates, when we were looking at the expenditures, if the member is irresponsible enough to make an accusation before knowing the facts - in the past I've given this privately. The person was named. The allegation was made that we had cut - because he mentioned that again today - and when you're spending \$70,000 on one person in a year, that's a hell of a cut.

A MEMBER: That's not the point, that's not the point.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has once again demonstrated the problem by referring to the amount of money and government support. Will he answer the direct question? If Manitobans bring their problems to the Minister of Health, can he offer them the assurance that their medical records, the government support of those people will not be made public as he did?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the one that raised this allegation is the honourable member that's speaking now. He stood up in his seat; he mentioned a person; he said that we had cut, we were making cuts, and what I did, I stood up, I got the information. He mentioned the person and I said, that's what we gave in 1981 - \$39,000 - I'll repeat it again. In 1982 - \$42,000; in 1983 - \$73,000 and I ask him if that was a cut.

If he asked me the same question, the same way, I'll answer the same way.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health has once again violated the privacy of an individual Manitoban. If in future a constituent comes to me with a medical problem where they think they have been mistreated, underserved, or have a complaint with the Department of Health and I raise that problem with the Minister of Health, can he assure that individual that their medical records and the government expenditures on that person will not become a matter of public record in the callous manner used by the Minister of Health last night?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: If in the future my honourable friend wants to know some information, he could ask me privately. If he chose not to do that, he could not mention the name or give me the name privately, I will give him the information. If in the future my honourable friend or any members in this House make an accusation that we're cutting down on support to a person, names that person, I will give him the answer.

A MEMBER: What about the privacy of medical records?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So then the Minister has assured the House with his answer, that anyone who feels cut back by the Department of Health will have their records exposed . . .

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

If the Honourable Member for Pembina has a question, would he please place that question without a hypothesis and without argument?

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

Sugar beet industry - Assistance to

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister.

In view of the fact that we have some 450 sugar beet producers in the province that have not got contracts to produce sugar this year and it is now seeding time, can the First Minister assure the people of Manitoba and those producers of sugar that he has done everything in his power to make sure we will have a sugar industry in the province this coming year and the producers will have a contract with the sugar company?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe it was a little over a week ago that I had an opportunity, as the honourable member knows, to raise the question of the sugar beet issue with the Federal Minister of Agriculture.

The Federal Minister of Agriculture indicated to me that the Federal Government was quite aware of the problem confronting the sugar beet producers of Western Canada, particularly those in Alberta and Manitoba, that he had delegated responsibility for exploring different avenues that could be pursued with the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board, the Honourable Mr. Mayer of the Portage and Marquette Constituency; and that he would be anticipating a response from the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board and then would be in a position to respond to my inquiry that I made directly to the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the government of Alberta have taken action and assured their sugar beet producers that they would get \$10 a ton assistance from the government for this year's production, is the Province of Manitoba prepared to make that same offer to the Manitoba sugar beet producers?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the honourable member just a few moments ago, I've raised this matter with the Federal Minister of Agriculture that acknowledged to me it was a problem that he recognized was one of Federal-Canadian significance and that indeed he would ensure, by delegating responsibility to the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board to make different recommendations to him. He was then going to respond to the Minister of Agriculture and myself at the provincial level.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be in the interest of all parties that we await what I assume to be initiative that is being undertaken by the other two Ministers at the federal level in regard to the sugar beet issue.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Federal Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board is dealing with the matter - and I'm aware that he is and has just paid some \$450 million out to Western Canadian grain farmers - and I'm sure is, as well, sympathetic to the Manitoba sugar beet growers, the question directed to the First Minister is, is his government prepared to offer the same commitment to the Manitoba sugar beet growers as the Government of Alberta have to their sugar beet growers to assure Manitoba has a sugar industry in the province for this

year? Is he prepared to commit the same kind of monies that Alberta have committed to their producers, in Manitoba, as there was in Alberta? Will he make that commitment?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Manitoba has met with the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board in regard to this question. He'll be making a report to us shortly in regard to his discussions that have been taking place.

In regard to the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board, maybe the Honourable Member for Arthur is indicating to us that he is aware of some proposals that the Federal Minister responsible for the Wheat Board has made to the Manitoba Minister of Agriculture. I don't know whether he's suggesting that or not in this Chamber.

I think we'd be best to await the advice as to recommendations that the Federal Government is prepared to undertake in regard to their area, due responsibility in regard to a matter which I know is of paramount concern to the sugar beet industry and to members of this House.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, this weekend my colleague from Rhineland is joining the Manitoba sugar beet growers and the sugar beet growers from Alberta to go to Ottawa to discuss with the Federal Government a federal stabilization program.

Will this First Minister give this House the commitment that his province is prepared to do the same thing as the Alberta Government is, for his sugar beet growers when they go to that meeting this weekend?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let it be duly recorded in this Chamber that several honourable members across the way, for the first time have acknowledged that profits will be accruing to the Province of Manitoba as a result of the sale of hydro to the Northern States Power. Let it be duly recorded so that all may know.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, because I know the First Minister surely doesn't want to leave a falsehood on the record.

What hydro profits, Mr. Speaker? Maybe some hydro profits, but if I understood the Premier right . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The honourable member did not have a point of order.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again I believe you will note that's the fourth form by which the same question has been posed to me in regard to whether Manitoba is to do a carbon copy of what the Alberta

Government has done in respect to its sugar beet farmers.

The honourable member referred to visits that will be undertaken by the members of the Conservative caucus this coming weekend to Ottawa and I commend them on their initiative on making representations to the Federal Government. They are, of course, two weeks late insofar as our government is concerned because my recommendations were made, requests for attention were made to the Federal Minister of Agriculture, I believe it was some 10 days ago, so I welcome however the efforts on behalf of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I gather the Honourable Member for Arthur, in making additional recommendations to the Federal Government and possibly as a result of our request to the Federal Minister of Agriculture, and probably as well the result of the recommendations honourable members will be making to the Federal Government, we will have early response from the Federal Government as to their initiatives. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's in the public interest at this point that we await a response from the appropriate jurisdiction in regard to this matter.

Sugar beet industry - Layoffs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

Keeping in mind that the Manitoba Sugar Company is a constituent of mine and employs approximately 200 people on a full-time basis and that doubles to about 400 to 500 people during the winter season when the processing is going on, my question is to the Minister of Labour. As the company has not entered into any new contracts with the beet growers this spring, has either the Manitoba Sugar Company or its owner, B.C. Sugar Company, advised the government that there will be layoffs at this company in the very near future?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Not to my personal knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. C. BIRT: Will the Minister check with his staff to see if that information has been given to his staff and, if so, would he bring that forward to the House as quickly as possible?

HON. A. MACKLING: I'll take the question as further notice and advise if such information has been received.

MR. C. BIRT: My next question is to the Minister of Industry.

Has the Minister entered into any negotiations with the company to provide them with any financial assistance or any co-operative grants to ensure that they stay as a viable entity?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have had discussions with the representatives of the company. They indicated that they did not see the need for any assistance by the Provincial Government. They saw no problems related to operating in the Province of Manitoba, that the problem is related to the areas that have been explored with respect to the producers and the Federal Government.

Life insurance and pension management study - Government entry into

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for MPIC.

A few weeks ago, it was indicated by the Minister and the Premier that decision on the government's potential entry into the life insurance industry was going to be resolved by meetings with the industry. My question to the Minister is why did the government cancel meetings with representatives of the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association last Thursday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to correct the Leader of the Opposition. The meeting has been postponed simply because there were other commitments at that time.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Premier indicated a great anxiety to get together as soon as possible with the industry and discuss those concerns, when has the meeting been reappointed for?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: The meeting has been postponed. I would certainly hope that the meeting will be held in the fairly near future.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister then indicate that no date has been set for the meeting?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I don't know what efforts have been made to determine the earliest possible date, but we will certainly hold a meeting at the time when it is most mutually convenient. I would anticipate that meeting will be held within a number of weeks.

**Energy sale to U.S.-
Ramifications of**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines. In view of the fact that there appears to be a lack of recognition of the significance of the announcement he made today by some members of this House, I wonder if he could outline the exact ramifications of the announcement that he made earlier.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to answer a question that is obviously seeking some information on some positive aspects and positive developments for Manitoba. This is indeed in some contrast to the sour grapes and negative attitude that we heard from the Member for Lakeside. I can appreciate his sour grapes. They had four years from 1977-1981 to achieve at something . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . with respect to Hydro . . .

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

Oral Questions are asked for the purpose of obtaining information. The Honourable Minister should not use it as a reason to make a speech however short.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I was somewhat detracted in my preamble by the earlier comments by the Member for Lakeside, but certainly I'm pleased to give to the people of Manitoba, at least the members on this side of the House and hopefully the members on that side of the House, the information that the study and discussion aspect of this which has been taking place for two years and has a very solid substantive basis in homework by both sides, has now reached the stage where eight utilities have signed this agreement of principles for negotiation. There was a process of signatures going through the months of February, March and early April, because there are eight utilities involved, and this document had to go to each one of those and did so on a sequential basis.

We certainly are pleased that we have reached the stage where eight separate utilities in the United States had determined that it is useful to have substantive negotiations, Mr. Speaker, substantive negotiations that could lead to a very profound and exciting development for the people of Manitoba.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

In view of the fact that the Memorandum of Understanding between the Federal and Provincial Governments which the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology outlined earlier, indicated interest in terms of emphasizing employment benefits for Northerners, maximizing industrial benefits, and a number of other joint efforts involving the Federal-Provincial Governments, I was wondering if the Minister would keep the Federal Government, which does seem to be interested in hydro development in Manitoba, abreast of this latest development?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I certainly will respond to that by saying, yes, we welcome the Federal Conservative Government's interest and desire to help ensure that Manitobans receive the maximum spin-offs from hydro development. This is in sharp contrast, I might add, to the Provincial Progressive Conservatives who seem to be completely and totally opposed to hydro

development which I find to be quite a flip flop from their position in 1980 and 1981, but, Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be pleased to send this material to the Federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and to the Minister responsible for chairing the Economic Development Committee and the Federal Government.

Grenada Demonstration Inquiry Report - Tabling of

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. It's with respect to his tabling the Grenada Demonstration Inquiry Report last night in the House. I would ask him when he received the report and why did he choose to table the report last night in the House and make a Ministerial Statement at that time when certainly members of the House and the media were all of the understanding that the House would just deal with Estimates last night?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm very pleased to be able to answer that question, Mr. Speaker. I received the report on the Thursday before Good Friday. Staff was not available on Monday for distribution of the report, so that it could be simultaneously distributed to the Winnipeg Police Association, the Winnipeg Police, and so on, so I decided to bring it into the House on Tuesday, the very earliest possible date in view of that intended scenario.

Members may recall I had the report in the House Tuesday at 2:00 o'clock and at that time I had sent it out to the Winnipeg Police Association, their counsel and so on, but members may recall that we moved into Condolences. For that reason and for that reason alone, I decided it would be improper to table the report as a matter of some question and controversy in those proceedings. I think that was a very fair and proper thing for me to do. I still decided that it was only fair to the House, having sent the report out to the parties involved, to table it at the earliest opportunity.

I was advised and, indeed, so it appeared, that the routine proceedings which were to have been handled in the afternoon were to be handled in the first event of the evening. That, indeed, was what took place. That's exactly what happened, Mr. Speaker, and any suggestion of any improper motives on my part is *scurrilous*, to say the least, in view of those circumstances when, out of deference to the passing of an honoured member of this House, I chose not to table it - although it was with me, the report, at 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon - but in the evening at the earliest possible opportunity. I did the right thing and I'll defend it to my death.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, Mr. Speaker, not a point of order.

I believe I have information respecting the question which was asked by the Member for St. Norbert which may shed some light on his question. I'd like to — (Interjection) — I didn't expect the question to be asked.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. An answer has been given.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in the Attorney-General's ministerial statement, he indicates that he is accepting the first two recommendations with respect to staying the charges against the demonstrators and not laying any further charges against any other persons, and he has instructed Crown Attorneys accordingly. He's indicated he received the report the day before Good Friday.

Could he advise the House whether the Director of Prosecutions reviewed the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry and concurs in the staying of the charges which have been laid against the demonstrators?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, in the first instance there is no Director of Prosecutions. The report was received on Thursday by myself and by my deputy, and we both, independently, read it over the weekend; discussed it on Monday. I had the opportunity of reading the full report and the complete evidence which was attached as an exhibit to the report.

I have no hesitation in saying that the report, which is the report written by Jeff Oliphant, Q.C. - one of the few credible Tories left in this province, I may say, after listening to that bunch - and counsel, Perry Schulman, Q.C., who was the Tory candidate against me in the last election, so this notion of some politics about the thing is again *scurrilous* and I reject it.

After reviewing the evidence, I took the political responsibility - because it is my responsibility - to have come to a decision on the first two recommendations which were - let's be clear what those recommendations were and what my decision was - namely, that the charges outstanding would be stayed and that where, in fact, there is a prima facie case to be put before the court that could involve charges against police persons and the counter demonstrators, I also agreed not to proceed in that direction.

Again, it was a very even-handed approach taken by the Commission of Inquiry, taken by Mr. Oliphant - who again let me say is one of the few credible Tories left in this province - and I agreed with it and I followed it, and again, I'll defend it to the day of my death.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, regrettably for this province, this Attorney-General has now become the Director of Prosecutions.

Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Attorney-General. Could the Attorney-General advise the House as to the full costs of this inquiry?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first part of the statement of the Member for St. Norbert,

he should remember - because he was the Attorney-General - that indeed that is the role of an Attorney-General; that the Attorney-General, both by law and by statute, has the responsibility for prosecutions ultimately.

Secondly, with respect to that question that was raised by him, I would like to point out that I'll take that as notice and bring in the full cost of the inquiry in due course.

I would also like to point out that the Government House Leader advised the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition House Leader that the report would be tabled at 8:00 p.m. yesterday. They were advised that at 4:00 o'clock yesterday afternoon, so this underscores the *scurrilous* nature of the kind of charges - particularly lying in the mouth of the Member for Pembina, that this House ought to hear less of.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, on a point of order. It was indicated to him that we would not be proceeding, which could have been our choice, I suppose, with normal business in the evening Session as well; that is, we would forego the question period. The Government House Leader indicated to me that a report was to be tabled, it was not specifically referred to.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. Yesterday in the Premier's Office, I spoke with the Leader of the Opposition, who asked what the business would be that evening. I advised we would only be doing routine proceedings and I expected to be going straight into Supply.

I did advise that the Attorney-General had a report he had planned on tabling and I did name that report to the Leader of the Opposition, to the Opposition House Leader. I said it was an important report, that the Attorney-General had committed himself to tabling, and would be tabling that evening. I made that very clear to the Opposition House Leader; to the Opposition Leader, I named the report.

I also, Sir, advised those members of the media, who inquired about what was going to happen tomorrow evening, because we had adjourned and would be commencing a new sitting, that the Attorney-General had an important report he would be tabling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank both members for that explanation.

Morgentaler Clinic - Police raids

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him whether the raids carried out on the Morgentaler Clinic by the Winnipeg Police have been with the approval of the Attorney-General or contrary to his own direction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Neither, Mr. Speaker. The Winnipeg Police, and indeed any police department, derives its ultimate authority and responsibility and duty at law from the Criminal Code in the Criminal Law. It does not derive from an Attorney-General. We do not have here or elsewhere in Canada a political police force directed by an elected member of the House and a member of Executive Council, therefore the actions taken by the police are taken within the sphere of their responsibility. That has always been the case. I expect it always will, at least as long as I'm occupying this position.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we do - in the way in which charges are brought in this jurisdiction - it differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction - there's a good working relationship between the Crown and the police - an excellent one - and we do from time-to-time give them legal advice with respect to charges that ought to be laid as a result of their investigation. We have no difficulty in that working relationship with the Winnipeg Police, or indeed with any other police department.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Attorney-General then why he directed picketers, who were picketing his own home, to go to the Winnipeg Police, harass them, and attempt to dissuade them from properly performing their duty?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not sure that the question refers to a matter which is in the administrative competence of the Minister. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General, I think a week ago, advised demonstrators to go to the Winnipeg Police and pressure them to dissuade them from properly performing their functions, and I find that a curious action on behalf of the Attorney-General.

I'm asking the Attorney-General whether that, in fact, is not some indication that he's trying to abdicate his responsibility and trying to have the public pressure the police to take the heat off himself, because he, himself, is not properly performing his function.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is argumentative.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: I simply would like to ask the Attorney-General then, in lieu of that, whether he is prepared to assume his duties and responsibilities as the chief law officer of the Province of Manitoba?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, it will not have escaped your attention, indeed of any decent and thinking member of this House, that not once did the honourable member ask me whether or not I said that. That wouldn't occur to him as a proper question, rather he would put it in the context that he believed to be the case - because he wants to believe it be the case - and then draw his conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, that indeed is not what I said to that group or any other group. I said - and I know what I

said - that if you have a complaint about the police activity, then there are proper channels for you to take that course. That is a responsible and accurate thing for me to say.

Where there is criticism of police activity, we have the Law Enforcement Review Agency, or if it's not of that character, they can take that issue up with the police officials; and indeed, I'm advised that that group met in a very frank and friendly - and not a harassing way - with the police in a very useful exchange of information understanding the respective duties of the Attorney-General and of the police and indeed, to that extent, my advice as to where complaints could be taken was followed and followed usefully. That's the way a democratic society works. But a democratic society, Mr. Speaker, does not work when an elected member of the House brings misinformation to the House and uses that as a premise for another one of his - well, I'll drop any adjective - questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, holding aside the Attorney-General's weak defence, I would like to ask the Premier the following question.

Given that the Winnipeg Police have been properly performing their function and given that the Manitoba College of Physicians and Surgeons have been properly executing their duties, while the Attorney-General is sitting on the sidelines, paralysed into inaction, plagued with a crisis of conscience, doing nothing, I ask the Attorney-General whether he is prepared to replace this man with somebody who will be prepared to uphold the law in this province and execute his duties and responsibilities . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. That is not a question, that is an argument.

Oral Questions.

The Honourable Minister of Culture.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: I want to know whether it is in order for me to ask a question of the Premier, whether he doesn't feel that at this point in time his Attorney-General has failed to execute his responsibilities.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a point of order. I sent all honourable members a copy of some guidelines respecting question period which is taken from Beauchesne, which has the same information in much more depth. If the honourable member wishes to know what is in order, he should consult Beauchesne for the answer.

Western Canada Lotteries Foundation - Laying off of staff

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I took, perhaps a week ago, some questions as notice with regard to the Western Canada Lottery Foundation and some layoffs as a result of British Columbia's decision

to withdraw from the foundation. I can report to the House that the number of layoffs that have occurred or will occur as a result of the British Columbia government's pull-out from the Western Canada Lottery Foundation is a total of 17 positions, 8 of which are full-time and 9 of which are part-time. There still will remain in the Western Canada Lottery Foundation 170 jobs or positions, of which 134 are in the Province of Manitoba.

There was also a suggestion that there was some commitment that there would not be any layoffs as a result of British Columbia pulling out of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation and that was not true. The former Minister did indicate that there would be some small reduction in the staff, but I think it's important to note, Mr. Speaker, that at stake was the total of 134 jobs if British Columbia had been successful in moving all of the operations of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation from Manitoba to British Columbia.

Casino - Winnipeg Convention Centre

In addition, I took as notice questions regarding the operation of casinos in the Convention Centre. I can report that the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation is renting space in the Convention Centre for a casino for 90 days per year. They are also renting some smaller space on an ongoing basis for storage and other uses for the ongoing operation of the casinos.

All of the revenues are deposited, not with the government but with the Manitoba Lottery Foundation bank accounts. They have not as yet entered into a long-term lease arrangement, but they do plan to sign a five-year lease with the Convention Centre when negotiations are concluded.

Casinos - hours of operation

In addition, there was a question regarding the change of hours of operation. I can confirm that the hours of operation for casinos have changed to 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. The changes were made by the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation to respond to demands from the public for increased opportunity to play during the days the casinos are operated, and to generate greater revenues for charitable organizations.

Grenada Demonstration Inquiry Report - Peter Balagus, witness

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier can indicate if one of the witnesses who is listed in this inquiry report, Michael Peter Balagus is now employed by the Manitoba Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe he was a witness as a member of the media to the commission.

MR. G. FILMON: He is?

MR. H. ENNS: He's your speech writer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Premier could indicate what his position is with the Manitoba Government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, he's involved with Communications and in fact will be working under my responsibility.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that this is strictly a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Does the honourable member have leave?

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, we are prepared to grant leave this time, Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that this is strictly a non-partisan statement and will not be a breach of our rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Forty Canadians participated in the Special Olympics in Salt Lake City, Utah. Out of the 40 Canadians, 9 members were from the Province of Manitoba. Of these 9, 17-year-old Richard Wall from Niverville won two medals in speedskating, a silver medal in the 75 metre race and a bronze medal in the 350 metre race.

I would like to ask members of this House and the people of Manitoba to join in congratulating Richard Wall on his tremendous and courageous accomplishment.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would you call the bills standing as adjourned debate on second reading in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper, and following that, Mr. Speaker, I would propose that we move to Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 2, the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 17, The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 22, the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

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

MOTION presented 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 Highways and Transportation.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Santos: The Committee will please come to order.

We are considering Item No. 3.(a)(1) Planning and Design and Land Surveys, Planning and Design, Salaries and Wages; 3.(a)(2) Other Expenditures.

The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, last evening when we left off, I indicated that I had some other concerns in the Planning and Design area. I'd like to refer the Honourable Minister to PR 354 from Elphinstone south to the Yellowhead Highway. It's my understanding that there have been requests for rebuilding it for a number of years. There have been designs put forward by his planning department which have not met with the approval of the rural municipality and all those concerned in that area.

It's also my understanding that several years ago, an alternate route was put forward and at that time I believe there was general agreement to proceed in that

manner where it required much less land acquisition. I'm now told that the department seems to want to go back to the original plan which requires taking a large number of acres out of agricultural production. That seems to be contrary to the stated plans and priorities of both this government and the previous government, that agricultural land should be preserved for agricultural purposes wherever possible.

It now appears as though the department wants to take considerably more acreage out of agricultural production and go back to their original design which would go through Mr. Robertson's farm for approximately three-quarters of a mile of new location, rather than follow the existing valley road which is a very scenic drive, and one that people for miles around wish to use at least half a dozen times during the summer because of the beautiful scenery.

Could the Minister indicate what the present plans of the department are, although I notice that there is nothing in this year's Estimates for that particular road?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is a project in carry-over in that area. I know that there has been a lot of difference of opinion, as the member has indicated, as to what the best route would be. There has been a meeting. We met last year - last summer or last fall - with the R.M. of Strathclair; I believe, to discuss some alternatives that they had, that they felt should be looked at by the council, regarding relocation of an entire length of that section, east of its present location. We've determined that that option would cost approximately twice as much as upgrading it in its present location, so that is not a viable option.

The existing road, as the member knows, has very poor alignment and it's very low and narrow and it does need upgrading, there's no doubt about it, but the survey and design work has not yet been finalized by the department, so we are not therefore putting it forward as a particular project.

It is being considered; discussions are continuing to take place with the people in the area to try to get some agreement as to the best location. We will continue to do that, to try to arrive at an agreement there.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, some years ago I believe there was an inspection carried out by the Minister of Highways at that time, who looked at the proposed route that is proposed by his department, which involves the acquisition of a large amount of farmland and relocates it about three-quarters of a mile east. At that time the Minister agreed that that would not be a good selection because it would take a considerable amount of farm land.

There was an aerial survey taken and a projected new route which met with the Minister's approval at that time, which would only involve maybe three or four acres of land, and taking much less land out of production. I don't know whether that was ever committed to paper or not, but it now appears as though the district engineer, who seems to have an awful lot of weight, is again insisting that it's my way or the doorway and if we don't build it on the original thing, the project does not seem to be put forward as one that is acceptable.

So the people of the area are becoming frustrated because it would appear that the only way they can get the road rebuilt is to accept the original proposal of the engineers, which takes a large amount of land out of agricultural production.

So I raise it, Mr. Minister, because it does come under Planning and Design. It indicates that there appears to be a large degree of decision-making power that rests in the district office, and it also appears as though the program of this government and the previous government, which is to preserve agricultural land for agricultural use wherever possible. It appears as though that program is being thrown out the window.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, no, that certainly isn't the case. We're always very concerned about ensuring that the impact on landowners is as minimal as possible, particularly where it involves productive agricultural land, and any option that we consider would obviously give considerable weight to the matter of agricultural land.

On the other hand, there is very often other very important considerations that have to be taken into account when determining final alignment as well in terms of the soil conditions, the proximity to a river, for example, if we're looking at bank stabilization or having to go too close, if their initial right-of-way is very close to a waterway where there's erosion and so on, there has to be a move. The terrain in the area has to be considered. So, there's a number of facts that have to be considered, but I can assure the member that we will attempt to minimize the taking of agricultural land and also consider the views of the local people. That's what we're doing now.

As a matter of fact, if I recall correctly, the plan that was favoured by the department was one that we decided after meeting with the local council was not the one that we would like to approve. It had not been finalized and we actually instructed the district engineer to go back and hear the suggestions of the council once again, take those points into consideration and see whether it was feasible to take the steps that they were suggesting to agree with what they felt were the priorities with regard to the location. So, they have been doing that in consulting, I believe, if the instructions have gone out correctly, and there's been no final decision. The location study is still in the program and once the route has been agreed on taking into account all of the various concerns, then we would proceed with the design work.

I think, very clearly, just to emphasize, the district engineer does the local planning and brings the plan forward to the planning branch centrally. Their final recommendations are made to the deputy minister and the Minister. So, it doesn't rest in the hands of the district engineer, but obviously, he's the person and his staff who deal directly with these people on a daily basis or whatever the case may be. At least they know the situation the best and, therefore, the people that should be undertaking discussions, and we encourage them to be flexible and cognizant of the concerns of the local people. That's what we'd like to see.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would gladly offer my assistance to the Minister to take him out for

an on-site inspection. I would even offer to provide him with aerial service when he's there so he can have an aerial inspection of the area as well. Whenever the Minister, at his discretion, would care to visit, I would be pleased to make all the arrangements for that to happen.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I thank the member for that offer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to raise the question about the planning and design of the bridge on Highway 23 west of 59. I hope the Minister is well aware of the bridge that I'm talking about.

There has been some major concern expressed by many people in the area, as well the R.M. of De Salaberry, who have run into major problems because trucks coming down Highway 23 come to the restricted bridge and use municipal roads as a result of it and have been banging up those roads. There has been some disappointment that the Minister could not pre-tender this bridge and the information I received was that the planning and design of the bridge was not completed. I wonder if the Minister could indicate the status of the bridge at this stage of the game?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The detour with regard to that bridge will be undertaken almost immediately, as soon as the spring run-off is complete. I am not certain of the exact conditions in that area, but that detour is being put in place and the bridge will be constructed this summer.

We did put a priority on that design work, as a result of the meeting that I had with the honourable member and a couple of his colleagues on this issue. As he can see, we've responded very quickly, as quickly as possible, to get that bridge in place and it should be operating for the people in that area by this fall. Maybe I'm being a bit optimistic - later this fall - but it should start construction this summer.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, to the Minister, sooner than later, really. But could the Minister indicate whether the planning and design of the bridge itself has been completed at this stage of the game, or is it still in the planning and design stage? If the planning and design has been completed on that bridge, then of course the timetable can be moved up, because it is creating major problems out there.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, as I've indicated, we've put this forward as an urgent project. The bridge office is working on the design work now and the tenders will be prepared as soon as possible for an early tender this summer.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly not trying to be difficult. All I'm trying to do is get a little better time frame because it is a major problem out there. When we're looking at the planning and design of the bridge, can the Minister define if that is completed or what stage is it at, and once it is completed will the tendering immediately take place?

The problem that we have - and I'd like to clarify that to the Minister maybe once again - is that we have a restriction on Highway 59 on a bridge as well. That whole corner is being cut off. The roads are allowed to have the maximum weight and the bridges are the ones that are restricting it and it's creating major problems for some of our bigger operators in that area. That is why there is a - you know, I'd very much like to get maybe a bit more specific so that I can go back to the people and tell them, maybe sometime this fall, the Minister as well as myself will be harassed all during the summer with that. If we can maybe establish a time frame that we're looking at, more specifically, then I think we can both have some relief for the summer about the project.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, the detour that will be built to facilitate the construction of the bridge will not have weight restrictions on it so that, for the immediate period, will serve that area without restrictions, so that's one positive thing.

In terms of the actual staging of the construction, the completion of the design and then the date for tendering and the closing of tenders and the start of construction, I can get all of those details to the member if he wants to make a call to the office or I can bring it forward to him within a couple of days as soon as we get to the personnel involved and determine exactly where they're at.

There's no problem with getting that information. I can't give him that in detail right at this time.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I appreciate that and I'd like it if the Minister could, within the next period of time, bring that information forward so that I can relate that information back to the people involved.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At this time I just want to underscore what the Member for Emerson said, that bridge, believe it or not, is even causing problems for a lot of the local business people in Steinbach who are moving products back and forth from Emerson across the line and then of course, the farmers that are hauling grain between some western points into the Steinbach and surrounding area.

So I would maybe just offer a suggestion to the Minister. If we're going ahead with that bridge and I know he's concerned about spring runoff before they put - what do they call it? - a slip or a bypass, maybe that could be put in as soon as possible before construction even starts so that we could alleviate that problem and have it going this summer. I would just throw that out as maybe a suggestion. That would take the pressure off this summer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I did indicate that would be commencing as soon as runoff was complete and it is, before construction. I realize the importance of this. As I indicated earlier, I met with three of the member's colleagues on this particular issue.

MR. R. BANMAN: I have another question I'd like to ask of the Minister. Highway 52 which runs through Steinbach, the eastern portion of that highway, up to the R.M. of La Broquerie border. From the R.M. of La Broquerie border running west there's about a mile that has had design work done. The acquisition has taken place; there's a rather complicated corner at the mile stretch and many of the local citizens, because of all the traffic along that road, would want a sidewalk, a bicycle path incorporated on one side of the road or the other.

I believe the department has had a look at it - if the Minister hasn't got the details here right now, but I would seriously request that design work with regard to that include a sidewalk on the north or south side of that road. It could probably be developed along the same way as the bicycle path was developed along the No. 12 Highway and that could be done, if the design work was done to accommodate such a path. Of course, from the town's standpoint, it would be good if the Highways would pave the stretch, but I'm sure that some negotiations could be undertaken with the town which would maybe see some cost-sharing or some local improvement done with regard to that area, because there are a fair number of houses and a lot of children right now travelling on bicycles on that very busy stretch of road, and the residents would appreciate the opportunity of incorporating a bicycle path with regard to that area.

I would urge the Minister to come up with a redesign which could be discussed with the local residents and with the Steinbach Town Council and, hopefully, alleviate any of the problems and any possible accidents that could happen to children walking to and from school as well as toward Steinbach for just their everyday activities.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Member for La Verendrye for his suggestions with regard to that section. The design work is in the carry-over program and it's being undertaken at this time and it will take into consideration the need for a sidewalk or a path along the side. Of course, it would be the responsibility of the town to actually put that in place as it stands, but provisions would be made in the design for accommodating such a path as the member refers to.

MR. R. BANMAN: I hesitate to mention at this time because it probably should be mentioned under the construction section of the Estimates, but I would say to the Minister that of all the new construction that should be done in my constituency, I would put this one-mile stretch as being probably number one as a priority list. I know that, as a member of the Legislature, you stick your neck out by saying that this stretch is more important than some stretch maybe in La Broquerie or Ste. Anne or some other places, but I believe that this right now would be a top priority and I pass that on to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

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

One of the roads I wanted to mention was No. 350 at MacGregor. Apparently, last summer there was some

discussion with the town of MacGregor and the R.M. of Norfolk about doing some work north and south of MacGregor on 350. As I don't see it in the program for this year, obviously you're not going to go ahead with it. Apparently there was some controversy over the relocation of the highway at MacGregor, and I wondered if that problem had been resolved and what was going to be done with that road. It was the southern part that was the problem.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that there has been some difference of opinion by the successive councils in that particular area with exactly which route they prefer. The past council had requested that it be designed for a different location than the current council is saying and that hasn't been resolved as yet. So that's one of the difficulties that we're having in that area.

It's always desirable to have the approval, as much as possible, of the local councils with regard to changes in road locations in a particular municipality. We haven't resolved that with them yet, as to whether the old suggestion is the one that they wish us to follow, or the new council's preferred route.

MRS. C. OLESON: So is that project on hold, waiting a decision from the council, you're telling me?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, the department's preference is the original request from the previous council. It's complicated matters because the new council has taken a different position and until we can get some avenues of agreement, if possible, and pursue options with the present council, there's some delay. But it is desirable, as I've indicated in all cases, that we do have the agreement of the council.

MRS. C. OLESON: Mr. Chairman, No. 352, north of Sidney, in the Edrans-Firdale area, I noticed in the program there's a one-mile acquisition of right-of-way in that area. Is that the property that was in question? I asked about it last year in Estimates and the Minister assured me that all was well, so I relaxed and thought that problem had been solved. Obviously it hadn't, because I got some more phone calls about it and I went out to see the farm in question and certainly discovered there was a problem, and subsequently I believe the Minister has seen it. Has he come to any firm decision on the location of that road?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: There has not been a decision to go forward with the original plans across the - I believe it was the Campbell property?

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, Campbell.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, I did go out and visit with Mr. Campbell and viewed the area and had some sympathy with his concerns. What we have agreed to do is replace the culvert or small bridge that's required on the location as it exists now and not proceed with the relocation of the road where it was proposed, across Mr. Campbell's property. The matter is still being reviewed and investigated by the district as to whether it's possible to find a new location straight down the

right-of-way there, but the plans have not been finalized. But I think at the present time it has been resolved and that we are not proceeding. Because of the impact it would have on that particular farm, we are not proceeding as planned. The landowner is satisfied with that, I understand.

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, it would seem to me to make - and certainly it seems to Mr. Campbell - good sense not to cross his farm diagonally, separating his barn from his house. It makes for a poor cattle operation when you have to cross a major road, particularly when there is a good, and I believe surveyed right-of-way that does not bisect his property.

Also in that area, just north of Mr. Campbell's, there is an intersection with 353, which is the intersection that jogs north and then east and then south again. Is there anything in the works to straighten that road and make it go directly across, because there is right-of-way there also. There doesn't seem to be any need for that jog.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I also drove that particular road when I was there and agree with the department's feelings in that area, that that should be straightened out when reconstruction takes place, so that would be the intent to improve the alignment there.

Just to make sure that the understanding is correct for the record here, of course, it should be pointed out that the existing road does already bisect the property of Mr. Campbell, so . . .

MRS. C. OLESON: And it's causing considerable difficulty.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes and, of course, that's been the case for 50 or 60 years, whatever, since the farm was located there and the road was located there many years ago. So what we would be doing is trying to remedy a situation that exists already.

MRS. C. OLESON: On No. 50, the road to Langruth, is there any plan or when is the plan to pave that - that new construction?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that is under grading and construction at the present time - that section - and so it would have to be completed, I think it's in the carry-over for completion this year. It would then be considered in subsequent years in the program, perhaps as early as next year or within the next couple of years.

MRS. C. OLESON: Now we go into, I believe it's No. 340, and the proposed bridge across the Assiniboine River. Has that bridge been designed and can we look forward to an early timetable for that construction?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The timetable, I believe the member is referring to the new location of a bridge to take the place of the Treesbank Ferry. Is that correct?

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That bridge is started design. Because it had been under design in some years

previous, the requirements for a new alignment and a new road are such that there had to be a delay in the actual design of the bridge until we have firmed up the exact location in terms of the right-of-way that's required. That is proceeding in this year's program and my plans would be to commence with the construction next year of the grading, if the acquisition was completed and goes well, and then to have the bridge being prepared for construction concurrent with that, so that when the road is completed the bridge is also completed.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you. I think that's all I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what has happened to the resurfacing on Highway 83 between Benito and Swan River?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have a couple of projects on Highway 83 on two portions of its length, but not in the location that the member is referring to. We considered that and recognize that it does require resurfacing, but it was not one of the final projects that got into the program. It was considered and is being given high priority for inclusion in subsequent programs.

MR. D. GOURLAY: With respect to - I notice in the Construction Program, on PR 588, some work is scheduled there and replacement of a bridge. What is the timetable for construction of the bridge over the Swan River on 588? Will that be contemplated this coming winter season?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, as a result of many representations from various groups in the area and individuals over the past year, I believe the Regional Development Corporation was involved in the letter to me, as well as others, that this was necessary and a high priority. I asked the department to proceed as quickly as possible on it and it hadn't been designed at that time but we did include it in the pre-advertising program last fall. It has not been let to now because it had not been completely designed, but we wanted to get it started as early as possible and receive priority from the department. That is the case. It's hoped that the tendering will take place within the next couple of months and we would be able to start this summer on the construction.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I believe the Minister indicated yesterday that he was looking at an expanded dust control program on the provincial road system. I'm wondering if there is an expanded program going to be put in place this coming summer for dust control.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I've indicated here, as the member has stated, that there would be an expanded dust control program this year. We have increased the program by \$600,000 this year which is a substantial amount for that kind of activity. We will be establishing, within the next month or so, the

priorities or the criteria for where that additional dust treatment should go.

As the member is aware, the current program calls for dust treatment in front of residences within a certain distance of the roadway. We would like to see, in certain areas, that that be expanded to include additional distances on the roads. We may have to include the consideration of the traffic volumes and the severity of the situation, number of complaints received and so on with regard to certain areas of road, the accidents and hazards that are involved. Also, in Northern Manitoba there would be a need for applying some stretches and intermittently, to allow for passing areas, where on some of the long stretches in Northern areas, there is a great problem with dust and no opportunity for people to pass, so we'll be looking at stretches in that area as well.

But we haven't firmed up the criteria as to the priorities for where this additional dust control would be located, but definitely there will be an increased program this year.

MR. D. GOURLAY: With respect to Provincial Road 366 through the Duck Mountains, can the Minister indicate what is on the drawing board for upgrading or improving that provincial road?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: It might be helpful if the member would specify particular sections that he's concerned about. It's quite a long section running through portions of District 9 as well as District 8. There are several different stages of activity with regard to that.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I'm interested in 366 particularly and District 9, although it is important - the entire road through the Duck Mountain system. But I know in recent years there's been quite a bit of design and planning take place in that northern part of 366 and I'm just wondering if the Highways Department has decided what upgrading will take place in the immediate future in that area.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, in the vicinity of the Wellman Lake area, there's about a four and a half to five mile stretch that is being considered, that design work is being done. There's no grading contract but it's being considered for possibly next year for grading in that area, so they're in the process of the design work, survey work that's required in that area.

The right-of-way has been completed, I think, in terms of the clearing - clearing of the new alignment has been completed. With the final survey and design work completed, we'd be in a position to have a grading contract for upgrading there. It's rather expensive for the construction in that area.

MR. D. GOURLAY: One other question that I have received a number of inquiries about in recent years. I'm not sure whether it comes under the Department of Highways or whether it's under the Department of Tourism, but it's the Manitoba signs, when you're entering Manitoba from out of the province. We don't seem to have many "Welcome to Manitoba" signs and I'm wondering, if that is being looked at by this department.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I agree that that would be a good project, a good program to improve the signage in the way the member's suggesting, but that would have to be financed under Tourism. They're rather substantial signs that would be put in place with the assistance of the department and perhaps manufactured at the sign shop, but it would have to be a program that is initiated from the Department of Tourism and I will raise that with the Minister to determine exactly whether that's under consideration at this time.

I think it's a good suggestion. I recognize the inadequacy of the signage in terms of the people coming into the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, this wasn't the subject that I was going to get on, but I'll start by helping the Minister out in saying that the Department of Highways have traditionally had welcome signs on the road and then I can tell him on Highway 83 coming in from the U.S. Customs, they tore down a beautiful big sign, "Welcome To Manitoba," because it wasn't bilingual.

They did the same thing on Highway No. 3 between Gainsborough, Saskatchewan and Pierson, Manitoba. There was a beautiful, big Manitoba sign which at taxpayers' expense was taken down, for what reason I don't know. It does fall within the Department of Highways, not within Tourism. I'd suggest he clean up his act and find out what he is responsible for and what he isn't.

Mr. Chairman, I will get into the area that we're discussing as far as road planning and bridges are concerned. I, as well, want to support my colleague from Gladstone in her request for the bridge between Shilo and Wawanesa. I'm aware that it is in the planning and design.

Two reasons, I think it's extremely important to put the bridge in on Highway 340. One is because there is a tremendous amount of financial activity on the Shilo Range with the German troops coming in, and the community south of the river, I believe, should have access to the kind of revenue that comes from the kind of personnel and the activity coming out of Shilo, and it would help the economies of the town south of the river. Secondly, there are many farmers in that whole area that could be accommodated with the building of a bridge. It's very costly for some farmers that have land on both sides. The current ferry system cannot carry a full load of grain, in fact, some farmers have had to transport one hopper at a time in one big truck so that it really adds to the cost of production. Thirdly, on that particular bridge, I think it would be an extremely important time to build it this winter and help with job creation in that particular community. I see nothing wrong with helping southern Manitoba with employment opportunities and the building of that bridge this winter, I think, would be an extremely appropriate time.

As well, Mr. Chairman, I think that with the acquisition of property that is planned, it would appear as if he could proceed this winter. I would ask the Minister if there are any plans to proceed on that bridge this year.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: First of all, I want to point out to the member that there are areas where the Department

of Highways and Transportation co-operates with the Department of Tourism on signage. It is not a cut-and-dried situation that it is the responsibility of Highways. In the case of the new Community Signage Identification Program, Tourism, through Destination Manitoba is actually funding the first phase for signage to assist communities in showing to tourists the facilities that are available in their communities. So there are areas of co-operation between the departments on signage. It's possible that in some instances in the past, the Department of Highways has put signs in place for welcoming people to the province and other times it could have been under a joint program between both departments.

With reference to the particular signs that the Member for Arthur was referring to, I can assure the member that no signs were removed because they are not bilingual. — (Interjection) — Well, it's interesting that the member would state that as if it was a fact without finding out, first of all, why it was.

MR. J. DOWNEY: It is a fact.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: If he can indicate his sources of that fact, then he should provide that information and not make a statement here. — (Interjection) — I can tell the statement was made by the Member for Arthur not by myself. He said clearly that they were taken down for reasons that they were not bilingual and that certainly would not be the case from the point of view of any instructions given. Whether an individual at some point made a decision for whatever reason, maybe the sign was deteriorating and needed to be changed . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: Not just one; two, one in Swan River. They're all torn down. Beautiful big signs of Manitoba, torn down by the Department of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, that's possible that some decisions were made to take some signs down. I'll find out exactly under what circumstances they were, but I don't think it's — (Interjection) — So, maybe they had to be replaced but we'll look at that situation.

Now, with regard to the bridge to replace the Treesbank Ferry, as I've indicated, the design work would have to be done. It's rather an extensive structure and it would not be possible to have it ready for construction this winter. I'm aware of the importance of it and that's why we've taken the decision to go forward with replacing that ferry with a bridge. An issue that hasn't just arisen, it's been around for many years and it rather amazes me that the previous government did not make those changes when it had an opportunity to do so. However, they weren't done. We are making those changes and improvements.

I went out to Shilo and visited with the various municipalities last December, I believe. We had a good discussion on this issue, received input, and as a result of that are proceeding forthwith with the work that is required to be done in preparation for the bridge and the construction of the new location of the road. So, we are moving and we are aware of the need for that facility to serve that area.

MR. J. DOWNEY: There are some specific sections of road - one specifically, is the extension of 345 between

Lauder and Highway 83. The Minister was kind enough to meet with a constituent of mine last winter, as well as a representative of the Town of Melita, indicated that he would be considering it. I see that it's not in the Highway Estimates for the planning. Has he made the decision now to consider it at all so I can report back to my constituent?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, we did consider that program, as I indicated I would at the meeting that the member refers to. I appreciated having the opportunity to meet with the Member for Arthur as well as a couple of his constituents, I believe.

The section is 13.3 miles and the request is for base and asphalt surface treatment which would cost \$900,000 to do. The traffic is only 80 vehicles per day. It can be argued, as it probably undoubtedly would be, that if the road was in better shape there'd be more traffic on it. That is certainly one argument that is made frequently with regard to roads that the department would place as a lower priority in the recommendations on the basis of the low traffic volumes. We do get those kinds of cases being made. However, the existing traffic is very low and, therefore, is one of the major reasons why we have not prioritized it for the construction program this year. However, I recognize that it is a priority in the area. I believe the Member for Arthur even indicated that was one of his top priorities for that area when I asked him last year. We will continue to keep that in mind.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have many top priorities when it comes to road development. I have to indicate that there has been a lack of major repairs and upgrading in the last few years.

I want to make specific reference to the road between Waskada and Highway No. 452 and No. 3 Highway which has carried a tremendous amount of oil. I note, when I'm speaking of that, that there is a plan to do the Cromer to No. 2 Highway. There's acquisition of property to do an upgrading or rebuilding of that road, but those are the two main roads that have carried the oil out of the Waskada oil fields.

There is still some oil being taken by truck and I wish that the Minister would move to include Highway 452 in a major resurfacing program. That road is in deplorable condition. There's still a tremendous amount of agricultural activity, school buses and the like, plus quite a bit of oil traffic and the need for resurfacing, or surfacing I should say, is imperative.

As well, when I'm on that road, it seems strange that when the government was getting a sizable amount of revenue off of the oil industry that the trucks were hauling, the province was getting a lot of taxation money, they waived the road restrictions in the spring.

I just got a call this afternoon from a constituent in Waskada who says that this year, because there isn't as much oil activity, that they've reimposed a weight restriction, totally restricting the movement of agricultural products and the road isn't going to be hurt by heavy weight at this particular time anyway. You couldn't hurt it any more than it is already knocked down to. So, what I'm saying is I would hope the Minister would have his department look at the road restrictions and remove them because there's no point of putting

restrictions on there. There's still oil activity; there's still a lot of farmers that need to use it and because they had them waived the last four years I don't know why they would want to implement them this year.

I would like to know if he has got plans to put a surface on that road and if he will be moving on the 256 this year, between Cromer and No. 2.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I would like some clarification as to the exact location, 256 from PR 345 to the west junction of PTH 2. Is that the section that the member is referring to?

MR. J. DOWNEY: 256, between Cromer and No. 2 Highway. You've got it here that there's acquisition of property. Will that be done this year?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, if it's not in the yellow program, then it's not going to be done this year.

MR. J. DOWNEY: It is in the yellow program, so that means it will be done this year.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes. I just want to find that . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: 256, you've got it.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, well 256 runs into at least two different districts and that is the reason why we have . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: You've got 9.3 miles of acquisition of right-of-way.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Okay, so that right-of-way will be completed this year. I believe it's not completed and therefore it's in the carryover program for completion. Until the right-of-way is completed, we cannot construct the road.

MR. J. DOWNEY: What about the highway north of Waskada? Will they look into the road restrictions on that road as of now, as soon as he can get somebody to look at it?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to look at that. My understanding from staff, on discussions we had about road restrictions, is that there were fewer road restrictions this year than there was the previous year and this particular one was not identified as being added, so I don't know that there hasn't been a change there, but we'll look at that.

MR. J. DOWNEY: As well, could he respond as to if they do have any plans at all to take a look at the surfacing of that Highway 452 in that area because it is deplorable. It's had all that heavy traffic and it's just almost impassable.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Is the member referring to the section from PTH 3 to PR 251, for clarification?

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's correct.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, that is in the program from the department for consideration for next year. We haven't obviously prioritized next year's program, but there is consideration of that. Of course, there should be a further reduction in the truck traffic on that as the pipeline comes into use and we'll want to monitor that situation before making a decision as to the priority of this particular road.

MR. J. DOWNEY: He talks about priorities. It is my No. 1 priority because the road has taken a tremendous amount of traffic. There still is a lot of traffic and I would hope they could move it up to top priority.

There's one other area that I would like to discuss briefly. Some time ago the Minister made reference to the fact that my colleague from Virden and Minnedosa and I had received invitation to the opening of Highway No. 1 at Oak Lake. It's a funny thing, Mr. Chairman, I never did get that invitation in the mail and I talked to my colleague from Minnedosa and he, as well, never got his invitation, the same with the Member for Virden. It just seems that those three invitations got lost some place and I just wanted the Minister to have that information in case he wondered why we weren't there; I guess the mail service just didn't come through.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to hear, in one respect, that there was another reason for the member not being there. I was afraid that they were boycotting the opening ceremony and I'm pleased to hear that wasn't the reason, but I am disturbed that the invitations did not get to the members because I had requested that they be sent an invitation and I can say that with all sincerity.

For some reason I guess they didn't get there. They were not sent out and I can only apologize for that, because I had full intentions that the members would be invited to the ceremony.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I can only speak for myself, but I accept that apology. I'm not so sure whether my constituents will accept the fact that I wasn't invited, but I personally can.

There's another area of major concern that I've raised in the House and I want to deal with it now, Mr. Chairman, and that is the building of the bridge over the Carrot River in The Pas area and the fact that the Department of Highways in the Province of Manitoba, I believe, should have the responsibility of building the bridges across the rivers to provide accommodation - or access, not accommodation - and it's extremely disappointing to me that the people of that community have been promised half a bridge. The farmers in that community have put their own personal money into that bridge, some \$20,000, which I believe is not really the proper way of doing it. I think that they should be reimbursed; I don't think they should have to carry the Provincial Government's responsibility.

Has the Minister of Highways given any consideration to putting money into the funding of that bridge and the design and the building of it?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just, first of all, want to assure the Member for Arthur that I did pass on his regards to his constituents at the ceremony at

Oak Lake, so I'm sure he's very pleased that I did that on his behalf.

In addition, I want to mention, with regard to Carrot River Bridge, that the MLA for The Pas is a way out in front of the Member for Arthur on this particular issue, is speaking up strongly for his particular area, the Minister of Northern Affairs and he had succeeded in getting some funding for that bridge from the Manitoba Community Assets Program this past year.

In addition to that, because it is a rather substantial program, we are considering sharing with the LGD, under our LGD Program, the remaining cost of that particular bridge and we have not prioritized that program as yet, but we will be considering it for cost sharing on a 50-50 program with LGDs, so there will be consideration for that project.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we just feel that it's important to move very rapidly and I therefore move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa, that Appropriation 3.(d) be increased by \$150,000 to complete the bridge crossing the Carrot River, allowing access to the Saskeram area of the province.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, that is not the appropriate section for including this particular project, in any event, so I would ask for your advice as to the legitimacy of that particular motion and . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I may have incorrectly put the proper . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's incorrect. The Member for Arthur realizes it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: It should have been 2.(d), I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Member for Arthur is finished, I'd like to recognize the Member for Morris.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, there's a motion on . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: It's out of order. He's still not found the appropriation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we're discussing Planning, Design and Land Surveys.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: No, I just suggested that the Chairman make that decision — (Interjection) — Yes, that he consider whether it's in order or not.

MR. D. BLAKE: You might as well get it done now, John, you're going to get it later.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: What?

MR. D. BLAKE: The resolution.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: It's not going to get you any votes in The Pas.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to inform the member that if he was considering this motion, it would be

appropriate under 7.(c). Appropriation 7.(c) is where the work in local government districts is included and we're quite a number of appropriations away.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, is my motion in order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now considering Item 3.(a)(1) and 3.(a)(2) and it's out of order.

The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if that's the case, then I'll put it in 3.(a).

I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa, that Appropriation 3.(a) be increased by \$150,000 to complete the bridge crossing Carrot River, allowing access to the Saskeram area of the province.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether you would like to have some advice on this motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is reserving a decision and in the meantime . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, you can't reserve a decision; you've got a motion on the floor.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I just want to inform the honourable member that this kind of expenditure is a Capital Expenditure under the L.G.D. Program which comes under Item 7.(c) and is not used, in any way, for construction of bridges. So that would not be . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a point of order being raised. The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister cannot comment on the motion until the Chair has ruled whether it is in order or not.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's right.

MR. D. BLAKE: Hang on boys, your bridge is coming. Here comes the Premier's adviser, watch out. Oh, it'll be clarified now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair wants to have the motion in writing. The motion is out of order for the following reason. Under Rule 53.(1) it says, "Any vote, resolution, address or Bill introduced in the House for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost to any purpose whatsoever, or to impose any new or additional charge upon the public revenue or upon the people, or to release or compound any sum of money due to the Crown, or to grant any property of the Crown, or to authorize any loan or any charge upon the credit of Her Majesty in the right of the Province, shall be recommended to the House by a message from the Lieutenant-Governor before it is considered by the House."

This motion seeks to impose an additional charge and it's not therefore coming from the right forum.

The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I could reword it and suggest that we strongly urge the government to increase it by \$150,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur can use the power of persuasion, but not the power of a motion.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On a point of order. I don't think it is up to the Chair to tell members what they can do and what they can't do. You, Mr. Chairman, are exceeding your authority.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the floor is clear now.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Not very clear. The floor may be, but the air sure isn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer some assistance to the Member for Arthur. He appears to need it. There are several ways in which that motion can be phrased. He can request the government consider the advisability of, which is an appropriate construction, but he cannot move a motion to either increase or reduce the Estimates, without either breaking the rules or having a message from Her Honour. Certain actions require a message, certain other actions are not possible once the Estimates are struck that way.

The normal motions used in Committee of Supply, which have been the traditional customs in that regard, have related to motions to reduce items as a protest to demonstrate an individual member's unhappiness with the provisions that are made in the Estimates, and that usual customary motion is to reduce that item to \$1, or if it is the whole of the Estimates, to reduce the Minister's Salary to \$1, and those are customary traditional motions as opposed to a specific motion relating to an item.

Mr. Chairman, I believe honourable members know that and I believe this is strictly a gambit to make a point and they've succeeded in doing so, so they can laugh all the way back to the House at 4:30 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few comments on the bridge, seeing as the Member for Arthur has had his . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The motion has been declared out of order and there's nothing on the floor. — (Interjection) — The member doesn't tell the Chair either how do his function.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Arthur should be aware that during the last federal election, the present Minister of Health for the Federal

Government was in The Pas and he promised that he would have funding for that bridge. All the federal departments that have gone and have been asked for funding have turned it down cold. There's been no funding from the Federal Government.

So, the Member for Arthur, we know that he is playing games by putting forward a motion like that. The bridge is presently being built under the Jobs Fund, which I guess the Member for Arthur is not aware that some of the lasting . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time being 4:30, committee rise for Private Members' Hour.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee, come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 2.(c) Maternal and Child Health: (1) Salaries.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Minister, when he took my question as notice, regarding the Personal Health Identification Number and then again last evening he said he would attempt to bring the information and we could revert back to it when he had the information, I wonder if he has that information now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I have a pretty detailed explanation here that I'll read to the committee at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Since the implementation of the universal hospital insurance plan in 1958, Manitoba has operated its health insurance plan using a family registration and single person number.

In the course of one's life, an individual may be assigned several family registrations or single person numbers that is dependent on parents, single, individual, on own registrations, spouse, separated or divorced, remarried, etc., etc.

Measurement monitoring at the individual level either within or outside the family unit has been difficult, if not impossible. The lack of a personal Health Identification Number has created a problem for health planners and researchers. Computerization of administrative functions in hospitals and clinics is increasing. Involvement of Manitoba Health Services Commission in these systems is becoming more apparent than desirable.

The Manitoba Health Services Commission in order to administer health care, a data collection compatible with health facilities, that is patient-resident, needed a numbering system, which would identify the individual within a family group.

The ability to access Commission health records will enable health planners to plan more efficiently for the province's future health needs by the efficient collection of data for the establishment of appropriate utilization levels; the ability to scrutinize individual patient movements from one service to another; provide a basis to better monitor utilization of services, both from the

point of view of the provider and the consumer; the ability to carry on epidemiological studies with greater speeds, scope and accuracy because of individual health profile; the evaluation of large numbers of records and cases of actual threats to individual or collective health, that is, epidemics like Western Equine Encephalitis, etc., and researchers developing surveys of disease patterns with greater efficiency.

No change is anticipated to the present family or single person registration numbering system. These number are being retained and will continue to be used by all registered Manitobans for the foreseeable future.

PHIN was developed to serve as an internal administrative tool to provide a more comprehensive useful health data base. Further, institutions who indicate the need and the intention to restructure their current medical record system and those who are pursuing the development of admission, discharge transference system will be informed of the PHIN system to permit the institution's utilization of this number in their system.

The Commission has, in the past, used the registration number and the patient's birthdate for health identification purposes, but this was a cumbersome method. The PHIN system simply enhances the registration number and birthdate for identification, either at MHSC or at the institution. For example, the hospital can use the PHIN number to obtain information relative to that hospital, but cannot gain access to any other sensitive information on the files of the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

The introduction of the PHIN system represents no danger to the security of the Manitoba Health Services Commission data as the same controls on confidentiality apply. The Commission's record on confidentiality over the past 25 years speaks for itself.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, the Minister and his staff were obviously anticipating my concern about confidentiality in responding to the question.

The Minister indicates that the number is intended to be used for the accumulation of data and the development of research information and he has highlighted, for instance, doing research on something like Western Equine Encephalitis.

My concern that I want to raise with the Minister is whether or not the information that can be accessed by computerized punching of a number and bringing forward the file would include information such as the names of people who have had abortions, information of this nature; or sexually transmitted diseases; or information that would be of a highly personal nature and obviously very sensitive information that individuals would not want to have easily accessed by merely punching a computer number.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm told that in this respect, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't change anything; it doesn't give access to any information that they didn't have before, some information about abortions and so on was available under the old system.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not the old system was a so called cradle-

to-grave system that stayed with an individual, his file information, his or her medical records and information stayed for all time within the grasp of, say, a computer listing.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The old system was much more cumbersome; I guess eventually it was the same information, but we had to use the date, number and the different names and different things and this makes it easier to provide the information, but it was easy to anticipate with my honourable friend because I would have had the same concern, to make sure the security at the Commission and also to make sure of the protection of the patient, of the public, and I'm told that this hasn't changed at all. It makes it easier for us to get the proper data for our purpose of planning for the future.

MR. G. FILMON: What assurances can the public have, given that they have this file number, which is now computerized and which presumably can be accessed either accidentally or deliberately as computerized file information can be, that this sensitive information is not going to be somehow made available?

We've had instances over the past number of years of patient files and records being dumped in back alleys; and I realize that these come directly from medical offices and there's a great concern expressed about it.

When all of this becomes put into a computer, based on a registration number which is, as I understand it, a cradle-to-grave designation of every individual in this province, my concern becomes whether or not, aside from the security, that there will be a greater concern and a legitimate concern that this information can somehow be accessed and the sensitive information would then be made available to people who none of us would like to have it made available to.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The facilities, the institutions and so on could only get the information that they put in in the first place, so therefore they'd have that. It is co-ordinating that; it is making it easier, but they are not privy to get the information that comes from the Commission and so on. It's just the information that they put there in the first place. There's no change at all.

MR. G. FILMON: In other words, by knowing the Personal Health Identification Number, the Minister is saying that a doctor or an institution could not access the entire patient record for all time in the past.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Correct.

MR. G. FILMON: Who can access the entire patient record through all time in past?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It would be just the Commission staff, certain people on the staff, the same as they do now.

MR. G. FILMON: Who are those certain people?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I apologize to the committee. My intention was to bring this up - some of these things

I haven't had a chance to read - when we open at the Commission. This would be the normal place because we're not dealing with the Commission at this time and we weren't on this, but nevertheless, if you want to bear with me, I'll read it for the first time what the release of information is.

"From time to time we have reminded staff that the Manitoba Health Services Commission has a very comprehensive file on residents of Manitoba and that a significant portion of the file contains sensitive, confidential information.

"As you are no doubt aware, Section 109(1) of The Health Services Insurance Act reads as follows: 'Information obtained by, or furnished to the Commission or the Medical Review Committee and relating to or respecting (a) the relationship of a medical practitioner to a patient or (b) the medical services rendered by a medical practitioner to a patient, shall not be communicated to any person not legally entitled thereto.'

"Attached is a document headed Oath of Office, Release of Information, that is made available to all new employees. While the procedures contained in the document are similar to those distributed to staff in the past, please carefully review the attachment and adhere to the conditions under which certain information may be released to persons or agencies outside of the Commission Offices.

"We wish to emphasize to all staff the extreme importance of following the approved procedures relative to release of information. Should you require clarification as to the appropriateness of releasing information in a specific case, please contact us, McCaffrey and Cook," who are the two associated executive directors of the Commission.

"Oath of Office, Release of Information. The oath of office taken by all the provincial Civil Service employees stipulates that information made known as a result of employment will not be disclosed without appropriate authority.

"The Manitoba Health Services Commission has files containing sensitive and confidential information. Consequently, each Commission employee must ensure that information is not released to unauthorized persons. Under no circumstances may an employee of the Commission divulge information from our files to agencies or private individuals. All such requests for information are to be referred to your supervisor, unless you have received prior authorization to release the specific information requested.

"The following reaffirms the Manitoba Health Services Commission policy, establishing the conditions under which certain information may be released to persons or agencies outside of the Commission Offices.

"Municipalities. Exchange of information with employees of municipalities may occur and should be confined to registration number, name, address, residence, report, and marital status; or personal information should not be divulged and if such a request from a municipal agent occurs, it should be referred to the Director of Insurance.

"Other departments of the Provincial Government. The same rule applies as in the case of municipalities, providers of services; that is, hospitals, personal care homes, physicians, optometrists, chiropractors, dentists, etc., etc.

"Exchange of information is necessary but should relate only to the patient and the provider of services. We must ensure that the confidentiality of the patient-doctor-hospital relationship is protected.

"Normally the Commission should only be required to provide sociological data; that is, name, address, registration number, etc. If a provider of service requests medical data from the Commission, the matter should be referred to the Director of Insurance.

"Police Departments and Federal Government Departments and agencies. Mr. E.A. Sliworsky, Supervisor of Registration, has been assigned to maintain liaison with these departments and is bound by the same rules as set out under No. 1. Mr. Sliworsky will check with the Director of Insurance if he is in doubt as to whether or not specific information can be released.

"Statistical Data. Requests for health statistical information are to be referred to Mr. Fred Toll, Manager of Management Information. Any statistical information that is to be released by Mr. Toll that identifies individuals or has the potential for such identification will require . . . with the Access and Confidentiality Committee of the Commission.

"Medical Information, Laboratories and X-ray Service Division. Medical information contained in medical records: laboratory, X-ray, EKG reports, etc., or gathered verbally, shall be treated, are strictly confidential. Each employee is responsible for protecting the rights of patients by ensuring that medical information and records are released only to the medical staff concerned with the patient's medical care and treatment.

"Requests for medical information from other than those involved with the patient's care and treatment shall be directed to the patient's personal physician or the unit chief technologist."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not under the former system all this information was stored in the computer and that this Personal Health Identification Number is just simply an easier way of tracing the individuals through their various phases of life.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's the latter. The information is exactly the same, but instead of using the date of birth and the name that number is used now. That's the only difference.

MR. G. FILMON: So we haven't added any information into the computer; we have simply changed the manner in which it's accessed, by having one number that stays with an individual throughout their lifetime - cradle to grave?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. G. FILMON: Okay, is there a possibility that this number could be used for any other purpose?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's a pretty tough question. I guess when you start in these things, in no time you

think it'll be done. I certainly don't think so and we certainly will, if anything, improve and always be on the alert, no matter who the director or who the people are, or who the government is, I'm sure. You know, we saw examples of some information that flying over the wind at times that nobody thought this was possible, so I guess we'll have to be constantly on the alert to make sure that this doesn't happen.

MR. G. FILMON: The reason I asked, Mr. Chairman, is that I have seen an internal planning document, somewhat similar to that which the Minister was reading from - not quite as complete as the one that he has read - that says and I think I'm quoting correctly: "At this point in time, the number will remain internal to MHSC," and that gives me great cause for concern that that number could somehow be a means of identification of individuals for other purposes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'd have to see the document. I guess the Leader of the Opposition has more information than we have, unless it seemed to be the working document at the time.

I think the important thing to remember is the same information is there and that the hospitals or the institutions or these people will only get the information that they put in themselves. Now, they could use that number to get to that information, the same as they were before, and I think that there probably was the same danger, if anything - if there is danger - that this could be known public by a different - instead of a number the way it was going, but it was more complicated. That is my understanding. But that document that my honourable friend - or that memo - I've never seen it and I don't think that staff here in front of me . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I'll leave this with the Clerk and ask that I get the original back because it's my only copy. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not, or how long this has been in place. When was this first instituted?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It dates from the fall of 1983 and it has been developed further, as the hospital can get it as I just finished explaining.

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if this particular number could be utilized to do, such as - I'm given to understand the Minister did last night - produce an entire record of billings, treatments, etc., for an individual Manitoban.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You were certainly given to understand the wrong thing because we've been talking about medical documents. At no time did I reveal any medical document or information. I just talked about dollars, monies that were spent after being told that there was a reduction, that there was a cut-down and I mentioned the total amount from year to year for the last three years.

The question was asked publicly with the name made public after certain accusations, not just a question, a normal question would have been not to name anybody and maybe ask the question outside of the House, but I can't control that if a question is given. We didn't

need these changes in numbers for that at all. That has nothing with it at all. I think the First Minister is stretching it a bit and I think he knows it.

MR. G. FILMON: I thank the Minister for the promotion, but my question to him is - you said the First Minister but that's alright, it's just a little premature - whether or not this could access an entire patient record if asked for and presumably the Minister would have authority to access an entire patient record for all time in past?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I suppose, yes, it could, but it was the same before. If you knew the name and the date and so on, you would get the same information as with the number.

You weren't here when we started explaining it. It was to expedite matters and make it easier. I'm not an expert in that. I don't profess to be at all. I wasn't that much aware of that. The only thing is there has been no different policy and I'm very interested, the same as the Leader of the Opposition - I got you right that time - when he talks about security and not releasing of all this information to the general public; I couldn't agree more with him.

MR. G. FILMON: Would the Minister have the authority to request the access of an entire patient record?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's certainly not covered in the act. I don't know where I'd get the authority.

MR. G. FILMON: So, the authority remains within the hands of the Commission and certain specific people who I am assured by the Minister are bonded and sworn under oath to protect and safeguard that.

What are the safeguards against computer sabotage where somebody can access information accidentally?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is an occasion that our rules are not quite fair. What I should have here is an expert in computers and I certainly am not. I think these things exist. I read the newspaper and they scare the heck out of me also when you talk about people getting in a computer at the bank and making deposits, but I'm not going to venture in that. That would be risky water for me.

What we could arrange, I'm sure, is some expert who might discuss with us; I'm sure that you can do that also. I don't think there's much purpose . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's candor and the fact that he received the information without the opportunity to thoroughly go over it and that he's essentially answered my questions based on the best information available.

I would just, in leaving this matter with him, ask him if he would just simply take the time to assure himself that this new identification number does not in any way make it easier to access files in a manner that could release private, confidential and sensitive information on behalf of an individual's health care history, and that he leave himself with the assurance that under no circumstances could this be misused in any way, shape or form by either the Commission or an individual or a government in the future.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for those remarks, this advice. I think it's good advice. With my Deputy Minister and the administrator in front of me, I will request that they go through Hansard with a fine-tooth comb, that they give me a report and, further, I'll see that you get a copy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that this PHIN system, this new identification system has been in place since the fall of 1983. Can the Minister indicate if all patients are on this system now?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, they are.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate whether the information that is on file or on computer now, basis the PHIN number, is the entire medical record of each patient who has been assigned this PHIN number? What I'm asking is this information since 1983 or does it involve their complete record back to the date of birth?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: My answer will be verified about the information that we have that we just processed and gone ahead with this system since the fall of 1983. We haven't gone back. Anyway, the information would not be more than was there before. That's the main thing.

I think the direct question was how far did we go back. I don't know how far back it was going before that; in other words, before that system came into force, but we'll check that and I'll give you the information as soon as I get it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well then, do I take from the Minister's answer that all the medical information that was available under the old number system is now filed and accessible by punching in this nine-digit number?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's the most that we would have. Now, it might be that they didn't go that far. That is what I will verify for the member of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this government has been fond of making announcements about changes, about the new and wonderful things they've been doing for the people of Manitoba. Can the Minister indicate why when probably one of the more sensitive areas of information; namely, a person's medical records, has been changed so that there's a new information system, a new nine number digit assigned to each person in Manitoba, why there wasn't an announcement by the Minister of Health that this is a new policy he's bringing in, that all Manitobans, all one million Manitobans theoretically, now have a nine digit number, and by accessing that nine-digit number a medical record of that person can be made available? Why was that information not made available to the people of Manitoba that that system was brought in and existing?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: At the outset, I want to say that I am the Minister responsible for the Manitoba

Health Services Commission. I also want to remind the members of this Committee that the Commission was set up - there has been no change since then, there's been a lot of talk of maybe bringing the Commission in or making it more independent. It was set for a corporation at arm's length from government. They don't go through the same red tape as the department does, for one thing, and we envy that and I want to say that.

I remember when I first started in this House where Mr. Pickering used to come. There was one line, so many dollars and no arguments. That was automatic, it was passed. Now, most of my Estimates are spent on this. I remember I was the first Minister that started giving details. Until that time it was only one. Why I did that is I felt that the situation was a bit different, because we had no premiums and that dated from that time, '69, we had no premiums, so therefore the Commission did not just come in and have the approval to increase the premium. They were doing the same thing as the Manitoba Telephone System was doing and as the Hydro was doing. It's exactly that. Then, because we were responsible - I certainly didn't want to mislead anybody or to fool anybody - for all the financing, we felt that we had to answer to the public and that's what we did. Now, I can honestly say that I didn't know about this myself. I had no idea about this myself and I don't fault the Commission at all. It was an administrative system; it doesn't change; it doesn't make it any more dangerous than it was before; it doesn't add to any information. It could have been seven numbers, it could have been 15 numbers. It could have been anything.

If we're to be faulted, it is to be faulted for the Commission taking care of their own administration, which they certainly have the right, according to the act, to do. It certainly wouldn't have been wrong to announce it, but I don't think that they had to tell me. If the security had changed at all, yes, I would have expected to know, but they deemed that it was an administration decision, that they had the right to do it and they take the responsibility themselves. I'm sure the board has been informed and they have the staff, the same as any organization, and all these things are not necessarily made public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister keeps wanting to separate himself from the responsibility of his department. He faulted the former Minister of Health for taking too many things on personally. During his term as Minister of Health, a new numbering system has come up. It's a unique arrangement that this Minister now has in that his Deputy Minister is also head of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. That is not an arm's length association that existed before this Minister came in as Minister of Health in the Pawley administration.

Here we have his major funded organization developing a new number system to access information on individuals in Manitoba, information by the oath of office he just read out to us this afternoon is considered highly confidential. This Minister is a member of a government that, on the election platform, promised

freedom of information and they promised it again, I believe, in this Throne Speech to start this Session.

Here this Minister now is standing up today and saying that it's not my responsibility, that the organization that I fund has implemented a new identification system, a new number system which allows people in his department, in the MHSC, to access complete medical records.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, the Minister doesn't realize what the implication of this. If this was a routine information access for research, etc., etc., that might be acceptable but, more importantly, Mr. Chairman, it would be highly explainable back in 1983 when the Minister could have made the announcement that his Health Services Commission were bringing in a new identification number, but he didn't do that. Now Manitobans all have their own number and that number used can divulge their complete medical record.

Mr. Chairman, what is frightening about this is just the example we got into in question period today based on the Minister's actions last night. We have a constituent in Manitoba who, because of her medical condition, requires substantial service from his department. She has been complaining to the Minister and to other members of government about the level of service that she's getting, about problems she's experiencing. When that was mentioned to the Minister, I didn't request any information from him. I was going to get to that — (Interjection) — and the Minister says I made an accusation. You bet I made it and when we get to that line in the Estimates we're going to discuss it very thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, what this Minister did last night in this House was malicious, irresponsible, and what it did is it left a message to all Manitobans who receive services from this Minister, through his department, through the Manitoba Health Services Commission, that if you're getting services from my department, you just better be satisfied with what you get; you better not talk about it; you better not complain about it; you better not go to the press; you better not especially go to any member of the opposition because I'll punch your nine numbers system into the computer and I'll pull your health record and I'll put it out to the people like the Minister did last night, and that, sir, is what is frightening about this new system that has been secret until today. It's been in existence since 1983.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister sits over there and laughs, but after what he did last night to an individual whom obviously he is not happy with because she's complained to him and complained to him personally. She's even been in his office to try to draw the problem to his attention and now, last night, out comes the record, and it isn't only just simply what orderlies were paid, what attendants were paid. He goes on to mention even \$26,000 for her hospital stay. Where did that information come from? Was that per chance out of the MHSC computer? Oh, don't need it, he says, but it sure makes it an awful lot easier to get that kind of information with your nine-digit number now, Mr. Minister.

It also makes reference while her husband is in hospital. That had nothing to do with the information the Minister put on the record last night. His was a malicious attack on an individual who has been complaining about this government and this

department. Furthermore, what the biggest problem is - no, I won't get into the politics of it because I'll let the individual do that - last night this Minister abused the office of a Minister of the Government of Manitoba by dragging out information on an individual Manitoban, throwing it out for public consumption. I want to draw a contrast in case anyone believes that this should happen or has happened.

When the Interest Rate Relief Program was brought in by this government and the Minister of Agriculture was providing interest rate relief to a number of farmers and there was homeowner interest rate relief for homeowners and there was also a program for small businessmen, I asked the Minister of Agriculture if he would provide us with the names of the farmers and the people who would receive that kind of assistance on behalf of the taxpayer. Do you know what the answer was? The answer was no, that's confidential information. We're not going to put that information out on the public record because we don't want one farmer to know that his neighbour has been getting a \$6,000 assistance to stay in business; and the small businessman on the corner of Kennedy and Broadway, we don't want the other businessmen next to him to know that he is getting assistance for interest rate relief from the government because his business is in financial problems right now. That information, the Minister of Agriculture said, was confidential information on Manitobans and should not be accessible to members of the Legislatures and to Manitobans in general.

You know, Mr. Chairman, we didn't like the answer back then but we accepted it. We never kept pressing him for it. Last night in this House this Minister chose to pull out confidential records, government records, as to the amount of dollars spent by the government to provide support services to an individual Manitoban who had done what? What crime, what sin had this person committed? She had actually complained about the level of service that this New Democratic Government was providing her and she even went further, Mr. Chairman. She actually complained to a member of the opposition and she even went further. She complained - and the lady's not with us any more - she actually provided that information to the Leader of the Liberal Party of Manitoba. That was her crime, and the punishment for that crime was to have her personal and confidential information dragged out maliciously by the Minister of Health for public consumption.

Mr. Chairman, the point I was making on Monday afternoon when I brought up that individual's name . . . The Minister of Labour is his usual humorous self. I would like to punch in the Minister of Labour's nine-digit number and stand up in the House and give his personal medical records and see how he would feel about it. He'd be out there suing; he'd be threatening with a lawsuit, that's what he'd be doing.

Mr. Chairman, I brought out the instance of this constituent, Therese Ducharme, that the Minister maligned last night because of the phony two-faced approach of her MLA, the Member for Transcona, because when he was in opposition, sir, he took and deliberately planned and staged a demonstration so that he could get press on behalf of another handicapped Manitoban, and now that he's government and his constituent is telling him that the government

is cutting back on services to her, what does he do? He doesn't answer phone calls; he doesn't answer letters; he doesn't do anything for her. He tells her that she's getting too much service, quit complaining, read Barry Mullen's article in the Free Press, and that is the kind of double standard I was pointing out. I called the Member for Transcona for deception and guile on Monday because, when he was in opposition, he cared.

That's the impression he left, but the only thing he cared about, in opposition, was embarrassing the government. His care of the problems of that handicapped Manitoban did not exist unless he could make a politically embarrassing issue for the government, and when the tables turn, as the tables do turn, on individuals like the Member for Transcona and he gets caught in his own web of guile and deception, what does he do? - nothing. He did nothing for his constituent, Therese Ducharme.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The Member for Pembina has used the phrase "guile and deception" on several occasions and I would remind him that any kind of characterizations which would tend to introduce heat and confusion into debate would be unparliamentary and while it has not, on past occasions recently, caused this effect, I would caution him to be careful in choosing his language.

He has also used the word "maligned" which has been ruled unparliamentary on occasion before. — (Interjection) — Does the Member for Pembina wish to challenge the Chair?

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, could you indicate whether "malign" has been used in a parliamentary manner as well?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The word "malign" is not specifically referred to as a parliamentary expression in Beauchesne; it is referred to as having been ruled unparliamentary. Does that answer the question for the Member for Pembina?

The rulings are only an indication. It is the situation which prevails, as I was explaining before. I am cautioning the Member for Pembina to choose his words carefully and not to create a situation in which his words would be unparliamentary. Specifically, I'm referring to the phrase, "the Minister of Guile and Deception" and also collaterally the word "malign."

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Transcona, who has used issues in this House to his own personal political advantage, and has used the unfortunate circumstances of handicapped Manitobans to his own personal political advantage, and when similar situations have been brought to the Member for Transcona's attention when he is in government, and not in opposition, the Member for Transcona chooses to ignore that situation and not return his constituent's phone calls. And to tell that constituent that she should read Barry Mullen's article; that she complains too much; that she's getting quite enough service, according to the Member for Transcona. and when you have an honourable member abusing

his privilege in such a blatant manner, Mr. Chairman, I think it's incumbent upon me, as the person to whom that problem has been drawn to my attention to bring it up for discussion in this House, because after all, sir, if there's one thing that a person should try to be, it should be consistent.

If a person's problems as a handicapped Manitoban are important when the Member for Transcona was in opposition, then surely a similarly handicapped Manitoban who presents problems to him when he's government - and indeed, sir, when he should be able to do even more for that Manitoban in government because all he has to do is get the ear of the Minister of Health and he can solve the problem. But when that Minister and that Member for Transcona chooses not to help the individual, because now he's government and he doesn't need the political advantage, is just the kind of situation that I pointed out.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that you may not like the words "guile and deception" but that is the actions of the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I believe that the member knows that he should not reflect on the decisions of the Chair. I would caution the member to be careful and to choose his words carefully when making his statements.

The Member for Pembina.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would also refer the member to Citation 326 in Beauchesne which says, "Words may not be used hypothetically or conditionally if they are plainly intended to convey a direct imputation. Putting a hypothetical case is not the way to evade what would be in itself disorderly."

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm very sorry if I left the impression that I was dealing with a hypothetical case. I'm not dealing with a hypothetical case or a hypothetical person, the fact that the person is real and exists was demonstrated last night when the Minister pulled her personal health files out and read them to the public; that's how real the person is; that's how real the situation is.

Mr. Chairman, we've got the prime example of 1984, George Orwell, now with his Minister of Health and his nine-digit identification number, computerized, to be accessible to divulge the information, the medical records of an individual Manitoban from cradle to grave. Does that mean now that Manitobans who would dare to question the action of this government in terms of the services and the health care system that they are receiving, and to question whether they are being treated fairly by this Minister of Health and this New Democratic Government that claims to care for people that they run the risk of the Minister of Health punching those nine digits and zap, the computer delivers the complete medical history, and he stands up in this House and reads it out to the people of Manitoba and says, what is that person complaining about, they're looked after very well? Is that the kind of control that we are getting into in the Province of Manitoba, that this

Minister now has at his disposal, a nine-digit number that he can punch in and pull out the medical records of any individual from cradle to grave? You know, Mr. Chairman, there are systems in the world that deal with their citizens in that manner. I believe the records that the KGB keep in that great bastion of freedom are complete records of individuals and the dissidents and the complainers and the people that don't conform with the government of Russia's ideal prescription of what people should do. They have complete records.

Mr. Chairman, the information on the preliminary planning paper that said this number could be expanded if successful to other departments - that's what it said - so that means if this Minister, this government decided that this nine-digit number was successful, they then could move over to the Highways Department and they could zap on all of the driving offences, all of the speeding tickets. They could go to the Department of Community Services and indicate social services and a complete record could come out from this new 1984 George Orwell nine-digit number that the Minister of Health now has in his department. — (Interjection) — Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister jokes and says the name of his dog. You mean that's even important to the government now, do you want to know that much about Manitobans that I have to tell you my dog's name?

The Minister makes light of this. But you know, Sir, the Minister cannot explain away the fact as to why this was not announced; why this new system of identifying Manitobans by a nine-digit number was not announced. — (Interjection) — That's right. My colleague says, can you believe with all the press releases, with all the numbers, with all the information, the writers, the communicators, and even with his great Research Department he's got, they could have written him a very nice little press release saying, "You could have made the announcement January 1, 1984," to coincide with George Orwell's year, that all Manitobans will now be identified by a nine-digit number and your nine-digit number, when accessed to the computer, we can have your medical health record from cradle to grave.

And if this system works good, we can add other departments so we can give you your driver's record; we can give you your welfare record; we can give you the easements on . . . land; we can roll in the Land Titles Office and show how much your second or third mortgage is, if you have one.

This is an incredible system that the Minister has here. It's been a secret system until today and the Minister hasn't explained why he didn't make this announcement, because I think most Manitobans will want to know that they've got another identification system, a nine-digit number whereby this government can access their medical files.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I haven't seen so much gall in a long time. The member that just spoke - you know with all these accusations, lecturing us on decency, on fairness, misreading what we've said purposely, trying to get the attention of the media to make a big scandal out of nothing, not accepting the explanation - not even taking note of the explanations that were given. Now let's look at one thing at a time - is it 20 minutes that I have?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Half-an-hour.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Is it 30? Okay, fine. So if I'm not too sure, I'll repeat like my honourable friend did. Let's talk about the Ducharme affair. The situation is that Mrs. Ducharme has been to see the Member for Transcona - remember this is the member that talked about deception and accusation and following the rules, who broke every rule. It was so cute, it was so clever to be able in every second paragraph, to describe the Member for Transcona as somebody who was the most vile person and shouldn't be respected and so on, and implying all the motives. That took an awful lot of brains to do that every second paragraph. It was cute the way they came out in every second paragraph to make this accusation.

I can assure the members of this - not necessarily the member that spoke, he wouldn't believe it, he chose not to believe it - anyway I can assure the members of this committee that many times until he began to be quite a pain, the Member for Transcona got in touch with me to ask me to meet with his constituents, which I did on a number of occasions. In fact we were practically going steady for awhile. She even came to see me in the hospital. So to say that we didn't see them, or the Member for Transcona did not want to see them, is certainly wrong. And we bent rules; we broke rules to try to satisfy that person.

Now the situation is after all, that the taxpayer has to pay certain bills and this is what we're doing during the Estimates, is looking at what the taxpayer has to pay to see if we're fair and to give as much information as possible to the taxpayers of this province who pay the bills. It's not my money; it's not the money from the Member for Pembina; it's the taxpayers' money, and they're the ones that have to pay and I think they're entitled to information.

Now we have a situation as I say, the policy that we've had under this government, under the former government, under previous governments, that you could pay so much for home care but there's a limit. You should not go over what the cost is of keeping somebody in a personal care home.

There is no doubt that some people who are now in a personal care home would love to be outside the home, would be able to if they were one-on-one or had two or three attendants constantly, and to have all these facilities, it would make it easier and we'd like to do that; we'd like to give them the choice, but there's a limit to the policy - right or wrong - of the government, with this present government so far, although we've stretched this quite a bit and I'm sure that the former Minister did the same thing. If it is we would not exceed the costs in the home care for one person, the amount that is spent to keep that person in a personal care home.

Now this person, as I have said, repeatedly got in touch with the member, who repeatedly got in touch with me and asked me to meet with them. I met with them; my executive assistance met with them; staff met with them, there was no way, unfortunately, that we could satisfy that person. So therefore after a certain time, fine. I mean as far as we were concerned, we could not meet the demands of that person. That person then went to the Human Rights, didn't get too far there;

and went to the Ombudsman, who got in touch with us also.

Now I've been Minister of Health for six, seven years. I've had other portfolios before. There are people that have been approached by constituents, who have asked me some questions, some information. They asked me that outside of the House and I have gone along with their wish. I've given as much information as possible and if they want it public, they would ask.

At times they asked me, without mentioning names, I remember the Member for Elmwood came in not that long ago and made certain accusations and I told him at the time, well fine, if you're going to come in and make accusations before getting the information, then quietly put your arm around me and ask me for information, after you've publicly tried to make a fool of and ridicule the department and lie and give the wrong impression, well I'm not going to give you any information.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I shouldn't say that - I withdraw the word lie for more than one reason, because it wasn't a lie and besides I shouldn't use that word here, so I withdraw it. But the situation was, it was misleading because he was taking the accusation of a person and he was saying directly, bring it as a fait accompli, and chastising the government for that; exactly like my friend from Pembina did yesterday, is doing today, and probably will do the rest of his life around here. It is always the same thing and it is never the odd question to try to get some information and then get the facts and then if he doesn't agree with them or if he feels that we have been wrong, fine, but it starts with the accusation of this Member for Transcona who never wanted to see her, who didn't want to do anything, and then remember and look at answers. The person repeatedly said you have cut - and he pulled out his Bible, and that is the commitment that we've made. He said here you are cutting down on health services - which was not the case, which we refuse - he said that and he'll repeat it, as I say, the rest of his life, and he gave that as an example.

He did not say what is the score? He said the Member for Transcona, that so-and-so that you ruled out of order a day later or two days later, but anyway the description he gave of the Member for Transcona, he did the same thing to the Minister of Health, the department and the government, and he said we cut. Now what did I do?

I'll punch your number, the member would love nothing better, the member that calls people communists and so on would love nothing better than to be able to see a big scandal out there. The government now has all the information and is at the whim of anybody. We were told that the Minister has no right at all, has no access to that at all, but the statement was made, I'd punch a number and say, here, I'll threaten you with that. I think that is unworthy of him. I think it is an insult to me and every politician in this House.

The situation then was, what did I do? That is certainly the people who are saying, you're not doing enough for home care. You're not doing enough for me, that

is going parading all over the place and the member knew it, but he made the accusation. He didn't ask me quietly, how much are we spending. Are you cutting down on the home care service for this person? Are you? No, not at all. That accusation was made.

So I got the information and I said we spent so much money in '81. We spent so much money in '82. We spent so much money in '83. Is that cutting? Well he was caught off-base. It was pretty embarrassing because he had made the statement. If he had been sure of his statement before, it wouldn't have been as bad, but he makes this accusation, then he gets mad at us because he was proven wrong, then he's going to mislead the people and say, look what you're doing. You're going to punch a number and get all this information, and you got even.

He's talking about somebody using a sick person in a wheelchair for his own use. What did he do yesterday when he brought that name in, because everybody knows Theresa Ducharme? What did he do? And then he says it's me that is using that, because I did dare say once and for all after being pushed and getting all kinds of accusations, and again figuring well this person has enough handicaps, don't make her life more miserable. But there's a limit.

You owe it to the people of Manitoba. They have the right to know. It's not her medical history at all. It is the money that we spend on that and if that's wrong, well then we'll have to start . . . and on the other hand, he wants me to make announcements every day. Make an announcement about this new thing. I am finished with announcements because I am going to be told that I'm giving a medical report. I'll never say again if we raise the per diem in a personal care home; I won't give any announcement. I'll be accused of pressing that number and giving you all the information on everybody from - what is it? - from womb to tomb or from grave to whatever, cradle to grave.

So the situation is, he can try to make his case as much as possible. He's not getting off the ground. It's ridiculous. I say to him now, if you want information, I will give you all the information possible. If you want to respect the confidentiality of a patient, ask me. I will tell you outside of the House if you want. I'll give you that.

The minute that you come and make accusations and say that you were told by these people who want their names used when they say that, well then I will refute it. I will refute it. We are not going to get a public question and give a private answer. There's no way, no way. I mean, if it's a question seeking information, but not a question but a statement, there is no way that I'm going to go along with that, so I'll make sure that I will act exactly the same way until I leave this bench here. You can rest assured of that.

Now the question again, he started by saying the Minister is not accepting responsibility. I stood up just before him . . . The situation is that I stood up in this House and I said, I want you to know beforehand that I have the responsibility for the Commission. Quite candidly, quite honestly, I explained the situation the way it was and the way it is and if anybody wants to challenge that it wasn't factual, I'd like to, but then to turn around and say that I am abdicating all responsibility, that I'm not accepting my responsibility, it's wrong.

What I did say and that's a matter of style, it's not a criticism, I told the Minister quite candidly, the former Minister last year, that he was criticizing and he was complaining which is his right and probably rightfully for being attacked while he was Minister of Health and that's true. I have said publicly that certain things were exaggerated. At no time did I think that the health system in Manitoba was going to pot, not more than I believe it is now when my honourable friend says it. He said that and I said it was exaggerated, but I also took the trouble of saying that there are different times that everybody that I knew before they had a responsibility like that - and I think they were honest just the same as I was honest when I first started in '59 and I was quite a crusader - I made a lot of accusations that I now realize were not fair. They were fair at the time. I thought they were fair because I thought they were honest, but they weren't. It was lack of experience, and you learn with experience.

I was unfair as a Health critic. I brought in probably some of those things that came in before. The former Minister, Mr. Sherman, was unfair when he was Health critic and I was the Minister of Health before he became a Minister. Then I think I changed. I think it was easy. In fact, I lost my job as Health critic because I wasn't hard enough. Last year, the former Minister became the Health critic, and he did the same thing and you people called it a "Bud and Larry Show." It was too easy. I think it was a responsible thing, and that is what I'm trying to say. I couldn't say it more candidly than that. I don't agree with everything that was said, but I did say this.

I said, well you asked for it because whenever a question is answered, it's as if you're a one-man show. If that's what he wants, fine, but I am not a one-man show. There is no way in the world I can run the health system by myself, or that I would try. That is ridiculous. There is a board, a Commission, I tried to be as candid as I could.

I explained what the Commission was, that I felt in all fairness we should give more information to the public because they'd had no premiums. The premiums then, they would come in once a year and say, can we raise the premiums and that was their money. They had raised that the same as the Hydro and Telephone does. But they don't. There are no premiums. This government decided that there shouldn't be any premiums. So all the taxpayers, through their taxes, are paying for the health care for the Commission service, every bit of it. So that is why as I said, it was during my first term as Minister of Health that we started giving that information. It has been a lot easier.

It was a cinch in the old days to come in and just say, well all right, hospitalization - in other words, there was nothing in hospitalization. There was one line and the Commission would come in and say to Cabinet, not in the House, we want the premium. We want so much money raised. We've got to raise the premium so much. They'd get a yes or no, the same as the Hydro rates or the natural gas or whatever and this is what was done. Now most of the time, they're talking about hospitals and Medicare, and I think that's the way it should be.

So we give this information, but looking at the act - my honourable friend is always trying to obey the rules - I am looking at the Act and there are certain

things that the Commission can do. I did not know how can I make an announcement. Sue me! Take my blood! Take my life! I didn't know. How in the hell can I make an announcement? — (Interjection) — No, I draw the line somewhere, Russ. That took five minutes anyway.

Mr. Chairman, the situation is, and I explained that was an internal decision. There is not - my old friend wants to discard that - any more information than we had before. If you wanted that information that bad you could get it before; now it makes it easier. There is less time loss, and it - I don't know if it's more accurate, but anyway - it makes it that much easier now that secrecy is there.

I took the advice of the Leader of the Opposition and I made the commitment, in front of all of the committee, that we would look at his word with a fine tooth comb, and I'm asking, through the Deputy Minister, to get all the information that we have, and then a copy will be given to the Leader of the Opposition. I don't know what else I can do.

Maybe I should turn around and condemn the Manitoba Health Services Commission, but I won't. In their judgment - it was a judgment call, it was something that was internal, it wasn't dealing with more information - it wasn't making it easier to get the information so, therefore, it was the same thing. I mean people, human beings, were charged, had a responsibility. They took an oath of office, an oath on this, and it's the same thing. It's just progress and my honourable friend, who is always talking about private enterprise and so on, let him take a day off and go out and talk to people in the private enterprise and see what changes there are in computer data and computer information and so on. You know, it's a bit odd because normally we would be told we're dragging our feet, we don't know what progress is, and that we should get on with the times. I think that is the case. So, this was the situation.

Now, again on the question, because we're talking about responsibility - and I want to make that quite clear - I have certain responsibility. I have a responsibility to make sure that there is a good system, to try to improve the system all the time. Now, I wonder who would not be the first one to chastise me if I started dictating to all the boards. We're going to do that, well then we'll take the boards over. The boards have been independent. We have been responsible, the Commission has been responsible for standards, has been responsible to review their budget. I'm not saying that they're just given a lump sum or a blank cheque, not at all, but I'm saying that they run their institutions in many ways. They have at least some independence and some freedom, and the same thing with the Commission. That is the difference that I was saying to the former Minister last year, that if you're going to say, "Well, I'm going to see that that's going to be changed," and he did that in the House. You know, I'm going to see that that's changed, or I'm going to see that the beds are made every two days. If somebody would come and tell me now that, "all right, you're too tough. We haven't got the funds, we're going to save that. We're going to make the beds, we're going to skip a day." I'd say, "so what?" But, I'm not going to take the responsibility alone. There are people working in the hospitals, there are people in the community, and there are people who feel that can be done. Under the thing it's better. It's either that or maybe taking

other services. I'm not going to panic if that is done. I'm not going to take all of the responsibility and think that I'm a dictator and I'm going to tell everybody what to do and so on. I have confidence in them.

We're even told now, what was it, some of the questions that were asked before about the standards and all that? There are different people in the health field with different responsibilities. There are certain people who are providing the service. There are administrators; there are researchers; there are planners; there are all kinds of things, and there is, of course, the financing of these services.

Now, I'm pleased under a very difficult time, I think the relationship in the Department of Health with all these different groups, I guess maybe it is because the general public and the providers know that we are indeed at a crossroad. You know, it makes me laugh when somebody talks about other jurisdictions, like the United States and so on. You live in fear, pick up the paper anytime, you live in fear of not having insurance, of going to the States and of losing it all if you have any accident. I know all of you, even the Member for Pembina, will agree with me on that. It's a great system when you're looking at the top of the system, what is available for a very small percentage of the people in the United States. But, we're talking about protecting all - universality - protecting all of the people of Manitoba. Sure, it's not perfection.

I would hope that we would continue to work together to try to improve that, and when I say work together, I mean the providers of service. Not necessarily, I want to make that clear before that's thrown back at me, I'm not necessarily treating everyone when we're talking about just the funds, just the money, because that's a natural thing. You don't take an athlete who's getting a million dollars a year, he wants to be the highest paid, he wants two million. When he's got two, he wants three, and somewhere when you have the responsibility, the taxpayer is paying for all that. I think that you have to look at something. I'm less concerned, I'm not saying that there shouldn't be the normal negotiating, but I'm less concerned about the discussion than having some kind - and this is what we're working on now - having some kind of an advisory council grouping all these groups together, that you will not just look in your own backyard and say, that'll affect my revenue, therefore, I'm against it. I'm saying the temptation is there. I'll say that the overall good will be looked at, and I'm talking about working with the people in the community, with the administrators of these facilities or programs, with the members of the boards of the different institutions that we have, with the Commission, with the advisory committee and the Research and Planning.

I was really trying to make up my mind to try to really understand what the member had to say about the Planning when we were talking about this, on the Ducharme case and so on, what he thought of Planning. I really don't know. I don't know if he's trying to ridicule the fact that we have planners, I'm not too sure. I've got a feeling that he doesn't really understand what we mean anyway by Planning and Research. There are different kinds and it's a combination of all that, that we have to have some people to do the hard research.

Another thing on . . . that I found very difficult to take is my honourable friend, today, is trying to make

a big thing out of something on the Ducharme case. I don't think he got to first base because there is no credibility at all. But he did not hesitate a minute to try to destroy the Member for Transcona in that issue. We're trying to picture him as somebody that didn't care; we're trying to picture him as somebody who had a role when he was in opposition, and one in government.

I think probably even more disgusting was what he did yesterday after a fellow named Roch, because he happens to be the brother-in-law of Mike Decter. And, again, it wasn't just a question of what is the case, it was the innuendos and so on that he was hired just for that. One of the better qualified economists in Health, probably the best one in the Province of Manitoba because there are not that many, who starting working for the Commission in 1971, and I had never heard the name Mike Decter in 1971, and that's when Denis Roch started working for the Commission. It was before I was Chairman of the Commission, it was in 1971, and I don't think that's fair. I don't think that makes it easier for the people who are devoted, either in government or in the Health field, to want to give their time, and at times that's sacrifice. These people could do very well. We would love nothing better than to have him full time, he's on term now, and he was a consultant for a firm that did a lot of work for the Conservative party. I dare say that his own politics, I don't think he's involved in any party, I never heard of anything, but I think if it's politics, if anything, and I didn't have to punch his number, I have never seen his number. But that, I think, could be more described as a small "c" conservative than and NDP or a socialist. I think that is a lot worse.

I think if we look at yesterday and the action of my honourable friend when he came in, of somebody that can't protect himself and to say, here, look at that. To try to tar, to try to dirty the name of the person who has been working since '71, I think that's a lot worse than what I did when an accusation was made that I was cutting down and said I got so much money in such a year, so much money in other years. My honourable friend also said that I mentioned the hospital. Now, that's exactly the case. That person could not be kept when her husband wasn't there, the husband was in the hospital. She had to spend time in the hospital. We broke the rule again; we let her go out during the time. We were keeping a bed for her in the hospital, paying the shot there, and giving some attendance during that time to get out during the day.

You know, if there were ever a case I could remember that came under my jurisdiction where we did everything because of the condition, remembering how much of a fighter that person was and to know how important it was for that person to keep on fighting, that we broke every rule, that you could rightfully chastise me now - saying what right did we have to break the rules and spend that money when we could have kept that person in a personal care home? And that was because of the Member for Transcona, who's a pain in the back as far as I'm concerned - every so-and-so phoning me and insisting that I meet with them. That was done. Therefore, you had a person whom you were paying for the hospital and paying for home care at the same time. The amount that I mentioned was \$73,000, plus the \$26,000 or so, a \$100,000.00. And then I am wrong because I'm defending, I'm saying where did we cut?

You know, you stand up with a document in your hand and you wave it around and say, here, you said you wouldn't cut anything on Health. Not did you? - but you cut, and it's the Member for Transcona who is cruel, who has no compassion, who is all these things, and I came in and said, oh, by the way, I have an answer to your question, we paid so much that year, so much the following year and so much this year. But it did not go along with what my friend wanted because he was cut off base. It was obvious that was a funny way to cut, to go from 30 to 70 or 79 and all of a sudden he started pulling in the thin number. We had gone. We had a very civilized discussion between his leader and myself, all the commitments that were made to give all that information, but all of a sudden it wasn't personal enough. It was more fun to blame the Minister for that to say that he was going to threaten, although I have no right to that information more than he has.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Concordia, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. NO. 2 - ABOLITION OF THE SENATE

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 4:30 and Private Members' Hour, a proposed resolution, Resolution No. 2.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside has 8 minutes remaining.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if I recall when last this item was before us I was indicating to members that the resolution before us could well indeed provide an opportunity, a forum, for a broader discussion about the role of the Senate, broader than what the resolution calls for, which simply is its abolition.

We know that is, of course, a position that the New Democratic Party has officially adopted for some time. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to acknowledge with some justification in the sense that the Senate, as currently appointed and in its current role, leaves a great deal of questioning particularly by Western Canadians as to its usefulness to the nation and indeed its justification for the cost to the Canadian taxpayers.

I suggest, and if I recall, Mr. Speaker, in my few comments earlier that there is in my judgment a possible

role for a Senate. There is need certainly in this nation, because of the geography and because of the distribution of the population, to strengthen regional concerns because in the House of Commons in the straight electoral system that most of us all support, we will, much like our cousins to the south, the United States, face the problem of having large population centres wield very substantial political control that perhaps sometimes is wielded at the expense of less populated regions. Certainly that's a similar situation that we have always faced since Confederation in Canada and, Mr. Speaker, likely will, at least for a long time to come.

If I recall, I tried to indicate however that under our parliamentary system of government mere changing of numbers or changing the way how senators get to be senators, the most popular suggestion is that they ought to be elected. This still will not bring about any fundamental change and in my opinion provide the justification for the kind of hopes perhaps that some people have in a Senate body.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps now that we have the Constitution back home with us in Canada, now that we have an amending formula, which I remind members we didn't have for many many years, that enables people like the aboriginal community to petition governments for changes to the Constitution of Canada, that enables this government, in its foolishness, attempt to bring about other constitutional changes to this province with respect to language.

What I'm pointing out, Mr. Speaker, we now have tools that we didn't have five or 10 years ago to bring about a more fundamental constitutional change to our form and style of government which in my judgment would have to be considered to truly make a Senate body operate in a way that could reflect and could bring to Canada a better balance, regional interest versus population centres, political control. In that way perhaps a future Senate could play a more productive role in our system of government and perhaps in that way a future senator would have a greater acceptability by Canadians in general than I am forced to say that he now has.

Respectability of the Senate, which I am prepared to accord certainly to most of our current senators when I think of people like the former Premier of this province, Senator Duff Roblin, I think of former Premier Ernest T. Manning of Alberta and other such senators who I am satisfied served conscientiously in the interests of the country. When I think of some of the more recent crop of senators then, Mr. Speaker, I have to acknowledge it gets a little more difficult to pass that same judgment as I did for these gentlemen that I just mentioned.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the members to take the opportunity that this resolution offers us to examine different ideas and different modifications including the one that is being presented, that calling for the outright abolition of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps that is as good as any way to start, to abolish the Senate and then to build anew a body that would represent, along with the kind of constitutional changes that in my judgment would be necessary that would take into account the fact that Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta will never in the next 10, 15, 20 years have as much political say in our

country as the one City of Toronto has, as the one City of Montreal has. The City of Toronto puts in 35 members to the House of Commons and the three western provinces will, around the year 2,000, have difficulty matching that. So, Mr. Speaker, there is reason to believe that a Senate-like body could bring some regional balance to the affairs of government in this country. It's not doing it now.

Mr. Speaker, while I will exercise my privilege as an individual member in Private Members' Hour with respect to my approach to this resolution, indeed I take this opportunity to remind all members that it is Private Members' Hour, and whether or not a position I take with respect to this resolution is one that a majority or my leader will take is not really a matter of concern at this time, but I do wish to indicate to the mover of the resolution that I will be supporting her resolution.

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

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear the conclusion of the Member for Lakeside's remarks that he will be supporting this resolution and his point of view that the effective way to approach the need for, or the concern about a need for another parliamentary body is to recognize the complete - I say complete - failure that the Senate now is and abolish it and look to the development of an alternative body. Now that, I think, is a very reasonable position to advocate because I think that . . . well for a time I was concerned about where the Honourable Member for Lakeside was going on the resolution.

I could appreciate from what he had said earlier, and I took care to read his remarks, that he was having some difficulty with the question. At one stage in his earlier remarks he had praised, and I think quite rightly, the tradition that we have inherited, the parliamentary system of the old country and everything that it constitutes, responsible government, and that's a very very important institution, a very important consideration in respect to a parliamentary form of government, a democracy, the responsibility of government for the actions of everything in government.

While it's difficult as Ministers to know in detail the actions of many people for which there is responsibility, it nevertheless ensures that Ministers and elected governments are accountable.

I was concerned, as I say, about the Honourable Member for Lakeside's position - I am happy with his conclusion today - but at one stage in his remarks I was afraid that while he had accepted in principle the tremendous value of the parliamentary system and the responsible government traditions which we enjoy, that he was looking somewhat favourably on the American system, the congressional system. As a matter of fact on the record he indicated in that speech that perhaps we should have a good hard look at that system when we're considering reform of parliamentary institutions in this country. I am glad that he hasn't reinforced that thinking today but has come to the conclusion he has. I say that because although I don't pretend to be anything of a good evaluator or expert of any kind in respect to comparative government, I do believe that

what we know in practical terms the congressional form of government isn't one that we should want to emulate.

I know the honourable member and I shared the sometimes frustrating but in the conclusion, I think, happy experience of visiting Congress people in Washington, senators in Washington, and we found that despite the fact that those people were elected under a political banner, they had wide disparity of view within their party in respect to their allegiance to various programs. It really was to me disquieting that notwithstanding that people were committed to a certain political party, they seemed to be free agents and there seemed to be a lack of political will in an organized fashion. I have grave misgivings about our looking south for an example of where we may want to emulate. So I am heartened that the member didn't, in his concluding remarks, proceed in respect to the American traditions.

I think that the British parliamentary tradition, which we have inherited, is still the best one, and I think that we want to maintain it. Yes, it's imperfect and this whole question that has been raised in this resolution is one that is deserving of our serious attention. Really I think we should ask ourselves when we look at the Senate: Who needs it? Who really needs it? Do the people of Canada really need the Senate? The answer, I think, is unequivocally, no.

I read some of the arguments that were addressed, some of the original rationale for the development of the Senate to provide regional representation. Yes, that is something worth considering, but has there been an abject failure of the House of Commons to present regions? I don't think that's the case. I think even though people may be of a different political party, coming from Western Canada, the voice of Western Canada, for example, has always been heard in the House of Commons.

I say this because, even though I am a democratic socialist and I have strong misgivings about those who continue to react so negatively toward the things that I believe in, nevertheless, I have admiration for people in other political parties, including both the Liberal and the Conservative parties.

There is no question but when members from Western Canada have been elected to the House of Commons, despite their having been from a particular political philosophy, they have nevertheless represented those regions and reflected concerns in those regions, maybe not to my liking, maybe not to the liking of members opposite in certain instances but, generally speaking, the parliamentary system has not failed us in providing representation on a regional basis. So I question whether there is a desperate need for greater regional representation. I admit there is weakness, there could be some strengthening of regional representation, but I don't think the system has failed us.

When it comes to the other argument - you know the other argument was to provide a forum for sober second thought - I kind of shudder a bit about the first adjective. I don't know whether in the early times some of the parliamentarians, the people, were considered to be too much of a spiritual nature in their remarks. I know that we have had, through the course of history, some parliamentarians who were able to handle their spirits very well and I don't think that, despite their odd imbuing of spirits, that the system failed either. I think John A. Macdonald was an example of that. He

was able to hold his spirits well and, nonetheless, was able to effectively, I think, represent the people of Canada.

So I wonder about the need for a forum for sober second thought. — (Interjection) — Well, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek says it's stupid. Well, he will have an opportunity to reveal the depth of his knowledge on this question. So I look at the institution and I really don't believe that in its present form it is providing the kind of purpose and function that was considered to be useful at the time that it was created.

Former Senator Eugene Forsey, in an article on the Senate, pointed out that the Senate has found itself less and less called upon to fulfill its original purposes. It has not vetoed any bill for over 40 years; it is now mainly a revising and advisory body laundering messy legislation from the Commons and investigating great questions of public policy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we know that the Senate has been an irritant to the House of Commons in many instances, and it has not created any positive atmosphere in the country. It has been the subject of continuing ridicule, because, Mr. Speaker, we know that former Prime Ministers have quite candidly used that institution for a place to reward former political organizers, some people who collect money that are called bagmen, and there is no question but the integrity of the Senate, from a popular point of view, has been badly eroded.

Mr. Speaker, I point out, as Mr. Forsey did in his article, that, for example, in respect to attendance in the Senate, he points out that any senator absent for two consecutive sessions automatically forfeits his seat, but a single appearance for a few hours every second session is enough to save his seat. A single session can last several years. The one that began on the 14th of April, 1980, had not ended by the 26th of October, 1983. So all a senator had to do in all that period of time is make one appearance in the House of Commons and continue to enjoy the largesse of the people of Canada in that very healthy retirement fund that is provided to them.

I think that those facts, Mr. Speaker, hold that institution up to ridicule. It has a history, quite frankly, of obsolescence, and while there are people who talk about reform - and I don't believe that those people are meaning ill - I think, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside does, that the way to start is to recognize the failure of the system, do away with it and let's see if we need anything else. If we need something else we are prepared on this side to be creative and I think that is the right position to take.

Now I don't want members to believe that my experience with all senators is negative. I want to join with the Honourable Member for Lakeside in recognizing that, at least from my experience, I have enjoyed the participation of Senator Duff Roblin, the former Premier of this province, who was very helpful in the lobbying effort - and that is the proper word in respect to the visits we had in Washington in respect to Garrison. That was a very successful collaboration on the part of this government, the opposition in this House and members of the Senate. In addition to the Honourable Senator Duff Roblin, Senator Gil Molgat accompanied us on one of those successful expeditions to Washington. I think they were very helpful and very

positive, but the background, the history of the Senate, makes those honourable gentlemen's contributions somewhat tarnished, and I really believe that they are wasting their talents in being in those institutions. I really think that it is time that we recognized that it is necessary to take that institution and cast it aside and build afresh.

So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate my complete support for the resolution.

I think we will be demonstrating as a province our agreement that the institution no longer is necessary or valid, and that with its abolition, may come some fresh thinking and I join with the Honourable Member for Lakeside in saying that I would be prepared, and I know a lot of members on this side would be prepared, to examine the alternatives. But we don't need the Senate as it's constituted today and the kindest thing we can do is to abolish it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do congratulate the Honourable Member for Riel who was so gracious and kind to bring this resolution before the House, very timely, extremely important, and certainly deserves the full debate of every member in this Chamber. The subject is one where we've had the federal committee across this province and every jurisdiction in Canada today are looking at the Senate and thinking about changes that should be made in this great country of ours and I welcome the opportunity to address my comments on the subject matter.

It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to address this resolution when you know first well before you speak where the First Minister of this government stands on the issue because he even refused to discuss his opinions in public. He wanted them someplace in a back room. Then he went on and he made it clear that it's a waste of time for us to be discussing the Senate in this province. Mr. Speaker, I don't take that approach to Senate Reform or any reform of our Constitution in this great country of ours.

This is the greatest country in the world, Mr. Speaker. We're the envy of the whole wide world right in this Legislature and across this great country. Why, after we have all those things on our plate, Mr. Speaker, should we come about asking for change? Why should we change something that has given us the best quality of life in the whole world? Why? For political advantage, or for what? I just don't understand it.

Parliamentary democracy, Mr. Speaker, is the most tender, fragile system and nobody can stand in his place in this Chamber I say, describe it or put words together how it works. It's crude. It's archaic. Most jurisdictions say it won't work, but it works well in this country of ours and it has worked well over the long 118 or 120 years of our history. This system that we are operating under today, which includes the Senate for whatever reasons whether it's bad or whether it's good, has built this nation and has built this country and has built it well, and has given us resources, wealth, talents and skills and as I say, we're the envy of the world.

But for some strange reason, Mr. Speaker, the socialists want to change it. Maybe I was just wondering as I rose in my place, Mr. Speaker, and I daresay that this is the first time that this type of a resolution has had debate in this Chamber. So it is very timely and I sincerely hope, as I said earlier, that the members will rise in their place.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, other jurisdictions and provinces across Canada have taken this subject matter in greater study and depth than we have in Manitoba. I would highly recommend to the Premier and to the government that we set up a committee of some sort to tour this province like other jurisdictions have done, such as Alberta and other provinces and the federal people have as well, to go around to the people in our province, to the mosaic of these people we have in this country from all these various lands, to our Native and our Indian people, and get their opinions as to what we should do for the Senate in this.

We haven't done that, Mr. Speaker, and it's quite understandable with this government in place, we're not likely going to get that vehicle to tour this province and take a second look and listen to what the people are telling us about the Senate, because the First Minister, and I guess that's a government position, they have no time and they have no place in their operation for the Senate. It's a no-no, because the Premier has come out time and time again and says, abolish it, period.

I don't happen to agree with the First Minister and I don't agree with the government on this subject matter because I don't have any just reasons why we should abolish the Senate as I stand here before you this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Because as I said earlier, when this country has progressed so well over those 118 or 120 years of our history, why should we change it?

I haven't heard the First Minister nor did I hear the Minister that just spoke before me to give me any just reasons why we should start taking one pillar down or two or three of the Constitution of this country that made us so great and start changing it. Parliamentary democracy, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion is a very fragile system. If you start moving one or two pillars or making changes to the Constitution, you can likely see - we don't know what will happen - but we certainly know what happened when the Commonwealth, as a classic example, when all these jurisdictions around the world that were under the Commonwealth and they are all striving and craving for the chance to govern themselves. What a turmoil that has been in the world today since that happened. That was a simple little thing.

Most people, politicians and others, Mr. Speaker, thought that was a great thing for the Commonwealth, for these little small countries to have their own government and have their own place in society and be able to govern their own people. It hasn't worked the way they expected it at all, Mr. Speaker. It's absolute turmoil.

Look at all the problems that we have in Africa today. Look at all the problems that we have in Africa today as one classic example. Mr. Speaker, that's the problem.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Whether they need the Senate or whether they don't need the Senate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: . . . my point on this, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that you start changing something that has worked and worked well and then if you don't make the correct changes and make the proper changes, the whole system collapses. That's the tragedy that we have before us in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied as I stand before you this afternoon in this Assembly that the people in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, are not prepared for Senate Reform at this time because they basically don't know what it's all about. We have not done our homework. We haven't been out to explain to them what all these changes will bring about, or how it will affect them. Do they want a political Senate? What kind of a Senate do they want? Nobody's addressed themselves to what kind of a Senate we're talking about, Mr. Speaker.

All we have is Howard Pawley says abolish the Senate. When the Senate Reform Committee came to this province, the Premier said, I'll not discuss my comments in public. He says it's got to be private. Now, I don't think that's the kind of way the Premier of this province should have addressed the subject matter. I think his comments should be on the record for everybody to look at and witness, but he didn't do it that way. He said I'll meet with you privately. So basically, Mr. Speaker, this government and this Premier hasn't done justice to the Senate Reform, the resolution that's been brought forth by the honourable member.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this is a political motive on behalf of the New Democrats, because they have basically failed in all other ways in this country to try and get their voice across. So now, grabbing straws and grabbing some new philosophy or some new dream, they think that maybe they can get a leg up and get another way so that you can form a government in this province, or at least get themselves recognized that they are a rational party, and they have some things that this country needs.

But, Mr. Speaker, by abolishing the Senate is not going to solve the New Democratic's problems. First of all, they don't know how to govern, they know how to govern. Just look at the example of this government that we have witnessed over the last three years - absolute disaster. Mr. Speaker, if Howard Pawley, the Premier of this province, stands up and says, "abolish the Senate," the people would be smart to go the extreme opposite and put the Senate back in force, because he's never been right since Day One.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the honourable member that he should not refer to other members of the Chamber by name.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to you and I apologize to the Honourable First Minister. In the heat of debate sometimes, in my senile old age, I do forget the Rules of the House, and I do apologize.

But, Mr. Speaker, this resolution and the conduct of the First Minister irritates me - irritates me. I would

think that a First Minister should take a look at both sides of the question. I think if he's going to be fair to all the people of this province he should say, well, there are people out in the rural parts of this province, or in the urban society, that may have different views than abolish the Senate. But he didn't take that route. He says, "no, just get rid of it." That is the general tone of the socialists because they don't believe in the Senate.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the First Minister, and let me ask his government, put the paper on the table that you feel that the Senate should operate under, if at all, and . . . are going to abolish it, they don't want it. I think we can still sit down by setting up a committee of this House, tour this province, go around and talk to the people and see what the opinions of the people that we represent are. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, if that committee ever had a chance to operate in this province we'd come back and I think we'd find that the majority of the people in this province feel that the Senate should be kept in place in some form or other. Certainly, we can revise the Senate. We can bring different forms of Senate into place in the parliamentary democracy that we practice in this country, but I'm scared stiff by letting this government and this first Minister pass this resolution and say, abolish the Senate. I think that would be an insult to Canada; it would be an insult to society; it would be an insult to the heritage of great people that gave their talents and their skills and made this country so great.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have difficulty in supporting this resolution, in fact, I don't think that I could. The reason there are so many diverse opinions as to what kind of Senate reform if we reform it at all. There are all kinds of opinions, and we've addressed ourselves to a lot of them from time to time, but I don't think this government has addressed themselves to the problem because they don't like the Senate. They don't want any part and parcel of it at all - just abolish it.

I don't think that Manitoba's position should be that. I think Manitoba should be open for reform; Manitoba should be looking at ways and means. If we have to change our Constitution, let's change it to make it better, not worse, because I have no evidence, I have no documents or papers from any members opposite to assure me that by abolishing the Senate it's going to make this country better or worse, it hasn't been forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, let's look back to the story of how this resolution arrived on our Order Paper. We've got a government that's struggling, that's striving to hold office; they're grabbing at every straw they possibly can to get public attention, and this - as my colleague, the Member for Kirkfield Park says - is a short straw, because you're not going to win any popular support by coming in here with a resolution to abolish the Senate. You're not, because it's not a general consensus across this province. In fact, I dare say, that if we were to poll the province today or put it on the ballot whenever the Premier screws up his courage to call the election and ask about Senate Reform, you'd find out. Why change something that's good? Why change something that's provided us with all the things that we have in this life today? I think it's ridiculous; I think it's untimely, and I think that the Premier and his caucus and the member who put this resolution before the

House should take another look at it and withdraw the resolution. I think it's untimely, it's uncalled for. Until we've at least got the opinions of the people in this province, I'm not going to stand up here in any way, shape or form and support a resolution to amend the Senate until I get the momentum from the people of this province.

I know the First Minister and the New Democrats, they got the big propaganda machine in there, and they've got these high-priced professional advertisers and the big political machines in their offices there, but I fail to see them putting anything about Senate Reform out, except this resolution.

A MEMBER: Hidden agenda.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Hidden agenda, yes. So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for bringing the resolution to the attention of this House. I think the resolution is a timely one; it deserves a lot of debate and a lot of discussion. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I cannot support it in its present form.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, at least with something he said two-thirds of the time. Three times he mentioned the timeliness of this resolution; twice he said it was timely; once he said it was untimely. I agree with two-thirds of what he said. I think this is the most appropriate time. I think the Prime Minister of this country has demonstrated some leadership in seizing a bull by the horns that has been asleep for generations, and I'm surprised that even one-third of the time the Member for Roblin-Russell would himself of a differing opinion from his national leader.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has been dead from the neck up for generations. The Senate has contributed very little to the democratic process in this nation, and it is a democratic institution, according to our Constitution, that contains absolutely no democracy.

Mr. Speaker, even worse, Sir, any suggestion that the Senate is a democratic institution belies everything that every member in this Chamber believes to be fundamental to democracy, and I do not believe that any member in this Chamber would deny that statement.

If the Member for Sturgeon Creek, for example, thinks for a moment - the Member for Sturgeon Creek says he would deny - that the very principle of elective office to which I referred is the foundation of democracy. Mr. Speaker, now I am, for the first time I've been in this Chamber, afraid. I have heard a member of this Chamber, who was elected to this Chamber and took an oath of office, saying that he does not subscribe to the principles underlying the democratic institutions of this country. He says that he denies that, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — That fills me with concern about the kind of institution an honourable member of that mentality and that opinion would build in this province. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member who protests should learn to keep his mouth shut unless he has the floor, if he's going to protest.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. ANSTETT: Just a few hundred less than it was in 1980 on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable for Roblin-Russell has suggested that the real example set by the Senate is telling us how to govern. Mr. Speaker, what do they govern? The govern nothing; they make no decisions of import. Mr. Speaker, if they had done anything of import, how do you sanction that statement with the fact that they haven't vetoed a single piece of legislation in 40 years?

MR. D. BLAKE: You should be home campaigning in Springfield instead of here talking about that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I'm enjoying the interjections of the Member for Minnedosa. At least his interjections have the humour that his colleague from Sturgeon Creek so seldom shows in this Chamber. — (Interjection) — Even the Member for Sturgeon Creek, when trying to be funny, can't quite pull it off. I'm worried, Sir, that someday his face may crack if he smiles.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin-Russell talked about senility and old age. Mr. Speaker, I would be the last to suggest that is the only requirement for membership in the Senate, but I would also suggest that it certainly helps.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite have also suggested why should we change something when it works? Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure the system works and I'm not sure the members who have been appointed to the system in contravention of the most fundamental principle of democratic institutions, that of election to public office, are working either. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have concern that quite a few of them tremble when they accept their pay cheques.

A MEMBER: Who are you talking about, Andy?

HON. A. ANSTETT: I'm talking about members of the Canadian Senate. I cannot believe that generally the membership of the Canadian Senate feels that the contribution they make to Canadian society is worthy of the \$24 million it cost to run that institution in 1982. Mr. Speaker, we know that the price is considerably higher today. Members have said why change something when it's so good? Well, Mr. Speaker, I remind them of the statements of their federal Progressive Conservative colleagues who have been saying for the last three months that the Senate is really not so good.

I wonder if they've examined those statements and examined the rationale for the demand that there be changes in the Senate's powers today. I'm opposed to that federal proposal in principle. I think that we run the real risk if we further water down the Senate's powers that it will become even more ineffectual than it is today, if that is possible, and that the bottom line will be that it will have absolutely no hope ever of becoming something real as a Canadian democratic institution.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate, when it was created, was created for essentially two reasons; lately, a third reason,

which is an attempt to justify it because the original two have long since been outmoded, has also been developed. The first reason was that the Senate should represent property, in fact, even a property requirement that was actually quite stringent for a person to be eligible for appointment. I believe, Mr. Speaker, in 1867 that requirement was \$10,000 - I think it was originally 4,000 pounds. Lord Palmerston described it as an institution whose purpose was to be a check on the popular will, because in 1867 democracy and the thought that free men should have votes - women, heaven forbid, that hadn't even been contemplated - was something rather new and novel and a check on that popular will as would be represented in an elected Assembly or House of Commons was required. And why? Read the debates. Read the discussions in Charlottetown in 1864 and members will find out it was to protect and they said it - and George Brown fought them on it and finally gave in - was to protect the interests of business and commerce. That's what it was there for, from the popular will of a House of Commons which might be radical. John A. Macdonald was radical? He was probably very radical. Nobody else ever thought again about giving the CPR \$25 million and then end up giving them several hundred million. Mr. Speaker, he was a popular radical.

Mr. Speaker, the other argument that purported to give the Senate some legitimacy 117 years ago and also three years before Charlottetown was that a *sobres* second look was needed at legislation; that those popularly-elected people would not have the education, the experience, the noblesse oblige, that was required in the British aristocratic tradition of the House of Lords; that those popularly-elected people, those people who had just recently been given the vote in the colonies, could not be trusted to enact laws that would order the society in which those who were drawing that Constitution imagined it should be ordered. There was a fear of that popular will. They wanted that *sobres* second look, that opportunity for a veto. Mr. Speaker, events have not necessarily proven them correct.

We've had governments in this country now for 117 years, Progressive Conservative, Conservative, Liberal Conservative, Conservative Liberal, and straight Liberal, but they've basically all been the same two parties, the same group, and to be quite honest, they haven't been a radical bunch. They haven't been people whose laws and opinions that required the *sobres* second look of a Senate. But popular will has not created devastation in the land; in fact, Mr. Speaker, they behaved very much the way I think the Senate would have behaved. There hasn't been a great deal of initiative. In fact, they've been pushed into every new idea they've had. They have been dragged, kicking and screaming into this century by radical parties of protest of the left and of the right who were concerned about the way the establishment of this country, popularly elected in a House of Commons, sought to protect only property and not people, sought to perform the role that John A. Macdonald imagined for the Senate.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: it's the best country in the world, Andy. Don't change it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell wants to change nothing. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell should crawl into his hole, emerge in a century and see that change will occur no matter how hard he holds up his hands to the waves and tides that roll on, and there is nothing that will stop that change.

When he suggests that we should change nothing, Mr. Speaker, he belies what he has learned in this House in 23 years, and that is change will occur and none of us can stop it. But one of the things we try to do in this Chamber and in government and in opposition is order that change in such a way as the objectives we perceive can be achieved. But, Mr. Speaker, the Senate doesn't do that.

They have imagined another new role for the Senate. This has just been in the last 20 years or so, Mr. Speaker, and that is, the Senate has taken on this role of regional representative. The Senate is going to ensure that because we have the first pass-the-post plurality system, representation by population, that regional interests can be denied. They won't get representation in the House of Commons. They won't get representation in the Federal Cabinet.

So now we need someone to represent the regions. But, Mr. Speaker, the majority in the House of Commons which is democratically elected by that rep by pop, one person-one vote system, in a first pass-the-post system determines who appoints Senators.

So who are they? We've had a dramatic change in the last year in this country and yet because that system that they want the Senate to modify, to represent regional interests, controlled the appointments, we have a vast Senate majority appointed primarily by Liberals representing primarily the established interests of central Canada, regardless of where they're from because they're tied to their party allegiances. Mr. Speaker, I have some problem thinking that the Senate can perform that role.

Mr. Speaker, the party system itself would frustrate the Senate from performing that role, unless members opposite are suggesting or those members in Ottawa who promote this view are suggesting that the Senate in this new role of regional representative would deny all party ties; sit as a separate caucus; that those 72 or 73 Liberal Senators would never join with the Liberals in the House of Commons in caucus; that they would in fact sit as regional caucuses, setting aside party differences to ensure that the interests of their regions were represented and act as a voice for the region.

Now, Mr. Speaker, anyone who understands the political party system in this country is going to know that that's nonsense. I think they recognize that because Senator Roblin, a committee in Alberta, senators from the Maritimes have now begun to suggest that what we really need is something that has been called on occasion the House of the Provinces, but is really a mechanism for creating an upper Chamber, which would have provincial appointees or people elected on a provincial basis or a P.R. system with a slate from the various parties, to represent the provinces.

Now we have an even worse system, Mr. Speaker. We have a Federal Government, popularly elected on the most fundamental democratic principle that every person should have a vote and that vote, as much as possible, should have the same weight, and we're going

to allow minorities from provinces to frustrate that Federal Government. No, they said, we won't do that. We won't give it enough power to frustrate anybody. Remember what happened in Australia. If we give it that kind of power, well then we'll really have a mess.

Oh well, are we going to provide for double dissolution so if this happens we can have a national election and replace the whole lot? On what basis? On the basis of political parties? Oh, but hold it, they were appointed by the provinces. Do we wipe out all the Provincial Governments, and elect all provinces and the Federal Government and both Houses at the federal level all at the same time if we get a blockade and the national will is blocked by a minority in one province? What a lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there has not been a proposal for reform of the Senate that addressed the fundamental question. Do we need an institution that second-guesses the institution that is democratic? And if we do, how can we possibly provide for that institution if it is not going to be democratic, if it's not going to respect the voice of its electorate, if it's going to be indirectly elected or elected in some way that it is allowed to frustrate the House of Commons?

The Australian example is illustrative, but, Mr. Speaker, more importantly, the fact that we have failed collectively as a nation to come to grips with the problem is illustrative of another thing, and that is, that Liberals and Tories will never come out in favour of abolition of the Senate and will never come out in favour of a fundamental restructuring because it is crucial to the system they believe in. Mr. Speaker, the underlying principle in which they believe in the Senate - I don't suggest they believe this in this Chamber or in the House - but the principle to which they are tied inextricably in regards to the Senate is the principle of patronage. Mr. Speaker, that is the shame; that is the shame of the Senate.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I would not be here today saying what I am saying about the role of the Senate had individuals, serving in the role of Prime Minister over several generations, not maligned the Senate by using it as a pork barrel institution for patronage and political rewards. They have destroyed any credibility the Senate might have gained; they have prevented it from evolving; they have inextricably linked it in the minds of the Canadian public to senility and uselessness. There is no turning that clock back, Mr. Speaker. The people of Canada will abolish the Senate. If the politicians refuse to do it, they will elect governments that are prepared to do it, and, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party is committed to doing just that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Yes. I have exhausted my opportunity to speak again unless leave is granted to speak again, but I would want to indicate to the Mover and to the Government House Leader that there are at least two other members on my side who would like to participate in this debate. Could we leave it open and call it 5:30?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

(Translation of remarks of Hon. G. Lecuyer appearing on Page 688, Vol. 22, 2:00 p.m. 9 April, 1985)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to add a few words to those expressed by my fellow members in fond memory of our friend and colleague, Mary Beth Dolin, Member of the Legislature from Kildonan.

As were all of us, I too was shocked to learn of her so sudden passing, and I would like to tell all the members of her family that we loved her and are deeply saddened by her death.

I first met Mary Beth seven or eight years ago, perhaps somewhat less than that, while she was on the executive of the Manitoba Teachers' Society and I was working at the Department of Education, where we worked together on the same committee on French-language education. In this same light, I benefited enormously from her encouragement during the second meeting of our committee when there were sometimes heated discussions and vehement debates on the Section 23 issue.

Mary Beth Dolin, you are a woman of great courage, a woman of noble heart, and many have been touched by your presence. She had a large family, for not only was she a wife and mother, but a grandmother as well. She was also an active woman, deeply committed in everything she undertook.

She had many responsibilities. As Minister responsible for several portfolios, she tackled them with equal and total involvement to advance the status of women, the working conditions of workers here in Manitoba, and many other fields. Those who knew her and worked with her, as all of us here have done, are all the richer for our contact with her.

The wish she expressed when she resigned her cabinet post in January bears witness to her maturity, her courage, her dignity, and I believe she lives on as an example we can all follow, for by doing so we would thereby carry on her deeply felt ideals.

I therefore wish to express our condolences and deepest sympathy to her family. And I wish to tell them that we share their sorrow on this day, and that we will do everything in our power to continue the fine efforts and work she held so close to her heart.