



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 70 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 18 MAY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**Thirty-Second Legislature****Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 18 May, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary, praying for the passing of An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Winnipeg Bible College and Theological Seminary.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A. ADAM introduced Bill No. 47, The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act; Loi sur les conflits d'intérêts au sein des conseils municipaux.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 45 students of Grade 6 standing from the Madison Elementary School in Fargo under the direction of Mrs. Thurston.

There are 38 students of Grade 6 standing from the MacGregor Elementary School under the direction of Miss Carman. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

There are also 27 students from the Garden Hill School under the direction of Mrs. Little. They are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Bilodeau case negotiations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Can the First Minister confirm the statement made by the Prime Minister of Canada the night before last in Winnipeg, during - what I take it was - a Liberal Party rally, to the effect that Manitoba and Canada and, I presume, the Franco-Manitoban Society, have completed negotiations with respect to the forestalling of the Bilodeau case soon to be heard in the Supreme Court which will result in amendments either to The Manitoba Act or to The Constitution Act of Canada affecting bilingual matters in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, all that I can confirm at this point is that there has been agreement in principle, ratified by the Federal Cabinet and by the Provincial Cabinet, that is sufficient in order to obtain an adjournment of the case this forthcoming Tuesday, May 26th. The Attorney-General is not present this afternoon but is prepared to give a fuller statement in respect to the matter to the House on Friday.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that these negotiations have been in the public domain now for some several months, can the First Minister indicate to us if it would be the intention of the government which I say, parenthetically, would be an entirely happy intention to submit this matter of principle before it is finally approved by the government, to submit it to the Legislature and, indeed, by way of Legislative Committee hearings to the people of Manitoba in order that they might voice their opinions on this change that is being proposed in the statute or The Constitution Act?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that legislation would be required to be approved by this House, and we certainly would take under consideration the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition pertaining to any public hearings.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I welcome that assurance by the First Minister.

Would the First Minister also give serious consideration to the Legislature seeing this matter by way of resolution, or by way of a draft bill before it is finally sanctified by the Executive Council of Manitoba. In other words before the deal is made, in order that this Legislature and the people of Manitoba may be of whatever help they can to the government in completing a negotiation which is an important one for the people of Manitoba, and one that all parts of Manitoba society will wish to be familiar with before it finally approved.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we will certainly take that under consideration. I understand there has been

consultation throughout between the Attorney-General and the critic from the opposition benches for the opposition, or at least there has been consultation in respect to this matter. I will certainly take the Leader of the Opposition's suggestions under consideration.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, again I thank the First Minister for his agreement to take that suggestion under consideration.

I can confirm for him that there was a communication from the Attorney-General to the Honourable Member for St. Norbert on the date of 17 December 1982 on this matter. I think it would be wrong to characterize that as ongoing negotiations, but there certainly has been communication between the two.

In order that there be no misunderstanding, will the First Minister agree to consider, if not to give the undertaking here today, that before any final ratification is given by Cabinet to this matter, that the matter be raised with the House. It has been discussed at this stage privately only with the Franco-Manitobaine Society, and while we appreciate having had the original draft of what was being discussed last December, neither the opposition nor the people of Manitoba are aware of what is now presently in contemplation.

That being the case, can the First Minister give the assurance to the House that the opposition and the people of Manitoba will be able to see what is envisaged in this new agreement that is being contemplated between Canada and Manitoba, which is now being discussed with the Franco-Manitobaine Society, but which I suggest with respect, needs to be discussed even more broadly before it is finally ratified.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that there has been no substantial change. I'm subject to correction by the Attorney-General if he was present, insofar as the material that was forwarded to the Member for St. Norbert, December 17th last year, no substantive change re those areas that were covered in the letter from the Attorney-General to the Member for St. Norbert.

I would certainly be prepared to examine ways by which there could be fuller and more complete consultation. This is a matter certainly that we want to insure the fullest understanding by members in the Chamber and I will indeed take this matter up with the Attorney-General as to continuing that process; needless to say at a point which would in all likelihood be during this Session, there would be legislation that would have to be introduced into the House for debate and I assume from that debate in the normal process there would be public hearings.

Constitution Act re education

HON. S. LYON: A final question on this point, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister.

In view of the fact that the previous Government of Manitoba, when it was negotiating the final draft of the Constitution Act, 1981 inserted in the draft - which was signed by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert on my behalf - inserted in the draft that the amendments in The Constitution Act relating to education in Manitoba would be approved by the Legislature of Manitoba, not just by Executive decree of the government.

Would the First Minister not consider, even though he waved that when he subsequently came to office, would he not consider that to be a suitable precedent to follow in this case?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to take that matter as one of notice on behalf of the Attorney-General.

Canada Safeway employees' union

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister.

On February 25th of this year the First Minister made a statement with respect to the Jobs Fund, and in discussing renegotiation of the MGEA Contract he stated that other employers and unions may well be able to free up funds for job creation by working together through collective bargaining, and we will also meet with business and labour to see how the principle of shared responsibility can be applied in the private sector.

My question to the First Minister is, Mr. Speaker, has he met with representatives of Canada Safeway, and representatives of the union of Canada Safeway employees?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the First Minister, in view of the concern that was expressed with respect to shared responsibility and job creation and freeing up money for job creation, could the First Minister offer a suggestion to Manitobans as to an appropriate wage level increase in 1983?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will reflect back to the announcement that was made at the time, it was a hope that indeed there would be recognition by employers and employees that the No. 1 issue confronting Canadians, and Manitobans was indeed, problems involved with unemployment. I would hope that indeed there would be some consideration - I so indicated at the time - by employers and employees. We're not in a position to do more than what we have at the present time, and that is to encourage the representatives of business, the representatives of labour, to ensure that job creation is No. 1 in their considerations.

Secondly, of course, Mr. Speaker, matters pertaining to each individual bargaining phase is a matter that relates to circumstances in that bargaining situation. Are we going to intervene in respect to particular bargaining situations that occur? No, Mr. Speaker, but we will certainly, by way of encouragement, by way of example, indeed, that the Manitoba Government Employees Association provided, an example by which each Manitoba Government Employee Association member contributed from \$600 to \$800 per year back from what was a legally binding contract to a Jobs Fund.

That is the kind of example we hoped would be greater picked up by the employer and the employee organizations in the province.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the First Minister if he intends to meet with representatives of Canada Safeway and of the union, and does he consider that the wage increase for 1983 that MGEA employees have received, or will receive, is an appropriate wage level increase to be applied in this situation?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the agreement that was arrived at by the MGEA by which - in fact they reduced the cost to government in regard to their negotiated settlement to some 7.6 percent during the fiscal year '83-84 from what would have been a settlement that had earlier been agreed to, some one year earlier which was very much in excess of that, was one that was very appropriate in those circumstances.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: Insofar as the Canada Safeway and the Safeway employees union, there would have to be a desire and a will on their part to meet and to discuss. Honourable members may wish to intervene in respect to individual cases of bargaining, but we do not intend, as a government, to intervene in individual bargaining disputes.

Guidelines re wage negotiations Crown corporations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister also. Can the First Minister advise the House what guidelines this government has issued to Crown corporations such as Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone System with respect to wage negotiations?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the general guideline is that prior to any offer being made, that that offer must first be approved by the Treasury Board. We have discovered, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a discrepancy insofar as various Crown corporation settlements have been arrived at, some discrepancy that can be justified, but other discrepancies that are more difficult to justify.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned that settlements reflect the existing level of income. That's why, for instance, this year, insofar as out-of-scope employees that are non-MGEA members, those that are in the \$40,000, \$50,000, up to \$60,000 wage bracket, a wage increase was restricted to \$1,000, which comes to a 2 percent increase on a salary of \$50,000.00. That is a practice that we have expressed, is one that ought to be followed throughout the Crown corporations and agencies, and that settlements should reflect the earnings that are received by individual employees so that those at the lower income levels will receive higher percentage increases than those at the higher-income levels within our society.

Mr. Speaker, during these difficult and tough times it's those of us, indeed, that receive the higher income levels in society that can best bear the substantial amount of the burden within our society during times of unemployment.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the Treasury Board given any specific guidelines to Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone System?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the question in regard to specific guidelines outside of agreeing to various offers that might be made would be better answered by the Chairman of Treasury Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Treasury Board had informed all Crown corporations, I believe it was back on January 12, 1983, that they were not to make any further offers to employee groups without having first obtained the approval of Treasury Board. One or two offers were indeed made subsequent to that without that prior approval, but in general that policy has been followed. What has happened is that individual submissions have been made to the Compensation Committee of Cabinet, which meets once every week; the compensation committee reviews the specific circumstances, and then passes on a recommendation to Treasury Board, which meets on the very same day at a later time; and Treasury Board then passes back its recommendation to the staff of the compensation committee, who then carry on with the Crown corporations, and different guidelines would of course apply to different situations.

Careerstart Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the Minister of Labour, I'd like to address my question to the Acting Minister of Labour. It deals with the Careerstart program. I have in my hand a letter which is from a farm employer who applied under the Careerstart Program, and the letter indicates: "We regret to inform you that due to the overwhelming response to Careerstart, we are unable to approve your application for assistance."

I wonder if I could ask the Acting Minister of Labour to indicate how many applications have been received under the Careerstart Program and how many have been rejected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to take that question as notice for the Minister of Labour. I do know, as I'm sure the member does, that we have approximately tripled the funds from what had originally been set aside, and we had within that already set a limit for non-profit groups in order that we could provide for more funding in the private sector where our money

goes further, because we only pay \$2 an hour as opposed to \$4 an hour in the non-profit sector.

That letter may have come out before the increase in funding was agreed to, in which case there may be another letter coming out. If not, then I would have to take the question as notice for the Minister. In terms of specific numbers, I just don't have them available here, but the response as indicated in that letter has indeed been overwhelming.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister then, I think the opposition at that time when the program was announced indicated that the money was not adequate.

Further to that, I would like to indicate and ask the question: I have information to the fact that applications that were received later than this one were approved, and certain applications were rejected. The question that I have is: What is the criteria that the program is using in terms of establishing who qualifies or who does not qualify?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that the member comes to the House without any prior consultation with the Minister and expects an answer here in the House with respect to a specific case. The Minister was here yesterday; he could have gone to the Minister's office. He could have gotten the information from that area but, no, he chose to come to the House without giving us any prior information and, therefore, we can't give him an answer here. If he provides us with all the information, he will get an answer.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, to the same Minister. I don't necessarily need a lecture on their efficiency and how they're running this program. They've been told time and time again, Mr. Speaker. The question that I have is: Will this Minister guarantee to let us know what the qualifications are, how they establish the priority as to who will qualify and not qualify, before he starts lecturing the House here as to how to ask questions in this House.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all of those items can be provided to the member, and I would ask him to provide us with the details, as I'm sure he will.

Sales tax on government purchases

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance.

Could the Minister advise the House if the federal department pays the provincial sales tax on their purchases in Manitoba?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The agreement I had announced, I believe it was two months ago, and I've tabled the agreement in the House; as a result of that agreement, we are also required to start paying provincial sales tax on Provincial Government purchases as the Federal Government does on federal

purchases. We don't quite recognize why that is necessary, but we are following the terms of the agreement, which is identical to the agreement that the Federal Government has entered into with all the provinces to the east of us, I believe.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, I thank the Minister for that answer, Mr. Speaker, and it seems very odd because the federal departments now, when they're making purchases of goods in Manitoba, are quoting a number 3905160 and saying that they're exempt from all provincial sales tax; that applies to the Department of Public Works, the Federal Department of Indian Affairs, and the RCMP.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. D. BLAKE: Will the Minister check into that and see if that's a special number to exempt them from the tax or . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, that sounds like a very interesting number - 3905160.

MR. D. BLAKE: 3905160.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, I can assure him that I am most interested in that and we'll check it out. I'm also sure that probably winds up coming into some central accounting fund that is transferred between the Provincial and Federal Governments. I hope that's what it is. If it isn't, then I'm sure the member has found another source of revenue for us.

MR. D. BLAKE: While the Minister's checking into that, I wonder if he could advise me so that I could advise the chap that informed me of how he gets around not paying his portion of the provincial sales tax, if he's unable to collect it from the Federal Government.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, I'm most interested in checking into the matter for both his benefit and mine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you. A question along the same line to the same Minister. I wonder if he could confirm that the province now is paying the federal portion on the gasoline tax and that the Provincial Government is now paying the manufacturing tax with regard to purchases like automobiles and other large purchases that they make.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have. I'm not sure why the member would ask that, because I had indicated earlier that I have tabled the agreement with the Legislature. Also, in the various documents that we have tabled with the Budget and Spending Estimates, etc., we've shown the costs to the province of that, and the benefits. Of course, the net benefits of the agreement to the province are more than \$4 million of revenue. That is, we get more than \$4 million more from the Federal Government than what we pay them with respect to the agreement, and that's why we've entered into it.

French language instruction in schools

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Education. In view of the fact that school divisions throughout the province are currently wrestling with problems to do with the presentation of second language training; in other words, they're having to make decisions as to whether or not milieu schools are preferable, or dual track, whether or not French Immersion or Core French has certain advantages or disadvantages. These decisions involve rationalizations in many cases; they involve reorganizations, closures of existing facilities, and so on. I'm wondering if the Minister's department has any studies or information that presents preferred positions or options on these decisions for the public or for school divisions to assist in their decision making.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think that this was one of the items that came up during the Estimates. During that time, I indicated that we had been gathering a fair amount of information through a number of projects and a number of studies of French language programs through the three-year Core French pilot project and some others, that we were now at the point of almost having completed that information, having received some very useful information from it. We are just on the verge of preparing this information for distribution and sharing with school divisions.

MR. G. FILMON: Because some serious decisions are in the course of being made at the moment, I am wondering how soon divisions can expect this information to be made public or shared with them to assist them in their decision-making process.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think with some of the information that is available that will have an effect on the programming and organization plans for the coming year, I hope to have it out within the next couple of weeks.

Care-a-Lot Day Care Centre

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, my question is to the Minister of Community Services. In light of the fact that a government-appointed board imposed a first contract settlement on Care-a-Lot Day Care Centre, which may cause the closing of the centre, and in light of the fact that a spokesman for the union said the day care board could meet the cost of increased wages by staging fund-raising drives, socials and other activities, does this government agree with the union spokesman to have union employees' wages paid for by working mothers and single parents by holding bake sales?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, well, indeed many many day care centres made up of volunteers - the boards are volunteer people - do indeed raise monies from time to time in various ways, whether it be bake sales or raffle tickets being sold, bingos, or whatever; there are many many ways that have been done and continue to be done, and that is fine.

However, Mr. Speaker, I can advise that having spent 2 hours and 15 minutes, I guess, last night in meeting with the board of directors, employees and parents of the particular day care centre, I believe that there may be some solution. Our staff is working very hard today analyzing their financial situation and we are hoping that we can find a way out of it.

I would mention again, Mr. Speaker, that the wage package still leaves the wage levels at this particular day centre well below the average of both unionized and non-unionized day care centres in the City of Winnipeg. So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that with good will and some hard work, that mutually we can work out an arrangement somehow to attempt to keep this particular facility in operation.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: A question to the same Minister or to the Minister of Labour. The same union spokesman added that the staff would be more than willing to help with such activities, such as socials and whatever, and my question to the Minister is: When the government negotiated with CUPE, were the same suggestions made to government workers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the government doesn't directly negotiate with CUPE as far as I am aware, but I'm not sure that there is anything wrong under the circumstances with the union coming forward with that kind of a proposal. We must recognize that in that particular day care centre, wages have now been set that are lower than in a number of non-union day care centres, and are certainly lower than in a number of union day care centres, because of some peculiar problems that have occurred in management in the past, not at the present time. It seems to me that the proposal that the union makes is a very responsible one which I hope can be taken up.

The alternative that the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park forgets about to first contract legislation is a strike or a lockout and then the kids would be out with no place and no one to take care of them while their parents are attempting to earn a living. If that is what the honourable member wants, let her stand up and say so.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: In light of the fact that the day care centre could conceivably close down, then there won't be any at all.

My next question is to the Acting Minister of Labour. In light of the Minister of Labour's statement that day care centres should be spending their money on salaries and not on lawyers, is the government telling the people of Manitoba that it's all right for unions to have high-priced lawyers when they're going before the Labour Board, but that the average working person on these volunteer boards should not have the same privilege, that they should be at home baking?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the increase awarded by the Department of Community Services this year to that specific day care centre was in the range of more than — (Interjection) — Well, the Leader of the Opposition may not be interested in the answer. I know he's very interested in the questions that he thinks will somehow embarrass the government, but I think he should listen to this because that day care centre was given more than a 20 percent increase this year in its operating grant from the Provincial Government. More than 80 percent of the costs of day care centres are salaries. And what was the offer that was made through that lawyer to the union? 1.5 percent. A 1.5 percent increase on people earning \$4 an hour, and if she thinks that is fair, if she thinks that is acceptable, that that kind of a wage increase is good enough for people working in the day care sector; if that's what she thinks those people are worth, people whom the parents appreciate, people who are doing a very good job with the kids, I think that there is something seriously wrong when those kinds of offers are made by lawyers earning significant salaries.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: A further question to the Minister of Labour. In light of his past remarks, then where does he stand on the suggestion that the mothers on welfare would get \$1 an hour?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the House, in case there is anybody watching this who thinks that there's any truth in that suggestion that people are receiving \$1 an hour, I just want to assure people that that's nonsense.

Indian Chiefs challenge Wildlife Report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. It's reported that the Indian chiefs of Manitoba have asked the Minister of Natural Resources to undertake an independent scientific study into the status of our wildlife resources because the chiefs don't accept the 5-year report which the Minister tabled in the House some weeks ago. Can the Minister advise the House whether or not he intends to respond positively to that request from the Indian chiefs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest the observations made and certainly will give all suggestions due consideration. I haven't had a chance to talk to my staff at the Wildlife Branch. I know that there are people who are unsatisfied with the statistics revealed in that report and are quite concerned and, naturally, I am going to be concerned to discuss those issues with staff.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister assure the House that he stands behind the report that has been prepared and tabled in this House?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when I presented the report, or when I commented on it during my Estimates, the report is, as I understand it, a statistical report indicating facts as the branch deemed them to have occurred, and it's true that within the report there is a supposition of fact, a generalization of fact, because this is not an exact science. The count of animals, the estimation of the rationale, or the reasons why there have been losses, is not a complete science. It is subjective and, of course, it has to be looked upon in that manner. But certainly, generally speaking, it's an attempt to provide a factual analysis of wildlife in Manitoba.

MR. B. RANSOM: A further supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. It was evident from questioning during the Minister's Estimates that he, himself, had read the report and indeed changes were made as a consequence of his reading the report prior to it being published. Can he therefore assure the House that he stands behind the statements made in that report?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, again, and I did put it on the record during Estimates, I was asked and the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain had been asking me over a course of weeks, when was I going to table the report, because the report was a long time in the work, it was the first five-year report that has ever been prepared by the department and it did take a considerable effort. I've indicated it cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$29,000 to produce.

During the course of questioning before my Estimate's review, I indicated that I had read a draft of the report. Some of the generalized language in the report - I had some concern with. I noted my concerns. I did not rewrite any section of the report. I believe the report is an attempt to be very factual about wildlife in Manitoba.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, can we take that as an assurance that the Minister stands behind the report?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think I signed the report; I tabled the report; I, as Minister, have to take responsibility for the report. But I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, that the report is not based on precise fact that one measures in a laboratory. It is based on subjective analysis of matters that are not absolutely certain. There is a certain range of very educated guesswork involved in all of these things and, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that there can be differing opinions as to those facts, or as to the conclusions drawn from the facts, and I appreciate that and expect that.

Attorney-General - defamation settlement

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. My question to him is this: In view of the fact that he has introduced a bill to amend The Financial Administration Act and Section 44 of the Act, whereby claims against Ministers of the

Government could now be settled by the Minister where they are under \$5,000, and would not have to be approved by Order-in-Council as they are now required to be under The Financial Administration Act.

Could the Minister indicate how many more claims there are against the Attorney-General than other members of the Cabinet, particularly in view of the fact, that the government and the taxpayers already have to pay some \$5,000 for a claim for defamation against the Attorney-General; how many more claims are they attempting to hide by this amendment they're proposing to The Financial Administration Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a cheap and inaccurate shot at what had happened and the member knows that. He knows that if he was being honest that he would rephrase that question considerably.

What has happened with respect to that Financial Administration Act is that over a period of years some of the numbers with inflation are being raised, just as the previous government, for instance, I believe it was in 1979, raised the limit on reporting for wages to \$15,000.00. That is, any wages below that amount aren't shown in the accounts of the province and we don't object to that. Those things happen with the passage of time and inflation. But what the honourable member is referring to here, as he well knows, is something that ought to be the subject for discussion at committee stage when that bill is in the House.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister in introducing this bill, did not make any reference to this proposed change whatsoever; and in view of the fact that the claim, which the Government of Manitoba and the taxpayers of Manitoba had to pay because of the Attorney-General's actions; in view of the fact that that was only uncovered because it had to be passed by Order-in-Council and the public is entitled to know that kind of information; would the Minister withdraw this part of his proposed bill in order that the public can be kept fully informed?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that at the present time, without that amendment, the individual Ministers can and could under the previous administration do the same thing at a reduced number and it's just a matter of the number involved. Because right now there's a provision for it, and I believe that the provision is for \$1,000.00.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Finance to reconsider his position, in view of the fact that there is no limitation on this type of settlement in the present Financial Administration Act, and there should be no change in the Act, in order that the public can be fully informed.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the Act in front of me. I'll take another look at that, but I do want to correct a misimpression that the Attorney-General was sued. That simply is not correct.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: Mr. Speaker, I have committee changes for Economic Development: The Member for Thompson substituting for the Member for The Pas, the Member for Rupertsland substituting for the Member for Inkster, and the Member for Burrows is substituting for the Member for Osborne.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bills No. 60, No. 3, No. 12, No. 43, No. 51 and No. 18, in that order please?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 60 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 60, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in making my remarks to Bill No. 60, which is seat belt legislation, helmet legislation, child restraint legislation, I would like to clarify a few things before I get into the subject matter.

I would like to indicate that the Attorney-General the other day referred to myself as a legal illiterate. I would just like to indicate to the House here that I'm standing in my place within my given right as an elected representative and the comments that I will be making are the comments that the people in my constituency would want me to make, the majority of them, which, Mr. Speaker, is more than I can say for the arrogant, conceited, hairbrained, lord ass, our Attorney-General, who has put shame on that office by the comments that he's made in this House and the way he's been conducting himself and I feel very strongly about that.

I speak on behalf of my people, and that is something more that the Attorney-General can say, because his comments and his actions in this House have been something that I think I, personally, and many people in my area have been ashamed of, and I think government should be ashamed of, and certainly the Premier should be ashamed of.

Mr. Speaker, when I speak to this Bill No. 60, as I indicated I want to give the comments and the impressions that I get from my people and they are opposed to this kind of legislation. I want to just indicate some of the things from which I draw my conclusions.

We had a questionnaire that was quoted in the Manitoba Co-operator some time ago, a couple of months ago, and various questions were put in the questionnaire at that time.

One of the questions was: Should the wearing of seat belts be compulsory? I would like to indicate why I speak out very strongly against this legislation is

because over 70 percent of the people spoke in opposition to compulsory seat-belt legislation. I would like to sort of build around that a little bit, some of the comments that I've heard. I've had many letters; I've had many resolutions, resolutions sent from councils, LGD councils and rural councils that are opposed to this kind of legislation. The biggest problem with this whole legislation is the compulsory aspect of it because, Mr. Speaker, there's many people — (Interjection) — I'm talking about seat belt legislation and helmet legislation.

There's many people right now that are driving motor bikes, street bikes, and that's a very popular thing that is developing. The majority of them, Mr. Speaker, are using helmets, they are using helmets in most cases. What the people object to, especially in the rural area, is the compulsory aspect of it, and I'd like to enlarge on that a little bit, for seat belts as well as helmet legislation.

We've had demonstrations in front of this building here not that long ago. Thousands of young people were coming out. Not just all young people, but people came out with their bikes and were indicating to the House and to the members here that they oppose the compulsory aspect of it. Mr. Speaker, most of the bikes that came up had a helmet hanging on the back. Most of these people believe in using a helmet, but they don't believe in the compulsory aspect of it.

The same thing happens with drivers. I believe the Minister of Transportation indicated the other day that approximately 20 percent of the drivers in Manitoba are using their seat belts at the present time. I think that the program of education has been working relatively well. It's slow but it's been working. But now we have a government that comes along and says, you shall use helmets, you shall use a seat belt, especially in the rural area. I think in the city there is an element that probably is a little bit more conducive to the using of seat belts, but I think that if you took a general survey of it that the majority of the people, as our surveys, indicate would be opposed to compulsory seat-belt legislation and helmet legislation.

Now why would the Minister of Highways bring in this kind of legislation? You know we have all kinds of information from the impression that the present government has given that they're always listening to people. They follow the wishes of the people. The Member for Elmwood there was speaking on it too. The thing that bothers me, how come you feel that you know best for all the people? If you think you know what is best for people, why don't you ask them at least? Statistics show that is not the case.

Then they send out propoganda like I have in my hand here. Great people, great future, Manitoba and the NDP. That was sent out in May. It's a fund raiser, it's a fund raiser that has been sent out now. The things that they mention in there, Mr. Speaker - "What do you think of the performance of the Manitoba NDP Government since the provincial election of 1981?" And then they have all kinds of comments about the dramatic great things they've done, which is basically nothing, and they say "I want to know how do you feel about all this."

Well, if they were really sincere about wanting to know what the people feel, why don't they do some surveys and find out regarding seat-belt legislation and

helmet legislation? The demonstrations have indicated, my surveys have indicated that people are opposed to the compulsory aspect of it.

You know, it's interesting enough, when we were in government not that long ago we had two Ministers that were involved in the transportation portfolio. From time to time they sort of tried to float it into caucus a little bit, the discussion about compulsory seat-belt legislation and helmet legislation. Well, it never got past the door properly, because the feeling was generally it was not wanted. It was felt yes, it's a good thing to promote, those people that want to use it. I don't argue the logistics of using it, but to make it compulsory - that's the thing that makes everybody nervous.

Now why in a Session when we're going to be having over a hundred bills thrown at us, why would we want to bring in a bill of this nature? Who has been asking for it? This is the question that I have. It's been a very small element that has been pushing for the aspect of it. I find it very interesting why they should zero in on this kind of an approach and want to make this aspect compulsory.

I have many old people, the pensioners especially, and as we go through a transition period, and if we promote the education aspect of it, people will learn to use a seat belt. There's more of them using them all the time.

When we look at the provinces that have made it compulsory, we find that 55 percent generally are the ones that use it and the others don't. The people in my area, they ask me, the pensioners and others, why? Why is the government making this compulsory? Many of them have never gotten used to wearing seat belts. They feel entrapped, they feel it's an entrenchment on their rights, and I think they are right. Why do they want to do this?

Other questions that are raised are, you know, the fines are going to be from \$20 to \$100.00. Do they do this to raise funds or what is the object of it really? Because they feel conscientiously that they have not had to do it now.

We have the same thing with the metric thing that the Federal Government slapped down everybody's throat. Nobody was asked, "Do you want it?" They just put it on, and that's what this government is doing with this. I dare say it's going to come back to haunt you.

The concern I have about the Minister of Transportation that brought forward this bill - I have a lot of respect for him. I've had lots of activity with him over the many years when he was Minister of Agriculture and we had our feuds and fights and disagreements and difference of philosophy. I'll accept that. I think he's mellowed to some degree where he is among the group across there, he's already a right winger, you know. We used to call him red, but with the group that's there right now, I think that, you know, the Minister of Transportation is already a real right winger.

What bothers me is when we went into the Estimates of Transportation the other day the Minister of Highways is sort of holding his hands and saying, well, economic conditions, they had a cut back on the road construction. When we raise the point that agriculture, highways, natural resources, all these departments were cut back. Well he says, you know, that's sort of the

desire of the Government of the Day. He wasn't strong enough and influential enough at that stage of the game to make sure that he at least kept the Highways Estimates at the same level.

No, you know, his Caucus obviously and his Cabinet voted him down. He had to take a reduction in this department. I'm sure he didn't do that willingly - I thought he did not do that willingly. But then we find he turns around and he cuts back on the safety aspect of it and this is the Highways Estimates.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And who was whining and crying? The Member for Elmwood was whining and crying about it.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, the Member for Elmwood has been trying to defend that position.

The Minister of Highways has cut back on the safety end of it in his Estimates and then comes around and is trying to give us the sales pitch that the seat belt legislation and helmet legislation is for the safety of people generally. He is going to look after that aspect of it.

I'm just tremendously concerned. That's why the question comes up with many people. You know, is this a revenue-raising thing? Then the suggestion I have if it is to raise revenue, let's catch all the guys after this thing becomes legislation, obviously, because the government is voting as a bloc. They don't have the freedom to vote as they please, because if they did, many of them would not support this kind of legislation, but the hammer is on, they'll have to vote for it, fine. We'll accept that.

But this legislation is going to haunt you people, I can guarantee you. Mr. Premier, this legislation is going to come back to haunt you, because many people, you're forcing something on them, but we've gotten used to that with this government. They say we have an open-door policy, but they don't listen to people. They just storm straight ahead.

MR. R. DOERN: Onward and upward.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: An interesting point that I want to raise, in my first year in this Legislature in 1977, I brought in a Private Members' bill at that time, to raise the drinking age from 18 to 19, and at that time I illustrated all the aspects financially, because of accidents, the problems that were created by having the 18 year olds drinking in school, the accident factor, the deaths it caused. I had all that information from all the provinces and states across North America, and what happened is, - it was a free vote, fair enough, it was defeated. I could accept that.

But the Member for Elmwood stood up the other day in his place and he's chastising you and promoting this type of legislation - not chastising it, chastising anybody that speaks against it - he was the one that was voting against raising of the drinking age, and if safety and cost is the main concern of this legislation then turn around and look what you've done. It isn't consistent at all, but then we're used to that. With this government they are not consistent in many things. It's the double-standard version, and we're used to that already by this time.

One of the things that people ask me nowadays when I get out in the hustings, they say how long, how long do we have to put up with these people? And what I tell them is, it's just started, we've just seen the tip of the iceberg. They got elected on false promises at that time, and they will hang in there for the full five years because they're power hungry, and they don't want to let go of it because they know when the next election comes, down the tubes they go.

You know, it might even be that the Member for Elmwood and, certainly, the Member for St. George will be going down the tubes this time, because the irresponsible actions as the Minister of Agriculture that he's had to date, illustrates that kind of thing. We have the same thing from the Minister of Transportation. I think he feels uncomfortable with what he's doing in that government. — (Interjection) — And the Minister of Agriculture says, who? But he should feel uncomfortable too, because those three departments that I mentioned before are the ones that have been reduced in their total spending, and they should be ashamed, but that shows and reflects the feeling of the people opposite, and that is why they bring in this kind of legislation.

Basically, it would be my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of legislation was promoted by a small handful. The bureaucracy is pushing for it, your bureaucracy is pushing for it, and how the Minister of Transportation fell for it, I can't for the life of me figure out. You know, it bothers me, but it's actually in keeping, I suppose, with what we've gotten used to. Words, all kinds of words being spoken, no action, and they go in their arrogant conceited way of doing exactly what they want. They don't listen to the people anymore.

But, I'll tell you something. You have three years to play around, and then you will listen to the people of Manitoba - you will. And there are going to be many many removed from that side at that time.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering how does this government view bringing in this kind of legislation? What is the motivation behind it? What is the motivation behind this kind of legislation? Over a hundred bills are being thrown at us, all aspects of them, and they try and float a few cuties, but this open and brazen.

As I indicated before, the majority of people don't object to the use of seat belts. Most of the motorcycle people don't object to the use of helmets, and I think the aspect of child restraint, it's a reasonable approach. But what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, anybody that has raised kids, let's say, raised a family and you travel two or three hours in a car and you're going to have your children restrained - I'm just raising this, I'm not saying, I'm opposed to child restraint - I'm just saying you want to be very careful the method in which you use child restraint in a car. Because having small tots, especially anywhere from three to seven years old, and you're going to restrain them for two or three hours in a car, or longer, depending how far you have to drive, you can just imagine the complications. Anybody that's had three of them in the car at the same time, or four, as I've had occasion to do, you have a problem. You

have a problem trying to restrain four of them for over an hour. You have a problem restraining four of them for ten minutes.

Now, from the parental aspect of it, I sometimes feel the wife's pretty busy trying to keep everything under control when you don't have this, maybe that aspect of it would not be bad. It would be easier for me when I'm driving the car, and the wife doesn't have to fight with four kids in the back, you know, they're at each other all the time. Maybe child restraint would have a plus there, but there are complications with that. I don't know, maybe my kids weren't quite normal, but to have four of them restrained at the same time — (Interjection) — now, don't take that wrong, my kids are normal in every other respect, but they are not normal when they are supposed to be restrained for two or three hours in the car when driving, and I think anybody that's got kids accepts that. So, it's the type of restraint that you have that would be very much concerned.

The same thing with the aspect of the seat belt itself. Let's talk about the rural people, who drive down the road, not that much traffic down the country road, they're supposed to have their seat belt on. They drive to town, half an hour, whatever the case may be, put the seat belt on, and I think the area of education, gradually, as we come through the system, our younger people are more receptive to it, but many of our senior people are very annoyed by it. They say, why do we have to have this? In fact, I've had a few old-timers - I shouldn't refer to old-timers, but pensioners - came up and said, listen if I get fined, Driedger, you're going to pay the bill, because I refuse to pay that bill. I said, well, I'm not going to vote for it, they say, you're government.

Actually we're tainted with the same brush as the government that is bringing it in, and it annoys me a little bit, because to many of them it isn't that important. We're all a big legislative body here. We pass bills, many bills, many stupid bills, and this is one of them as far as I'm concerned. I think we should concentrate on the aspect of education as the previous Minister of Highways did, and it's gradually coming. It's coming gradually. Why do you want to force people? Every time we pass a bill in this House, we take away rights of people. We do every time, and this year we have over 100 of them and every time we restrict certain rights again. It's been apparent in many of the bills; the bill that the Minister of Natural Resources brought forward, The Water Rights Act.

There's good things in some of these things; there's things that should be considered, but why should we always make it a compulsory aspect of it! I'm talking on a general scale. I don't want to go into the details, because when we had resolutions that we debated in this House off and on about seat belt legislation, and if I'm correct - I think I'm correct - I think the Member for Elmwood brought forward one of these resolutions on compulsory seat belt legislation. We've had all the debates, the pros and cons. I think the Minister, when he introduced the bill, indicated that there are circumstances where maybe a seat belt has been detrimental in terms of an accident where people drown. We refer always to the drowning end of it. There's other examples too, but we've debated them many times in this House, the pros and cons of it. Definitely, there is

an advantage to using a seat belt. I think most people will accept that, but why should we take and make them do it.

We can take this further, and it's in keeping with the socialistic type of approach; make people do things for their own good, as I indicated before, but they're not consistent in that. As I referred to the Private Members' Bill that I brought in about raising the drinking age, that was for the good of the young people; it was going to save a lot of money; it was going to save a lot of lives, but to make it compulsory, to raise that - no, no, you're taking away certain rights.

We are taking away the rights of people to make decisions now by bringing in this kind of legislation. I have to say, and I have no problems with it, I am totally opposed to compulsory seat belt legislation and helmet legislation. I make no bones about it, and that is in keeping with the feeling of the people in my constituency. I would just like to ask members of the government: How many of you have gone out and checked what the feeling is of the people in your area? How many of you? The Member for Inkster, he doesn't even know where his people are really; pardon that little slight.

MR. D. SCOTT: Talk for yourself . . .

MR. A. DRIEDGER: He has not made contact with his people. Many others have not made contact with the people in their area about how they feel about this legislation.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That is a fact; that is a fact. Certainly, the rural members must feel pressure about this thing. I wonder how the Minister of Agriculture feels about this legislation; about how his people feel about it. Mind you, as I indicated, he's so busy trying to run the Department of Agriculture, he probably hasn't got time to make contact with them.

A MEMBER: Did you ask them, Billy?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I'm talking about making contact with the people in his area to find out how they feel about compulsory seat belt legislation.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to put these things on record. It is expected from the people in my area that I oppose this thing. I think I would encourage the Premier that we should have a free and open vote on this thing. Mr. Speaker, I feel very confident if that was allowed to happen, that this bill would not pass because, in all sincerity, now they're all hiding behind the cloak that it is a government bill; I can't help but support it. If the Premier would take the shackles off and let them vote as they please, this legislation would not pass. As I indicated, there's positive aspects to the thing, but the compulsion aspect of it is what annoys everybody. I think that the Minister - obviously, it has already been indicated by the Premier that it's not going to be an open vote, a prevote; it's a government bill and they'll hammer it through.

With that, I just want to indicate that I am opposed to it and this is something that is going to come and haunt you people in the next election, which will be your last one for a long time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 3 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 3, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege to say a few words regarding this important controversial legislation that has been introduced by the Minister of Agriculture.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture when he introduced this legislation back on Thursday, December 16, 1982, at the time of the introduction he made some statements regarding his concerns. He mentioned that he was concerned about the preservation and the strengthening of the owner-operator family farm. Well, I don't think there's any member in this Chamber of the 57 members who would disagree with that statement; that if we can have more farms in Manitoba that are owned by those that are working them, we would certainly have no objections to that. The members on this side of the House have always encouraged sons of farmers to continue into the field of agriculture and to, if possible, take over family farms.

The Minister makes reference to the absentee ownership of farms in Manitoba and how they have played a great role in the escalation of farm prices in Manitoba. I would differ, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister there in that I don't think the amount of absentee ownership has had that great a bearing on the prices that farms have sold for over the past 10 years. I would think that inflation and interest rates have had a far greater bearing on prices of farms over the last decade.

His third point he made in the introduction is that he was concerned about the opportunities that exist for current farmers or future farmers in Manitoba. I would say that all members on this side of the House - and we have a goodly number that are in the field of agriculture - would agree with him that certainly we're concerned about who is going to do the farming of the next decade and the one to follow that.

The Minister went on to say at that time, Mr. Speaker, that he was introducing the bill for two reasons; one that he felt he believed in and that Manitobans should have strong legislation in this area, to prevent land speculators; and his second reasoning was The Lands Protection Act that was introduced by a previous government was insufficient. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope to deal with some of those points that the Minister has made reference to during his introduction.

There's two real reasons, Sir, that I would have difficulty supporting this bill. I don't believe that governments should interfere with the lives of people

any more than they have to. This is certainly restricting Canadians from another nine provinces and two territories from becoming landowners here in the Province of Manitoba. Yet many Winnipegers and persons from eastern Manitoba own land in Ontario primarily for recreational use, but the people of Ontario seem to welcome them into Ontario to be landowners, although it may be for recreation purposes. So I personally don't like seeing a barrier put up at the Ontario borderline or at the Saskatchewan border.

I recall, Sir, back in 1980 when the Minister of Transportation was on the committee that was holding public hearings regarding the constitution, and on a number of occasions, the then member, now the current Minister of Transportation, said that we should have written into the constitution resource-sharing proposals. He made references at that time to the Province of Alberta with the oil resources that they had, the possible and potential oil resources for offshore drilling for the Province of Newfoundland, and so on, and that these matters should come under federal jurisdiction, where the Federal Government could perhaps share the earnings and the income from these resources on a proportional basis with other provinces in Canada. Well, what's good in the constitution, that we should share with other Canadians, obviously doesn't appear to be good for the Minister of Agriculture, who doesn't want to permit other Canadians from becoming landowners and farmers in the Province of Manitoba.

A good example would be a relative of mine who is with the Federal Department of Agriculture in Regina, and if that person wishes to buy a farm in Manitoba, although makes his home in Regina, earns the largest portion of his earnings from his position with the Federal Government, it's my understanding that he wouldn't be permitted to come back to Manitoba and farm on a part-time basis, although he would be retaining his home in the City of Regina. If I'm wrong, I would hope that the Minister would make such a correction. Fortunately, in this particular person's case, he has been able to, over the last few years, purchase a small farm and does come back to Manitoba on a regular basis on weekends and work it. But let's say he had wished to take advantage of this opportunity at some future time. It's my reading and understanding of the legislation that he wouldn't be permitted to do so.

Then the other reason, Sir, that I disagree with the Minister of Agriculture is that I think he's interfering with the free marketplace by putting on these restrictions and he talks about the out-of-province and non-Canadian - or as the term some people like to use - "foreign ownership" having a great bearing on the prices of farms in Manitoba over the past decade.

I, for one, don't believe that foreign ownership has had that great an impact on the farm prices in Manitoba, and only in a few examples am I aware of foreign ownership in various municipalities being a major concern. Certainly, the Minister refers in his opening remarks, in introducing this bill, to a Dr. Daryl Kraft from the University of Manitoba and some research work that was done by a group of students for that particular professor; but I would like to point out some statistics that we have been able to obtain from the secretary-treasurers of the various municipalities who have taken this information, Sir, from the tax rolls, and so I would hope that it is at least as accurate as the

students who worked for Dr. Kraft - their information - or even more so. I'm only going to cite a few examples, Sir, of municipalities that I'm familiar with or that I have had some background information with and I've had some dealings with.

The R.M. of De Salaberry out there near where St. Pierre is, I know that municipality very well, and it's got a lot of persons who commute from Winnipeg and back and forth. But do you know that the number of non-resident Canadians who own farm land in that municipality is one-quarter of 1 percent? It has one of the highest of foreign non-Canadian owners and that is, perhaps, because the eastern area of that municipality was virtually undeveloped and it is very close to the American border, so maybe Minnesotans own land in that municipality. As I've said, I know of foreign persons that have developed farm lands in that area and broken new land in the R.M. of De Salaberry, so there's 11 percent of the land in that area that is owned by foreigners. That is one of the highest percentages in the total list.

The R.M. of Dufferin, Sir - that happens to be a municipality that is very close to the Member for Pembina - 4.25 percent of the land in that area is owned by non-Canadians and zero percent owned by non-farmers, although Canadians.

Another municipality, the R.M. of Franklin - this is the one that my in-laws farm at - within 9 percent of that area is owned by non-Canadians, and again that municipality almost runs down to the local government districts that border the Ontario border and much of that land in recent years has been broken in and put under cultivation. It is new Canadians and potential new Canadians that are going into these areas to do their farming, and let's never put the brakes on having an increase in population and bringing in new Canadians that want to work and become taxpayers in this province, because without these people, I am sure that most of us wouldn't be here today, and without our forefathers having come to Manitoba, whether they came as merchants, or came as farmers, and so on.

In the R.M. of Franklin the number of non-residents is less than 1 percent. A good farming community, the R.M. of Grey, out near Elm Creek, 1 percent is owned by non-farming Canadians and only 8 percent is owned by non-Canadians. The R.M. of Macdonald on the edge of the City of Winnipeg, Sir, 3.5 percent of its property is owned by non-Canadians and only 3.5 percent by non-farming Canadians.

The R.M. of North Cypress, one in which my family operates a farm in and has a farm in, has only 2.7 percent of its total farm acreage owned by non-Canadians and only 1 percent by non-resident Canadians. I would imagine that my family fits into that 1 percent, because my father lives in Winnipeg and he has owned the farm out there since 1922 and before that, his father and his grandfather have owned it and that farm was homesteaded, Mr. Speaker - and I'm proud to say this - in 1880. It was one of the first in western Manitoba to be homesteaded. It is still in the same family name and when my father, who is now 87, passes on, it's his intent that it will pass into my hands, and I someday will pass it on into my daughter's hands. So it is our wish, Mr. Speaker, to keep this family farm in the family.

I might point out, Sir, that the Minister talks about the short leases that are given by non-operator farmers.

I might tell the Minister that when my father was at dental school in 1922, he started to rent his farm out to the MacFarlane family, and that family continued to rent the farm for 50 consecutive years until he turned it over to a cousin of mine two years ago. So I say, Sir, if that's an example of a non-farm operator leasing out his land and giving short-term leases - sure, they were yearly renewable leases - but in that particular case, the family stayed for 50 years and went through two generations.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, but Warren, the NDP think that's bad. That's bad.

MR. W. STEEN: Well, I see nothing wrong with that. The Minister made reference about keeping farmers on the farm and permitting sons of farmers to continue to invest in farming in Manitoba, and by bringing in such restrictive legislation, he's going to make it somewhat easier for these young farmers to participate in agriculture, to buy farms, and to conduct a business of farming - and farming, Sir, is a business.

I say to the Minister that if he would take his Agricultural Credit Corporation and perhaps revamp it, and work with the chartered banks and make monies available at lower interest rates to young farmers, perhaps these people could buy these farms that he is so concerned about being in the hands of foreign persons and so on.

I say that the non-Manitobans that are wishing to invest in farms are investors, Mr. Speaker, and that they are not trying to purchase lands with the idea of a get-rich-quick proposition, because the prices that these people have been paying are far too high to be in on a get-rich-quick proposition. So the reason that these people are buying farm lands in Manitoba and in Canada is they eventually want to have a good, stable investment. Canada is a relatively good, stable country, and I would hope and I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that many of these people will eventually be Canadian farmers and be over here practising the art of agriculture and working as agrologists. — (Interjection) —

I would say, Sir, that absentee owners in my opinion are not doing any farm community any great harm. In talking to the Member for Emerson, I said to him that in reading a presentation that was given to the Minister by the Manitoba real estate agents, they make reference in their presentation to the numbers of acres that have been purchased in southeastern Manitoba. The Member for Emerson says that, yes, they have poured a lot of capital into southeastern Manitoba which has been good, and that money has been spent in the region. These people have become good citizens, the ones that have moved in. The other ones who have purchased much of this land in many many cases, almost to a letter, Sir, have rented back to the person that they purchased it from and in most cases given a three year lease to them; therefore, a person has a lease to operate the farm again. They've got the money in their mitt from the sale of the farm. The area has also seen great expansion in numbers of acres that have been cultivated. So the Member for Emerson tells me that in talking to municipal officials in the southeastern part of Manitoba that they have all expressed a desire to see more of this farm land - a lot of it is marginal farm

land that has been bought by non-Manitobans - being sold to these persons who are prepared and willing to come into this province, to cultivate, to put the acreage under cultivation and do their best at farming what might not be called triple A farm land.

If they were speculators, Sir, I would propose that they would be buying this land at the lowest possible price and sitting on it with the intent to resell it. Obviously, they can't be speculators, because that's the common cry you hear from persons that want to put all these restrictions on is that these people are paying ridiculously high prices. So therefore if they're paying ridiculously high prices, Sir, I would call them investors rather than speculators; they want the land and they want to continue it in ownership and so on.

I would say, Sir, that the proposed legislation will deprive Manitobans who wish to retire. This, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is an important factor, and an area that I have had some personal knowledge in is the family persons operating the farm. The youngsters, the children in the family, go off to university, they get into an urban area, and they don't wish to go back farming. So when it comes time for mom and dad to retire, and in many cases they have lived poor most of their lives, and the greatest days they're going to have and are going to be perhaps their days in retirement. If we pass this bill that is going to put restrictions on who can buy farm lands in Manitoba, I think that we're going to deprive a number of persons that fit the example that I've just cited, where persons who might want to retire from the farm and retire perhaps before the normal retirement age of 65, because they've worked from a very early age, they've worked hard on acquiring these assets, and they want to live off these assets in their days of retirement, and particularly if their health is with them. Not every boy or girl that grows up on the farm wants to remain in the farm community.

We have seen over the last 50 years the City of Winnipeg grow immensely. It's mainly because many persons who have come in off the farms have come into the urban area.

Another restriction that I don't like about the bill when he speaks of restricting non-Manitobans from buying farm land. I would hope that all the city members on the government side would realize for one moment that the Christmas sales in our retail stores often are a result of a good crop or a poor crop. If we have a bad harvest in the fall, many retailers in Winnipeg will tell you that Christmas sales and retail sales over the wintertime will be poor. If the farmers have money in their pockets and they do well, they come into Winnipeg and they are consumers. They are into our city and buying goods and services from Winnipeg merchants, and the merchants in the larger villages and towns in their own area. So I would hope that we would not prevent other Canadians from buying farm land in Manitoba. I think personally that the numbers of so-called foreign persons buying land in Manitoba is not a serious problem today; I have seen the statistics from a number of the municipalities. In my opinion, it is not a higher number, and that we in Manitoba should be looking for growth in Manitoba in both population, and as I have cited the example, in eastern Manitoba where a number of acres have been put under cultivation in recent years and new farms have been established that each and everyone of these persons

that operates these new farms are going to be consumers of goods and services. They're going to be coming into Winnipeg to buy shoes and clothes from the Winnipeg merchants or the merchants between here and the City of Winnipeg and their homes.

The Minister made reference to the fact that the opportunities for farmers aren't there. I made reference to the Agriculture Credit Corporation and subsidizing young farmers' interest rates with the commercial banks in my opinion is a worthwhile concept to give serious consideration to, particularly, if his people from the Department of Agriculture, through the Agriculture Credit, look at the potential farmer to see if he's got the capabilities of being a farmer. Then if the Agriculture Department of any one of the chartered banks has a look at that same operation, perhaps we won't have the problems that we all heard so much about in Portage la Prairie recently when a person who wasn't capable of farming got into a big farm operation.

Farming is like any other profession, it's not made for everybody. There are skills and training that are needed in order to be in farming. Sir, I think that it would be shameful in Manitoba if we are starting to deprive other Canadians from a chance to come to Manitoba and to go into the farming agriculture business in our province, if we shut the door to non-Canadians from coming and joining and becoming future Canadians and coming to Manitoba and doing the farm work. If you talk to farmers, whoever require help on the farm in the way of hired help, they'll tell you that it's very very difficult to get second generation Manitobans and Canadians to go out and do farming work because farming work is difficult work.

Perhaps, maybe some of these new Canadians or prospective Canadian have the work ethics within them that they'll come over here and become excellent farmers and do the tough work that is involved in farming and particularly if they get into mixed farming. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm opposed to the bill because I don't like government getting in with a heavy hand and telling other Canadians who can come to Manitoba and who can't come to Manitoba. I think the restrictive aspect of having non-Canadians coming to Manitoba is not required at this time, because the statistics show in the municipalities around Winnipeg that the number of foreign-owned farms is a very small percentage. The example I cite in the two municipalities of Franklin and the R.M. of De Salaberry in the eastern area, it is well-known that a number of foreign persons have come and located in that area and bought farms.

In many cases, when they have bought established farms, they have turned them back into leaseholds to the existing person who operated the farm. But one step even further and better, Sir, is that in many cases they established new farms and broke land and started the cultivation. It's these people that are increasing the viability of southeastern Manitoba as an agricultural community and, as I said, that we, who represent constituencies in the City of Winnipeg, and although my constituency is primarily a residential one, everyone of those persons in the River Heights constituencies are employed somewhere, hopefully. In many cases, they are employed downtown and in the various major shopping centres in Winnipeg, and when the farmers do well, the people of Winnipeg do well.

Farmers are consumers as well as producers, and I think that the Minister of Agriculture is taking a very

narrow view when he wants to put restrictions on who can be in the farming business, because he's forgetting about the fact that they are consumers, and that they can assist Manitobans who are not in the farming community in establishing their own livelihoods.

I would suggest, Sir, to the Minister of Agriculture, that if his greatest concern is the young farmer's inability to get onto the farm because the prices are high, it's not a result mainly of foreign ownership. It's the high interest rates; it's the inflationary period we've gone through in the past decade. If he still feels that there are a goodly number of capable young men out there that want to be in the farming business, why doesn't he have a serious hard look at bringing in some legislation or making some changes in the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and maybe trying to work with the credit unions, maybe trying to work with the chartered banks and trying to free up money so that these young farmers can get themselves established?

If the farm has a value of X on it, why should somebody be forced to take something less than X just because they want to help some young farmer from down the road? I think if persons want to sell their farms and retire, they are entitled to the best price they can get, and legislation shouldn't be introduced to deprive them of a retirement that I'm sure in many cases they deserve because they have worked long and hard in establishing a farm. As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I've known many farmers and they live rather poorly and they often die rich. The reason they die rich is that they have spent a lifetime trying to pay off their farm, and at the time they get to retirement age, many of them, if their health still is with them, they would like to retire a wee bit early and to enjoy a few years of life. The only way they can enjoy their retirement is get a reasonable amount of money because very few farmers, Sir, have pension plans and this government is always talking about pension plans and employee and employer relations. I'm not really speaking on behalf of the corporate farmers, I'm talking about the average farmer that his only asset at the time he wants to retire is selling his farm and his equipment, and that is what will provide him with his years of retirement.

So, Sir, I would suggest that the Minister of Agriculture have a look at the Agricultural Credit Corporation and the way it's working and take off these restrictions; they aren't necessary. The number of persons from foreign areas buying farm lands in Manitoba is not a significant number, so I would suggest what he should do again is do as he did last year, pull the bill and forget about it. I don't think it's needed. It's not needed and just plain forget about all these restrictions.

I think he's been listening to the farm union perhaps a little too often and some of the other groups, and maybe if he got out talking to all the farm groups and the various individuals he would perhaps find that the bill is not needed. So, therefore, Sir, if the bill is not needed, I would say that I'm certainly not going to support it, and I would ask the Minister if he would seriously reconsider the bill because I don't think it is needed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm rather amused by the attitude of the honourable members opposite. They are concerned about the problem, but they really don't want to do anything about it. Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that the honourable members opposite have a fixation; they have a fixation about the open market. But, Mr. Speaker, we have to face up to the realities of what's happening out there. We know, Mr. Speaker, that our land base and our agricultural base is not infinite; it is finite. We do not have an unending supply of arable land on this planet. Certainly, we don't have an ever-expanding frontier of arable land in this country. The acquisition of arable land comes now at great expense: excessive drainage, excessive costs of developing further arable land. We know that with these constraints — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult even to hear my echo in the Chamber given the fact that the Honourable Member for Pembina seems to be involved in incessant chatter.

Mr. Speaker, given the limitation on arable land, we know that without any other factor, land values are going to continue to increase. Mr. Speaker, we know that despite the fact that from time to time there appear to be world food surpluses, there are no real food surpluses in the world, and we need all of the arable land and we need it in production.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not inhibit the ownership of land for cultivation in the production of food, not at all. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that young farmers today trying to engage in farming face escalating land costs, making it almost prohibitive for a young man or a young woman to start out in farming. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are not idle theories; they are fact. The Honourable Member for Gladstone, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, and the Honourable Member for Niakwa know that in their constituencies they have farmers that farm land; they can't begin to own the land, it's too expensive. They rent, and they are obliged to rent, and they are obliged to rent now, Mr. Speaker, from people who don't reside in Canada. They are now, Mr. Speaker, ever increasing tenants in their own land.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell says, some guys want to rent land. Well, Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the Chamber, want people who rent land to be able to rent land from other Manitobans, to be able to make sure that the revenue that comes from that land is circulated here in this province and doesn't go to New York, doesn't go to Germany or doesn't go to Rome, Mr. Speaker, because

MR. D. ORCHARD: You're so far out on left field, you don't know what you're talking about.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Pembina is talking about left field.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's not even factual.

A MEMBER: What about our family owning land, Al? What about your family?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in the constituency of Springfield - in the R.M. of Springfield — (Interjection) — Well, the Honourable Member for Pembina is hurling insults and leaving the Chamber. May well he do so, because fact is a stranger to him, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't want to know the facts and deal with the issues on the basis of fact.

Mr. Speaker, in the R.M. of Springfield, close to where I live, I have neighbours who are farming. Mr. Speaker, several years ago one of the large farmers in the area sold his land. He sold, as I recall it, six quarters. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that up until the time that sale took place, land was selling in the neighbourhood for \$300 an acre, but he sold to a non-resident. I don't know the arrangements; I wasn't privy to them, but it became common knowledge in that farming community in a matter of days. The sale price, Mr. Speaker, wasn't \$350 an acre; it was \$500 an acre. And who was the purchaser? Well, it was a non-resident; someone that lived in Italy apparently, and that land is now being rented.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me indicate a contrast. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is this incessant chatter over there demanding that non-residents control our farm land. I don't understand it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, let me contrast that situation with another one in the same rural municipality . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: One of these days you're going to hit your knees together and it'll hurt.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek settles down so that I can hear myself speaking, you know - and he is going to turn purple if he keeps getting so agitated.

Mr. Speaker, in that same rural municipality we have people who have come from overseas, have become landed immigrants and are farming, and they are welcome. That's the basis upon which this province was developed; people coming here to farm, but certainly agriculture won't be developed and enhanced by people coming here through lawyers and buying up our land and then renting it back to other people.

Mr. Speaker, that isn't the basis for healthy agriculture. Members on the opposite side of the Chamber know that, but they refuse to admit that that is fact. Well, Mr. Speaker, they have this fixation about land. Let's look at the record of some of the sales.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: We have a fixation about freedom; it's called freedom.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, let's look at the record of some of these speculative purchases in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, these are case histories compiled by the Agricultural Lands Protection Board. I want to put these on the record, Mr. Speaker.

Case No. 1: In recent years, an eastern Canadian lawyer has acquired 8,928 acres of prime agricultural

land valued at \$5.2 million. To finance the land deals, this individual enters into an agreement with another eastern Canadian lawyer who puts up all the money through a mortgage agreement. The lawyer in turn secures funding from the deals from offshore sources. That's one technique; that's 8,928 acres of prime land that no longer is under the control of Manitoba or Canadian farmers.

Mr. Speaker, Case No. 2: An eastern Canadian land dealer, who purchases in conjunction with offshore investors, has secured 7,031 acres of prime agricultural land valued at \$7.3 million.

Case No. 3: A former lawyer in British Columbia, who now resides full time in Europe, acquired 3,027 acres of prime agricultural land valued at \$2.5 million through his Manitoba corporation.

Sample Case No. 4: A Canadian land dealer, who has a Quebec address but resides most of the year in Europe, has purchased 5,060 acres of prime agricultural land valued at \$3.1 million through two corporations. To facilitate his transactions, he enters into an agreement with a resident of the province who negotiates with local farmers. In some cases, the local resident, through his numbered Manitoba holding company, buys and registers the property and then resells it to the other corporation. Observe the profits and hence the inflation of land prices involved in these corporate rollovers.

Mr. Speaker, let me digress - honourable members know something about corporate rollovers; even the Conservative Government in Ontario had to do something about corporate rollovers involving real estate in Toronto recently - but just hear it going on with this sample case (a): 745.39 acres were purchased by the holding company for \$375,000 and transferred to one of the two corporations for \$409,964 - you see, there's some slight increase there, Mr. Speaker, an increase of \$34,964, and you know how long it was, Mr. Speaker - two months later.

(b) 320 acres purchased by the holding company for \$131,000, and then transferred - not a year, not two years later - one month later to one of the two corporations for \$174,900, an increase of \$43,900 - \$43,900 in one month, Mr. Speaker, and that's good private enterprise; that's the kind of thing that honourable members opposite want to continue to fight and protect.

A MEMBER: They paid for it.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, they paid for it and the honourable member would want to know where the money came from. — (Interjection) — Yes, well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell doesn't care where money comes from as long as people pay money. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know his philosophy; all it takes is money, and money counts with the honourable member; not principle, just money.

Mr. Speaker, Case (c): 244.21 acres purchased by the holding company for \$84,000 and then transferred - how long, Mr. Speaker; take a guess - six days later to one of the two corporations for \$134,000; an increase of \$50,000 - \$50,000 in six days.

Mr. Speaker, these aren't imaginary examples. These are cases taken from the Agricultural Lands Protection Board's files.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's \$8,300 a day; that's more than Saul Cherniack makes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, obviously, to the members opposite, and I'll put this on the record, they are making light of these transactions. They think it's funny; they don't think it's a matter of concern. Well, Mr. Speaker, farmers in this province are concerned. I know that they're concerned; even Conservative farmers in this province are concerned about this, because it affects their livelihood.

Let's deal with sample case No. 5. A Manitoba lawyer has acquired and holds over 20,000 acres of farm land. The purchases have been made through a variety of numbered Manitoba companies. Moreover, several thousands of additional acres have been acquired and then transferred to landed immigrants - most of whom do not take up permanent residence in Manitoba. In many instances, prices paid for land by the numbered Manitoba companies exceed the going market prices in the local area. Mr. Speaker, it's a litany of inflation, of acquisition, without any intention to farm.

Sample case No. 6 — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to put on the record that the Member for Roblin-Russell thinks the whole question of foreign ownership of land in Manitoba is a joke. He derides me reading into the record, the fact of acquisitions of foreign corporations. Mr. Speaker, you know the honourable member now seeks to rise on a point of order . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . but he has been continually indicating that this is a funny situation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Member for Roblin-Russell on a point of order.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I never said that this bill was a joke or the farming industry in this province. I ask the honourable member to withdraw those remarks. I never made such an allegation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if I misinterpret the honourable member's heckling, his laughing, his derision of my comments, as something other than I should have interpreted, than I apologize to him. But the honourable member has continued to laugh, to heckle, to indicate that this has no meaning, no significance to the people of Manitoba, and I, Mr. Speaker, take that conduct, that attitude, as indicative of indifference on his part to this whole question.

Mr. Speaker, let me take another case. A Canadian land dealer, who resides most of the year abroad, has purchased 6,809 acres of farm land, valued at \$2.8 million, through a numbered Manitoba company. This individual buys land through her corporation, and in some cases, transfers this land to individuals who are

successful in obtaining landed immigrant status, but who do not necessarily take up residence in Manitoba. Substantial profit, and hence, escalation of land values is involved in these transfers.

Sample case No. 7: Another land dealer who has landed immigrant status has purchased in whole, or in one-half interest with the individual in sample case No. 6, 3,904 acres valued at \$2.2 million. Purchases by the land dealer in case No. 7 have been made through three numbered Manitoba companies. He, in turn, sells off land to offshore investors, who succeed in securing landed immigrant status but do not necessarily reside here.

Case No. 8: In 1979, a locally-based corporation acquired a parcel of farm land for \$462,000 or \$3,000 per acre. The land, over the next one-and-a-half years, was rolled over to related corporations in three successive transactions. The result is that that land escalated in value from \$462,000 in mid-1979 to \$939,400 by early 1981.

Case No. 9: In 1978, a section of land was sold to a land speculator, who resided in Ontario for \$600 an acre. It was sold to another corporation in 1980 for \$1,048 per acre and in 1981 was transferred to another corporation for \$1,125 per acre. In three years then, the land almost doubled in value. It might be noted that the latter corporation is controlled by a landed immigrant who resides abroad.

Mr. Speaker, these . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Why don't you do it on my house? Why don't you do it on my house?

HON. A. MACKLING: Now the Member for Sturgeon Creek, Mr. Speaker, continues to try to heckle me, making again light of the facts that I'm endeavouring to present to the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, if he is representative of the attitude of the Conservative Caucus in Manitoba, makes light of a very serious situation. A situation that confronts Manitoba farmers who are faced with ever-escalating land costs - not by farmers, Mr. Speaker, but by speculators - people who are affecting the ability of young people, particularly in Manitoba, to be able to acquire land and farm.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek and others, who continue to heckle, who continue to indicate a disinterest in this question, are putting themselves on record through me, because I'm recording their attitudes, Mr. Speaker, and that kind of attitude will be made known to the farmers of Manitoba come another election. Mr. Speaker, that kind of attitude, not only by the heckling, but by the honourable members opposite who have spoken, and who will dare to speak.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I looked at the remarks of the former Minister of Agriculture from the Conservative Government. He spoke on this resolution on December 16, 1982 and he indicates on Page 298 about a constituent who was concerned about selling his land, and he indicates that this constituent would have liked to have seen foreign buyers there, and he didn't disagree with that. Obviously, he would have liked to have seen foreign buyers there too. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Arthur associates himself with land speculation and that's what his speech indicates.

And then, Mr. Speaker, on page 299, not content with merely associating himself with land speculation, what does he say in the - let's see, it's the second paragraph. Then he takes a slap at civil servants. He says, ". . . but he is a typical person working for government. The more laws you have in legislation, the more regulations you have. The more you make the people come to you and sit before a board in judgment, the happier they are . . . "

That's the attitude of the Honourable Member for Arthur, Mr. Speaker. That's the attitude of that member, and I think it's typical, indicative of the attitude of most of the members opposite. Mr. Speaker, they think that this legislation is designed to frustrate people. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to protect the bona fide interests of agriculture in this province, and it's not unique legislation. It's not unique legislation.

We have similar legislation in other parts of Canada and why it's become necessary, even in provinces that have Conservative Governments and maintain that legislation, is because they know and appreciate that agriculture is an important industry in Canada and it must not be subject to the kind of international speculation, the kind of international laundering of money, the shifting values in society, where people want to find security in land values in Western Canada. Mr. Speaker, that attitude on their part just isn't good enough.

We have an obligation. We have an obligation. Certainly this government recognizes that obligation. In the constituencies of all members, including the members opposite, to ensure that kind of speculation doesn't continue. But, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members opposite continue to argue for the retention of an Act which obviously has not provided any protection to Manitoba farmers. That kind of speculation has taken place. It's not a figment of anyone's imagination, but do any honourable members rise in their place over there and say, yes, there are some weaknesses in the Act, and yes, you are right in tightening it up, but make this slight change here, or make a little change there and we will agree with it? No, Mr. Speaker. We haven't heard constructive criticism opposite; we've heard condemnation in total of any attempt to tighten up what is obviously a very loose Act and a very loose set of regulations, and so loose, Mr. Speaker, that Conservative-type organizations called upon the previous administration to do something about it - tighten up the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that advice, that concern, fell on deaf ears. Mr. Speaker, it continues. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, now we have another member, the Member for La Verendrye who obviously, because of the derisive remarks he's hurling across this Chamber at the present time, indicates a sympathy for land speculation in Manitoba which we do not share.

A MEMBER: Do you like drilling oil wells, Al? Is that called speculation or not?

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye on a point of order.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like the Minister to withdraw those remarks. If he'll read my speech, I put

my position clearly on the record with regard to foreign speculation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that the manner of his heckling, his attitude, while I'm speaking on this very important question, important to his constituents and all of the farmers in Manitoba, his attitude in this House indicates a derision of what I'm saying, indicates that he does not agree with my concerns about speculation. Now, he can say that he spoke in the House and said that he did not agree with speculation. Well, if he doesn't, he would show some empathy, some agreement, for the concerns that I'm making at this moment on that speculation.

Now, actions, Mr. Speaker, his actions, speak louder than his words. On the formal record he says he's against speculation. I say, that the honourable member is indicating in his attitude that it's the reverse. I have to accept the honourable member's words, but, Mr. Speaker, his actions belie his words and I wish that — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I have not said the honourable member believes in speculation. I have indicated that his actions indicate a sympathy for that. All right.

MR. R. BANMAN: I will get elected in my riding with this and this will not help you at all.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that he is not troubled by his position. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, here's another one of the techniques that the members of the opposition try to use. They try to set themselves up as defenders of rural interest. Well, Mr. Speaker, we haven't heard any vigorous defence of the interests of farmers in Manitoba in representations to this House on this bill, far from it. We've had the kind of representations by the former Minister of Agriculture, who in a backhanded kind of way indicates that he is all for a vigorous open market that involves speculation, involves foreign residence, being able to buy land, and that seems to typify the attitude of the Honourable Member for River Heights who just spoke. — (Interjection) —

Well, these are the facts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. Mackling: Now, the Honourable Member for Pembina is so irritated by my exposing his weakness, his ineptness, in respect to his position on this bill that now he's hurling personal insults to me. That doesn't trouble me, Mr. Speaker, because he knows in his own conscience that there is a serious problem here, and he is not prepared to address it. We are, Mr. Speaker, prepared to limit the amount of land that a non-resident can own. We want people in Manitoba that own the land to farm it, or if they don't farm it, if they own the land in Manitoba, that they reside in Manitoba. We've made provisions for exceptions, exceptions where there is an estate involved. We allow anyone to own 10 acres of land in Manitoba.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Isn't that nice. You'll allow me, isn't that lovely.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Al. Thank you.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . big brother has reserved the right to own 10 acres.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek in his ignorance of this Act says, well, Al, it's very generous of you, you'll let me own 10 acres. Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would take the time to talk to any of his colleagues that have read the bill, he will know that the Member for Sturgeon Creek can own all the land in the Province of Manitoba if he can afford to buy it, and that's the provisions of this bill we are making. We are going to allow the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, or the Honourable Member for La Verendrye to acquire all the land. — (Interjection) — Now, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has got a problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

HON. A. MACKLING: Certainly I will, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member that if my wife and family and I formed a corporation in Manitoba and wanted to purchase farm land under the name of that corporation, could we buy it?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if I were acting for the honourable member as a lawyer, I would advise him that pursuant to the Act, yes, he can establish a Manitoba corporation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: You're a damn poor lawyer then.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: But the provisions of the Act would have to be followed, and the majority of the shareholders would have to be involved in active farming.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we could spend the rest of the time that I have — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the

Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has but a passing interest in this legislation. He passed it over very quickly when it crossed his desk. The farmers in Manitoba have a very legitimate, a very concerned interest about foreign ownership of land in this province. It is not a matter that will pass lightly, politically or otherwise through this House. Mr. Speaker, the intent of this legislation is not to inhibit the ownership of property, but what it's designed to do is ensure that arable farm land in this province is available to Manitobans to farm at the behest of Manitobans, not at the behest of residents of Germany, or of New York, or of Rome, or wherever.

Mr. Speaker, those are our concerns. They are legitimate concerns about the rights of Manitobans to be able to farm, not today but generations ahead, that the young men and young women in Manitoba will be able to own the land. They will not be tenants of foreign residents because that is the way it is going, Mr. Speaker.

Organizations throughout Manitoba, not wild eyed radical organizations called upon government to do something about it. We're prepared to do something about it, Mr. Speaker. Honourable members opposite apparently are not.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill 12, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. (Stand)

BILL NO. 43 - THE TRANSPORTATION OF DANGEROUS GOODS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 43, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few remarks to Bill 43 today.

I'd like to make some general comments on the intention of the legislation as indicated by the Minister of Transportation when he introduced it.

This bill is part of a thrust initiated by the Federal Government in 1980, I believe, with the passage of federal legislation in July of 1980. The intent of this legislation as I understand it, and as was the planning process when we were government, was to adopt parallel legislation provincially, and parallel regulations provincially to the Federal Act to assure a uniformity in regulation of the transportation of dangerous goods across this country. Now the Minister has indicated that in introducing the bill, that is exactly what is to be accomplished.

Now, I have no major concerns with the bill, but I wish to put three basic principles on the record so that

the Minister might give us the assurance, when he closes debate, that these three major principles and concerns are addressed by this legislation.

No. 1, there must be uniformity of provision within this Act with the Federal Act; that includes, not only the Act itself, but indeed in terms of the regulations, as well.

Secondly, there must be uniformity of provision by this Act, and the accompanying regulations, between provincial jurisdictions. That is particularly important with this bill because it does regulate the transportation of dangerous goods on our highway systems which are under provincial jurisdiction; therefore, this Act must parallel the Act in neighboring provincial jurisdictions, all across Canada, I might add.

Thirdly, this Act must ensure an equitable inspection framework across Canada. The rules by which the inspectors involved in the search and inspection of the transportation and movement of dangerous goods must be the same between provinces, and indeed, they must be the same for a federal inspector as they are for a provincial inspector.

The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, I think is quite obvious and simple. You cannot develop a federal system of transportation, a national system of transportation, if you have different laws and regulations for the inspection of the movement of hazardous goods, or dangerous goods, between provincial jurisdictions within this country, so that uniformity is the key. Anything that is done in Bill 43, and the accompanying regulations, must be uniform with other provinces and with the Federal Act and regulations.

You cannot have a system whereby, in moving a truckload of hydrochloric acid from Alberta to Ontario by truck, by rail, you cannot have a circumstance where each province has different regulation, different inspection procedures, so that the carrier is put through several different types of regulations, and must meet several different types of requirements. They must be uniform to ensure the economical transport of those goods.

Now the Minister has indicated in the introduction of this bill that is the case; that, indeed, this legislation is to parallel federal legislation and the indication is implicit that it will also parallel provincial legislation.

In perusing the definitions I note, compared to the Federal Act, that there are some discrepancies in terms of definitions of several of the terms included in the Provincial Act versus the same definition in the Federal Act. We will be asking the Minister for clarification and any variance of a significant nature between the two definitions because, if there is a variation of significance, then the Minister has to explain why it's there and how it's going to meet with the broad goal of uniform and parallel legislation between federal and provincial jurisdictions.

Now, as a general philosophy on this bill, I don't think there's anyone who argues with it. What we are seeing expressed in this bill is, I would say, a universal concern for the safe transportation of dangerous goods within Canada, and indeed, hopefully, within the North American transportation system. That is a motive that we all aspire to, that we agreed to as members of the Council of Ministers responsible for highway transportation and safety over the course of the years 1978 through to 1981. There is no dispute with that

as a philosophical goal to be enshrined in legislation and in regulation. But we must bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that our modern society, with all of the benefits that it has conferred upon our people, the relative wealth, the status of well-being that our citizens enjoy in Canada, and in North America, and in the industrial areas of Canada are a result of the growth and development of a quite refined industrial and commercial industry in Canada. That industrial and commercial activity and industry does require the transportation and movement of hazardous commodities. Without them our industrial processes would grind to a halt and our standard of living would fall.

So that in reality what we've got here is a legislation that must gently walk the fine line between the ultimate effort of safety, which would mean no movement of any dangerous goods whatsoever, balanced off against the need of an industrial economy to have those goods moved. This legislation has attempted to be a balancing act between that, to assure general public safety in providing for the transportation by air, rail, by barge or marine service, and by highway transportation, the movement of those goods balanced off against the safety of the general public.

As I say, you could have the safest possible provisions enshrined in legislation on the movement of dangerous goods. You could prevent all dangerous goods from moving, but the net result would be a wind down of our industrial economy and a decrease in our standard of living. So this legislation is like a lot of legislation, it's a delicate balancing act between two opposing desires with the overall health of the economy having to be necessarily considered in development of the regulations.

I'm particularly pleased that in this bill there is a provision towards the end of the Act - at least I interpreted it as a provision - whereby the provincial Act will have an override feature over any municipal by-laws which may be passed to control the movement of dangerous goods. Now that would mean, for instance, that in a municipality or indeed in a city in the Province of Manitoba, they could develop a by-law, Mr. Speaker, which would effectively prohibit the movement of a dangerous commodity. When we get into the definition, and when people see the list of dangerous commodities, I think it will possibly alarm many people, because the list will contain many many commonly used and available products from gasoline through to various cleaning detergents, etc., etc., that will be labelled as dangerous goods and subject to the regulations and the provisions of this legislation.

So I'm pleased that the override provision is there, because you could have a situation develop in a city whereby they have a dispute for whatever reason with a major industrial concern who is manufacturing a given product which is classified as a dangerous good. They could develop regulations and by-laws to essentially shut down that industry and thereby blackmail them to meet other requirements that are not really part and parcel of the ongoing operation of that industry. So the provincial override provides the check and balance of an abuse of establishing by-laws which could be detrimental for other reasons than simply the deemed necessity to safeguard citizens from the transportation of dangerous goods.

Mr. Speaker, on the overall philosophy of the movement of dangerous goods, I think it's a topic that from time to time gets a lot of exposure. The derailment at Mississauga gave us lots of exposure. The derailment at MacGregor while we were in government was a matter of a great deal of concern; so was the derailment at Austin; so was the accident in the CPR rail yards last December, I believe, where the propane car exploded; that always focuses attention on the movement of dangerous goods. It is interesting and it's a blessing indeed that in all of those incidents where dangerous goods were involved in those accidents, there was no injury and no loss of life. I think that speaks well for the present emergency response set-up that we have in Canada. It can be improved, but certainly those four incidents indicate that indeed it is working quite well.

I think what we always have to bear in mind when we're talking about the movement of dangerous goods is that we do not overreact to some of the circumstances when they happen, because overreaction can cause long-run problems for our industrial economy in the country of Canada; and that's something that we all have to be very careful of, that we don't react to possibly very vocal pressure groups who are alarmed at given circumstances and given accidents such as we've seen over the past number of years.

To back that up, Mr. Speaker, I want to put on the record some interesting analysis done by the Western Transportation Advisory Council. This is in the January-March, 1983 newsletter from Westac, and the headline or the title of the article is, "Dangerous Goods Movement Calculated Risk."

The article says, "The movement of dangerous goods through populated areas continues to be a subject of popular concern in several Canadian cities and towns. All major centres in Western Canada need certain hazardous materials to maintain and expand their industrial bases. In each centre public debate may strongly influence where dangerous goods, processing, transportation, and handling facilities are cited and how they are operated."

Westac conducted a study, Mr. Speaker, in Calgary and they attempted to show in this study through a statistical analysis of the comparison of risk of the transportation of dangerous goods to other commonly held occupations. They have used as selected activities, for instance, coal mining, wherein an individual undertakes some 1,600 hours per year of work employed in the coal mining industry. The comparison of the risk is given in deaths per year, that being a 1 million person exposure, and the calculation is on the basis of a 1 million exposure in deaths per year. Coal mining has a 330 deaths per million per year. The basic risk for an average Calgary resident, regardless of occupation, regardless of what he's doing at any particular time of the day or night, is 230 deaths per 1 million; motor vehicles: using those motor vehicles 300 hours per year, there is a risk of 220 fatalities per million exposure; fire is 31 deaths per million; drowning 28 per million; Canadian air travel, 20 trips on a major carrier per year involves 12 deaths per million.

Here's the interesting note. Hazardous rail shipments, CP rail yards subdivision in Calgary, the deaths per million on a yearly basis is 3.3; that's one one-hundredth of the death rate in coal mining. Hazardous rail

movement in Calgary in general is down to .2 fatalities on a yearly basis per million of people exposure. So you can see that in relative terms, I believe the risk due to the movement of hazardous goods or dangerous goods is a much overrated risk. It is one that catches the headlines at time to time with the Mississauga and the MacGregor incidents, but in terms of exposure to risk and death, it certainly rates much much below a lot of other normal occupations that every citizen across this country engages in. So I think, when we pass legislation and when we develop regulations, that we must be very cognizant of this.

In closing - and we're willing to let this bill go to committee with the Minister closing debate - I would offer two comments. Mr. Shafransky, a former MLA in this House, is I believe the Legislation Analyst for dangerous goods. It was told to us by one of his former colleagues in the New Democratic Party that if Mr. Shafransky is handling the Legislation Analysis of the Transportation of Dangerous Goods in the Province of Manitoba he doesn't think the province will be any longer safe to live in. That's a comment that I would like to leave with members opposite. I know not on what basis the former MLA NDP would have made those comments about Mr. Shafransky.

The other one I'd like to point out; this one is for my honourable friend, the Member for Inkster. I would note that in Clause No. 2(2) of the Act: "This Act does not apply to the transportation of dangerous goods that are under the sole direction or control of the Minister of National Defence for Canada." I might wonder how the Member for Inkster with his anti-military stance ever allowed that to be part and parcel of this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to make a few comments. We will look forward to the Minister closing debate on this, and we will look forward to committee perusal of the Act.

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

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 51 THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES ELECTION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 51, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My remarks will be brief; I've had the chance to look over Bill 51. As the Minister had indicated when he was explaining this bill, he said the changes proposed establish final dates rather than commencement dates for the enumeration, revision and final completion of the list of electors.

Of course, we realize that this fall there will be general elections held in all the the municipalities throughout

Manitoba. As I understand it, this will be an important change, particularly for the larger urban municipalities, where they do find it difficult to commence enumerations in the month of June as the present Act now states. So the changes, as we see it will be - it just spells out when the enumeration has to be completed. We don't have any reason to hold this bill up and are prepared to move it along to committee at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 18, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

MR. G. MERCIER: I would suggest you call Bill 55.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Acting Government House Leader indicate the next item of business, if it is not to be Private Members' Hour?

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the honourable members are ready to go with Bill 55.

BILL NO. 55 THE LEGISLATION ASSEMBLY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 55, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't see how I can possibly support this bill, Bill No. 55, that's now before us. Mr. Speaker, the reasons are many. Mr. Speaker, I wonder when the day in this House that people who are elected to this Chamber don't have to go back to the public trough and ask for the taxpayers to bail them out with legislation such as we have before us.

When, Mr. Speaker, do the members opposite, the socialists, recognize what an honour, what a privilege, and what a dedication it is to be elected to come to this place and express yourself here on behalf of all of the people of Manitoba without having to go to the public trough of legislation, such as we have before us in this?

Mr. Speaker, there are many members of this Legislature who have given of their souls and they've given up their business. I used to operate a couple of grocery stores, Mr. Speaker, before I came to this Legislature. I never asked this Legislature to go back and bail me out for my business when I was in it. I found it an honour and a privilege, and I was dedicated to come here with the salaries and the wages that were offered to me and do my best in this place, Mr. Speaker.

The people of Roblin and Russell - and it's now Roblin-Russell constituency - Mr. Speaker, have seen fit to send me back time and time again, not needing this type of help from the taxpayers to keep me elected and keep me looking after the people that I've had the honour to represent for all those years.

I know how the socialists operate and I understand how they like to go and get the greed and get the taxpayers to prop up their philosophy with propaganda, ill true statements, quarter truths, etc., etc. Here's a classic example, Mr. Speaker, for them to go all out at the expense of the taxpayers of this province. I'll spell it out, Mr. Speaker, in more specific terms when the bill comes up.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, may I ask the members opposite, let's fight the next election on this bill? You put it on your election literature and we'll put it on ours. Let's let the people decide. Is that a deal?

A MEMBER: It's a deal.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: It's a deal over here. It's a deal, because we won't be buying it, but let's try that on for size for a starter.

As the Member for Virden espoused here yesterday, let's tell the people of the next election and hold this bill off, all these retroactive clauses that are in this bill, and go to the people on this one next time around and see what happens. I suspect . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour.

When this bill is next before the House the honourable member will have 37 minutes remaining.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. 11 - UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

MR. SPEAKER: The first item is Private Members' Resolutions.

Resolution No. 11, the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Thompson, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who has 20 minutes remaining.

Can any member advise whether the Minister is on his way?

The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, the member is unable to be here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will then lose his opportunity to speak on this resolution.

The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Monsieur le président, cette résolution présentée en chambre ou introduite en chambre par le député de Thompson veut le support de l'assemblée manitobaine sur deux points précis.

Ce support est voulu pour marquer notre position à tous les frais supplémentaires imposés directement à

ceux qui ont recours à des services dans le domaine de la santé. Que ce soit des facturations supplémentaires imposées par les médecins ou des frais modérateurs imposés par les hôpitaux ou les gouvernements, pour des soins dans les hôpitaux, ou toute autre prime imposée pour des soins en santé. Deuxièmement, cette résolution demande que le gouvernement fédéral, au gouvernement fédéral, de maintenir le niveau de financement envers le programme des soins en santé à travers le Canada. Nous savons que le gouvernement fédéral a, de façon unilatérale, réduit son financement aux provinces. Et les révisions qu'ils se préparent à présenter à l'Acte sur la santé doivent nous inquiéter beaucoup.

Dans cette résolution donc, pardon, cette résolution est des plus pertinentes et des plus importantes à ce temps ici alors que partout au Canada les gouvernements provinciaux coincés par la récession, l'inflation, par la baisse dans les revenus, sont à leur tour à chercher à faire comme le gouvernement central; c'est à dire, ils cherchent des moyens pour ne pas avoir à assumer le coût total des soins en santé à même le trésor provincial.

Au Manitoba, un certain nombre de médecins ont opté pour fonctionner en dehors du système Medicare chaque fois qu'un patient visite un de ces médecins ou qu'il reçoit des soins de ces derniers, il reçoit aussi une facture plus élevée que le remboursement fourni par Medicare. Ce genre de pratique ou toute autre pratique similaire, pour le député qui intervient, je signale que j'ai bien dit pour ces médecins qui ont optés pour fonctionner en dehors du système, ce genre de pratique ou toute autre pratique similaire tente de décourager les gens de s'avérer des services en santé dont ils ont besoin. Les mesures déjà implantées ou présentement contemplées dans certaines provinces font atteintes au système Medicare. En temps que représentant élu, le devoir nous incombe de protéger le droit de tous les citoyens canadiens aux meilleurs services possibles dans le domaine de la santé.

Le système Medicare canadien est le plus progressif qui soit et fait l'envie de nos voisins vers le sud. Vous savez comme moi, sans doute, pour l'avoir lu dans un article qui paraissait dans le Free Press la semaine dernière, dans lequel on faisait état d'une campagne de souscriptions pour un jeune enfant d'Ile-des-Chênes, ici au Manitoba, qui doit subir une intervention au coeur; et pour obtenir ce soin spécialisé on doit l'amener aux Etats-Unis. L'article indiquait qu'il en coûtera au total soixante mille dollars, soixante mille j'ai dit dont deux mille par jour pour des soins intensifs, alors qu'ici au Manitoba les soins intensifs coûtent moins de trois cents dollars par jour. Présentement l'accès universel aux soins en santé est menacé et à moins d'efforts déterminés de la part de tous les niveaux de gouvernement, le système Medicare canadien va sombrer face à tous ces assauts.

Si on fait un retour en arrière pour un moment, on se souviendra que le système Medicare dont nous jouissons au Canada date depuis 17 ans et remonte au système inauguré par le gouvernement CCF de T.C. Douglas en Saskatchewan, lors de son premier mandat entre 1944 et 1948. Pourquoi avait-on adopté un système, un système personnel dans le domaine de la santé, un système universellement accessible à tous les Canadiens. Et bien, parce que l'on avait reconnu que

les services médicaux sont un droit fondamental qui ne doit jamais dépendre sur le statut économique de la personne.

L'accès à des services médicaux de premier ordre, l'accès à l'éducation et à la justice ne peuvent pas être comme un luxe dans une société dite moderne et qui dispose des ressources pour fournir de tels services. A un temps, bien sûr, certains décriaient Medicare comme étant purement du socialisme. Ce terme était utilisé de façon dérogatoire bien sûr.

G.S. Woodsworth n'a-t-il pas été accusé d'être socialiste-communiste pour avoir présenté un projet de loi sur les pensions de vieillesse. Qui sont les gens qui n'ont jamais vu Medicare d'un bon oeil? Ce sont, premièrement, des gens étroits qui croient que les services sont disponibles à tout le monde en autant qu'ils peuvent se les payer. Deuxièmement, des gens en bonne santé. Troisièmement, des gens qui n'ont pas le sens de justice sociale et qui croit dans le Darwinisme, concept qu'ils appliquent aux sociétés modernes.

Dernièrement, nous entendons des échos de la droite comme suit: il faut baisser les taxes, augmenter les services, empêcher les abus, abolir les dettes, etc. Ce sont des beaux principes. Mais comment peut-on être sincère et logique et énoncer ces principes de façon générale dans une même phrase? Déjà nous avons des preuves de l'érosion graduelle de Medicare. A un rassemblement de valeureux conservateurs, un orateur premier ministre d'une riche province se fait applaudir chaudement pour s'en être pris à Medicare et son caractère universel.

En Colombie Britannique, on demande des frais annuels de 384 par famille. Et ce n'est que les débuts. On parle maintenant d'imposer des frais journaliers pour ceux qui ont le malheur de se trouver dans un lit d'hôpital.

Pensez-vous qu'un lit d'hôpital est une chambre de motel où les gens relaxent tout comme s'ils étaient en vacances? En Alberta, province riche, la plus riche au Canada, un autre gouvernement conservateur exige que chaque famille paie 494 par année pour leur assurance médicale. Multimillionnaire ou simple travailleur, c'est la même chose. Dans sa grande magnanimité, ce charitable gouvernement conservateur offre une assistance financière à ceux qui ont un revenu faible, c'est à dire ceux qui gagnent moins de 4 000 par année auront à payer seulement 50% des frais réguliers. Quelle charité! Quelle compassion!

Et maintenant, en Alberta encore, on se propose d'introduire des frais de 20 par jour pour des gens malades qui n'ont pas le choix d'aller à l'hôpital. Juste tout dernièrement, dans un article qui paraissait dans le Globe and Mail, le ministre de la santé de l'Alberta, face au fait justement qu'un montant considérable de cette assurance n'aurait pas été collecté l'année dernière, se proposait de couper les services médicaux à ceux là qui n'auront pas payé leur prime.

Où s'en vont-ils ces vénérables parlementaires albertains, 20 par jour, l'année prochaine ce chiffre grimpera peut-être à 50 et à ce rythme, dans quelques années on exigera peut-être 100 par jour pour un patient, d'un patient pour un lit d'hôpital. Une fois embarqués dans cette voie néfaste, qui aura-t-il pour arrêter cette course? Surtout que maintenant on invite déjà les compagnies d'assurance privées à revenir dans le domaine de l'assurance pour les soins de santé.

Visent-ils les tarifs américains où l'entreprise privée bat son plein. Au sud de la frontière des frais variant entre 500 et 2 000 par jour, ne sont pas rares. Après tout, il faut bien que les actionnaires de nos compagnies multinationales propriétaires des hôpitaux soient récompensés pour avoir bien voulu investir dans ces entreprises si profitables. Voilà, au sud de la frontière canado-américaine, on gère les hôpitaux comme on gère une compagnie de pétrole. Premièrement, des profits pour récompenser les investisseurs et ensuite oui ensuite les services en santé. Est-ce que c'est ce système que certains veulent recommencer au Canada. Laissons parler les faits. En Ontario, encore une, encore une province conservatrice, une famille, c'est à dire deux ou plus, doit payer 680 par année pour être éligible au programme Medicare, 680 par année. Il est évident que pour certains ces quelques 57 par mois ne veulent rien dire, mais pour bien d'autres, c'est beaucoup d'argent et dans bien des cas, c'est déjà un montant qu'ils n'ont pas pour se payer même un petit luxe de temps en temps.

Qui sont les gens qui utilisent nos services médicaux le plus? Evidemment, ce sont les personnes âgées, les personnes handicapées, les personnes atteintes d'une maladie chronique et des gens souffrant de blessures ou de maladies causées par le travail ou à l'endroit du travail. Certains disent qu'il y en a qui abusent des services médicaux, il y en a certainement un certain nombre qui visitent leur médecin sans que cela soit nécessaire. Alors exigera-t-on que les médecins soient plus sévères envers ces personnes, qui d'ailleurs ne sont pas difficile à trouver. Lorsque l'on trouve une pomme gâtée dans une boîte, est-ce que l'on jette toute la boîte pour résoudre le problème de la pomme gâtée? Non, cependant, ceux qui veulent détruire Medicare sous prétexte d'empêcher quelques abus, font justement cela. Même si on impose des facturations supplémentaires ou des frais modérateurs aux malades imaginaires, ces derniers continueront à faire leur visite régulière au médecin.

Peut-on vraiment parler d'abus lorsqu'il s'agit des séjours dans les hôpitaux? Et si oui, qui est à blâmer? N'est-il pas nécessaire pour être admis à l'hôpital qu'un médecin donne son autorisation? Quelles sont les conséquences des tarifs mensuels, des facturations supplémentaires et toute autre forme de frais modérateurs. Evidemment, ceux qui ont de l'argent continueront à recevoir des services de première qualité par contre ceux qui en ont moins devront se priver ou attendre plus longtemps et parfois laisser une maladie progresser au point où il en coûtera plus cher pour guérir, ou bien dans certains cas il sera sûrement trop tard.

On sait maintenant qu'il est possible dans la majeure partie des cas de traiter un cancer à condition qu'on le découvre assez tôt. Mais s'il faut payer des frais pour un test ou un examen, combien de gens attendront plus longtemps pour se rendre chez le médecin? Probablement qu'ils attendront jusqu'à ce que la douleur devienne si forte qu'ils n'arrivent plus à la supporter, mais alors il sera aussi trop tard.

Les économies, si on veut en faire, se trouvent dans la prévention, une meilleure utilisation de nos ressources et si les gouvernements sont sérieux lorsqu'ils parlent de réduire les coûts, il leur faut chercher ailleurs des solutions. D'abord par des lois plus sévères, ils peuvent

dés maintenant assurer un environnement plus sain et plus sûr. Il faut arriver à contrôler et à disposer des produits chimiques, par exemple, qui sont déjà, nous le savons bien, causent de maintes maladies dans la société, de maladies industrielles qui touchent non seulement les travailleurs mais toute personne, ou même dans les quartiers résidentiels de nos villes.

Monsieur le président, une société qui se dit chrétienne, juste et moderne ne peut pas permettre d'avoir un système de justice pour les riches et un pour les pauvres. Elle ne doit pas avoir un système d'éducation supérieur pour certains et moindre pour les autres. Enfin, elle ne doit pas avoir un système de santé qui offre des traitements médicaux à ceux qui disposent des dollars et des services à la "soup line" pour les autres. Les fonds pour le maintien du système Medicare doivent continuer à venir des taxes générales, sinon nous regressons au temps passé où il y avait un système de soins pour les riches et un tout autre pour les pauvres. Merci, Monsieur le président.

(English Translation to follow in Vol. XXXI No. 71A)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on this resolution and welcome the opportunity that the resolution affords all members of the House to express their views and some of their concerns and maybe offer a few suggestions to how something that has evolved over the years, namely, the health care system, has provided and stood in good stead for the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada and provided us with one of the best systems and one of the best health care that I think any country around the world has. I know many many countries - people who visit here - are envious of our particular system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that I was a member of a government for four years who dealt with this health care situation, and I'm proud to have been a member of that government who acted very responsibly in that particular field. The record, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself.

However, I want to say to members opposite that when I ran for election in 1973 one of the biggest things that was used by the New Democrats, by the socialists, was don't vote for the Tories, because if the Tories get in they'll introduce health care premiums. Then in 1977, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . decided that they would use the same scare tactics. So in 1977, it was like history repeating itself. They, once again, went through my constituency and all the constituencies in Manitoba and said, "You elect those bad Tories, they're going to have health premiums." Mr. Speaker, after four years of Tory Government, did we have health care premiums? No. However, Mr. Speaker, in 1981, when we ran, what did they say? - "Elect those Tories and they're going to introduce health care premiums."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in Brandon, I understand it's the Brandon-Souris by-election. They say, "It's those

terrible Tories. You elect them in Manitoba, they'll introduce health care premiums." Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the record is clear; my record is clear in this House. If the members want to persist in that type of scare tactic, I want to tell you that the people of Manitoba have already figured this one out.

Let me deal with a few things. The Member for Radisson, who just spoke, said some interesting things and I'd like to deal with a few of them. One of the things he mentioned was that it cost from \$500 to \$2,500 in the States now to have somebody in a hospital, and he suggested the reason for that was because private companies were involved and everybody had to show a profit. I wonder if the Member for Radisson could tell me what it costs to keep a person in Manitoba in an intensive care unit.

MR. G. LECUYER: \$280.00.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, to keep a person in an intensive care unit, if he says \$280, he's way, way out. What I say to the members opposite, one of the problems we have with the health care system in Manitoba is that a lot of people don't really realize what the costs are. I have been an advocate for many years to send people who have a lengthy stay in a hospital, or at sometime spend some time in a hospital, had major surgery, or had their gall bladder out, or whatever, send them a copy of what the bill would have been should they have had to pay for it, because that would drive the point home to the people, the amount of money that the medical system is costing. We, in this Legislature, have to at one time or another grapple with that, whether we are in Cabinet or the backbench, we have to grapple with the costs.

The Minister of Health several days ago announced that they're going to be moving to try and get mothers who have not had any complications in childbirth, move them out of the hospital bed a little sooner to try and cut some costs provided that the mother is capable of going home and that there haven't been any complications. I have no argument with that, Mr. Speaker. But we all have to be cognizant of the costs, and to constantly talk about free Medicare, we have almost lulled the people into believing that it doesn't cost anything to stay in the hospitals.

I would suggest to the members opposite if they want to do something positive, let's show a person who has had a gall bladder operation what the surgery has cost, his seven days in the hospital, and what the real cost has been to the taxpayer, so that person can go home and show his family and say, look, isn't this a good system? If I hadn't had the coverage, I wouldn't have had it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the opposition is constantly being accused of not being positive. I don't know what the cost would be on something like that, but I think it would be something which would help the public relate the costs of what really health care is. Because it really isn't free; we're all paying for it in one form or another. Mr. Speaker, I make that point.

As I mentioned before, my particular stand, the government that I was a part of, their record speaks for themselves. But I do not appreciate the type of scare tactics that members opposite attribute to me

with regard to this particular resolution and the thing that motivates it. If we were to believe this type of scare tactic - I know in 1977 when we ran, and they used the scare tactics and, of course, they also indicated that personal care homes would be shut down - they had some of the old people really believing that should the Tories be elected in October of 1977, you were going to be able to go to the personal care homes the next day and see everybody being thrown out of the personal care homes. That's how they had some people all excited. Mr. Speaker, I have to say to members opposite that their scare tactics with regard to the Tories introducing Medicare premiums in Manitoba is an old falsehood, and the First Minister knows that. Every time there's an election - in the last three that I've been involved in personally - they've used that tactic and we see it rearing its ugly head in Brandon-Souris again. Every time they run, that's what happens, so let's put that to rest. If they want to use it next time - fine.

I want to give an example of what happens when this particular government, on the one hand, uses that scare tactic, and once gains control what they really do. I think a classic example dealing with what they say on the one hand and what they really do when they're there are the personal care homes.

We had debates in this House. We had the Member for Transcona, who in one year got the - what do they call this - the sleaziest gimmick award for his irresponsible treatment of the health care system, especially the personal care system in this province. I want to say to members opposite that your track record with regard to what you said in opposition and what you're doing now with personal care homes in the Province of Manitoba is one that you should really look at.

I want to make an analogy here between what they say when they're in opposition and what they really do in government. We're talking about the health care system. We're talking about the system totally dealing with the elderly, the people who can't look after themselves, people in extended care units, which is really an extension of our hospital system, because if we did not have those particular facilities they would be taking up acute care beds, and that has been of course another problem that we're faced with.

On January 6, 1982, the NDP Government increased the rates for the personal care homes by 50 cents because of a system that was established which automatically saw the rates increase every three months. They, however, went ahead and rescinded that, saying that it wasn't fair, and that they were going to review the whole system of how they were going to deal with personal care homes. So then on March 20th, they increased it by 60 cents a day; then on June 19th, a few months later, again, it was increased again by some 30 cents; on November 1st, they increased it by 35 cents; on February 1st, three months later, they increased it by another 35 cents; and now on May 1st, three months later, they have increased it again. Their track record, even though they were against the quarterly system of imposing new rates on personal care homes is such, Mr. Speaker, that on the one hand they said it was a terrible thing to do, the elderly couldn't afford it. Given the reigns of government, they went ahead and increased it. Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, if we want to really talk about the facts here, the facts

of life are that this particular government, when they were in opposition, chastised the then government for any cost-saving things that were trying to be done with regard to health care in the Province of Manitoba.

Now, half a year later, all they're trying to do, according to the words of the Minister of Health, is maintain the system. Maintain what system, Mr. Speaker? Maintain the system that was in place. So if it was that bad when we had it, why is he trying to maintain it?

So, Mr. Speaker, they consider themselves the champions of the poor downtrodden, and I want to say to them that the majority of Manitobans have seen through that, and they will of course work on that in the next election. But this government, when in opposition, criticized the increases on personal care homes. They had given the authority; they have had four increases in less than a year.

Now, I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, what I believe. I believe the NDP in their scare tactics with regard to the health premiums in this province really want to keep that scare going to try and keep people frightened and keep them from voting for the Tories so that they can elect them again in the next election, so that they can introduce health premiums. Because I think really in the back of their minds they are looking at ways of saving money. I think the Manitoba NDP Party is secretly thinking about introducing premiums to the people of Manitoba; that's what I think they're doing. Mr. Speaker, their track record is clear with what they've done to personal care homes.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the members opposite are in a position which the Manitoba people are reading through very clearly. We all remember sitting here and them screaming about bed sheets, remember that?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Two strips of bacon.

MR. R. BANMAN: Two strips of bacon - the First Minister was yelling about two strips of bacon. We had people, who are now government, just really chastising the way the health system was being carried on. Now, we have the Minister of Health saying, I'm trying to maintain the system.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Two strips of bacon looked pretty good.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe, as I said at the outset, that the tactics of the NDP are not one of real concern for the health care system in this province. They are really concerned with only one thing, and that's the re-election and the power that they get from that re-election. It has been demonstrated, the system that we left them was in good shape. There were no premiums, and yet they persist in saying we're going to introduce premiums, and they are saying it again in Brandon-Souris in the by-election, I understand.

So, Mr. Speaker, the record is clear, their record is clear, and I have to say to members opposite that the pensioners, the people in the personal care homes, and the people involved in receiving health care benefits from the province realize that system is in place and that system is functioning very well. That system has been developed over the last 30 years in this particular

province, and that all of us on this side of the House are concerned with the maintenance of that particular system.

The members opposite profess to have all kinds of unique ideas. I have to say that I have suggested one to them where they could make people probably more aware of what real costs are, and we get away from that sort of free Medicare syndrome which we all face and would help make people more responsible.

There are many other areas which I'm sure the Minister of Health is looking into, things which he will have to deal with. Health costs will in the future continue to rise, not because of just wage settlements or increased construction costs, but because modern medicine is moving ahead. There are so many more procedures that can be done when you're involved in surgery and other things. There are many more tests; there is much more new equipment coming out and these things all cost money. So we are looking not at reducing health care costs in the future, and I suggest to you that health care costs will continue to rise because of advancements in modern science.

I sum up by saying and repeating - because I've heard this story repeated to me time and time again - I suppose the next time when I run they'll get up and they'll say, well, you elect those Tories and you're going to have health care premiums. I was part of a government for four years that didn't introduce them. They have been playing that old record about the health care premium scare for many years.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And it's wearing out by now.

MR. R. BANMAN: I want to say to members opposite that the maintenance of the system is important. We maintained it when we were government; we will maintain it when we are in government next time. No amount of scare tactics and trying to fool the people on this issue will work next time. They know where they stand, they know where this government stands, and they know what are policies are. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to say a few words on this resolution. Let me start out with saying, first of all, that I find I believe one of the most essential things that we should have in a free and just society is a Medicare system which is fair to all. I'm not saying that there shouldn't be some recognition of the fact that it costs money, and I think that the issue that the Member for La Verendrye raised that maybe there should be a bill to indicate what people have to pay would not hurt except it would cost extra. There would be more administration, and, since we're trying to keep costs down, this would be a further cost to the system.

Now, in respect to the cost to the system, I think that we have to look at ways and means of changing our values and of changing our system of operation in order to achieve those cuts in costs. First of all, the people that can really achieve some of that is the profession, the medical profession, is the one that really has control of some of our costs in respect to the cost

of Medicare, that is, the system of health delivery. The fee for service is one of the most expensive ways of doing this system. I think we have to look at changing the values in our society where we can look at a communal form of offering this system, whereby some of the consultative fees that are now being paid 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 times would be eliminated, because the person would go through a clinic where there would be a number of specialists that would not all charge separately. They would only charge them for the patient once for coming through there. I think this is one of the things that we can look at.

I should like to say that I was a little annoyed at the Honourable Member for La Verendrye at saying that they are for this system, and they have no desire to change it, and they are going to maintain it. I have to remind him that I was here when this system, because of the efforts of the Federal Government to have a universal health care system and because of the cost-sharing, forced the Provincial Government to bring it in, which was the Conservative Government at that time. They brought it in; they were dragged into the 20th Century, but they did institute premiums at that time. It was the New Democratic Government after '69 which did away with the premiums. So the honourable member doesn't have much to crow about the record of his party in respect to premiums.

Let me also say to him and to all his colleagues that we have a very good example of what Conservatives do around the country. We do have the record of some of their candidates for leadership going around and saying, just like Peter Pocklington said - I think I read it in today's paper - where he would abolish Medicare outright for 85 percent of the population. So this is the example that we have to worry about.

We also have the example of what is in existence in all of the Conservative provinces at the present time.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: We'll hold you responsible for everything Mr. Martin says.

MR. P. FOX: We have, for example, Alberta, which is one of the richest provinces, proposing \$20 a day for hospital stay. I would like to ask those politicians in Alberta whether anyone desires or wants to be in a hospital or does it happen simply as an unfortunate accidental cause. No one wants to be sick, no one desires to go to a hospital; yet those people who do become ill, whether they can afford it or not, will now be punished further. Besides being ill, besides having something wrong with them, they are now going to be charged a deterrent fee. That is not all that is happening in Alberta. They are also raising the premiums there and they are quite substantial.

I should like to say that the other province which is even richer than Alberta - Ontario - has boosted its — (Interjection) — Yes, in quantity, not quality - has boosted its premiums as well. Again, that is a Conservative province. So what kind of an example do we have from Conservatives, that wherever they are, they are charging people premiums! On top of that they wish to have deterrent fees.

Mr. Speaker, one of the important things to realize about deterrent fees is that it affects those who are at the bottom of the economic ladder. Let me explain

to you one little item which is overlooked before you apply deterrent fees. Everyone who is a worker, who works for an hourly wage, if he takes off an hour, he loses an hour's pay. He doesn't need a deterrent fee; he's already got one, and consequently, many many people, workers, delay in getting medical attention which they deservedly should have. They keep putting it off and consequently they get into a critical situation where they cannot often be helped or, if they can be helped, it takes a long long time and is much more expensive. I think what we have to do is provide a system of care where people will be adequately protected, where they can utilize it without any deterrent. I mean not just deterrent that is provided by the hospitals or by the system, but also deterrents from their place of employment because when they are ill, it takes a lot more money for them to get well, and it also takes a lot more of their resources to get them back on the road to health.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that as a Canadian I am proud that we have instituted this system. I want to say, also, about the only other place that I'm aware of where they have a totally free Medicare system is New Zealand. I want to tell you also that there are many places in Europe

A MEMBER: Not free; it's not free here.

MR. P. FOX: I agree. It's not free, but it should be available as freely as possible to everyone because only the rich are the ones who can say that they can afford it at any time. The ordinary working people cannot. As I was starting to say, it's not free, that's true, but nevertheless it's accessible. It should be accessible to everyone and to anyone because sickness, illness has no boundaries. It doesn't ask whether you are rich, whether you are poor, or whether you are coloured or anything else and, consequently, it should be available to all. I believe we as Canadians should strive to make it accessible to all. We should pay for it out of our general consolidated fund. There should be no premiums; there should be no hindrance; there should be no deterrents because, Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out earlier, the deterrent for working people is already there.

I want to indicate something else which we are probably not too often aware of, and that is, the people who are using the system more than anyone else are those who are better educated, those who have a little more resources. If there's any abuse to the system, I say you can't blame the people who are going there asking for advice, saying they don't feel well. You should put it on the profession. The profession should be the one who should discipline whether there are abuses to the system. The person who is a malingering should be told so. The person who believes he is ill and isn't necessarily physically ill may be mentally ill. He, too, has a sickness and that should be recognized instead of giving him some tranquilizers and sent home and told to come back again in two weeks' time or three weeks' time as so often is the case.

I'm certain that if the medical profession would have a hard look at the system of delivery that they have, they could probably improve upon it. A fee for service, Mr. Speaker, is not necessarily the best way to provide

this care. Again I say, Mr. Speaker, I think we should be careful as to how we proceed with our Medicare system. We should cherish it, because as I said, the matter of becoming ill knows no boundaries; knows no character; knows no creed or anything else. Anyone can become ill, and consequently they should have the best attention available.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a rare privilege to speak on this legislation. I was in the Legislature like some of the members here today when Medicare became part and parcel of the statutes of this province. I was just reminiscing with my Leader here as to what the costs of Medicare were in those days. If my memory serves me correctly - I could be corrected - it was well under \$50 million. The federal paid half and we paid half.

Of course, the health system was built up by the Roblin Government. Hospitals were built all over this province and they expanded, you know, and for I daresay most of those hospitals are still in place in this province today, Mr. Speaker. So there is certainly no quarrel with myself or, I'm sure members of our caucus about the resolution that's before us. But I certainly have some concerns about the way in which this health delivery system costs are escalating. We are this year looking at a budget of a billion - it's over \$1 billion. That's \$1,000 whether you call it free or not, for every man, woman and child in this province.

I think that we in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, this government and others that are going to be sitting in the benches, the Treasury Benches of this province are going to have to deal with this problem very, very quickly because otherwise it's going to break this province. We can't afford in my short few years in this Legislature, escalating costs of that magnitude with the resources that we have in this province.

I suspect, like the Member for La Verendrye raised in the debate on this resolution this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that we can do a lot of things. We can do a lot of things to find out where are the problems with this system and it's an excellent system. It's worked well. There's no member that I know of this Legislature or any person in this province would stand up on a political platform anyplace and try and speak against the health delivery system that we're speaking about in this resolution.

But there are problems there and the problems are getting more and more serious as I stand here this afternoon. I think it would be an excellent idea if the Government of the Day or the Minister of Health would somehow, with the computer system and the accounting facilities that we have in our society today, be able to hand the patient when he leaves the hospital a bill of what services he got. In a lot of cases, we don't even know what service we're getting out of this health delivery system today.

I go to the hospital and I get medication, or my neighbor does. You come back home, you feel fine. You don't even know what actually happened there or what drugs were administered or what it was all about.

The doctor will talk to you, and the nurse will talk to you in a certain language. Well, that's the way it is.

I suspect that in the administration of the system, Mr. Speaker, there are some problems. There are some expensive problems in the administration of our health delivery system in this province, and we had better start dealing with it because if we don't we're going to end up like the people in the Old Country, in England. You know what happened to their system. It was much similar to the one that we have in this province.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I'm told by people that come back and forth - I met a gentleman the other day, who said if you really want to get health care or a health delivery for your family in the Old Country, in England today you better go to the private entrepreneur because the national system can't meet the demands of the public. I don't know the problems in the Old Country, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not a knowledgeable person in the field. I only know what people are telling me. I've heard that on several occasions, and I'm taking it to be factual.

I was in the Old Country four years ago. In fact, I was there when Margaret Thatcher was elected luckily, and was able to sit in Westminster and heard that charming lady make her maiden speech in Westminster. But, Mr. Speaker, there are problems with this system and it's a reasonably new system. It's in my lifetime, in this Legislature, that this health delivery system has been brought into the spectrum of our great country, Canada. So naturally it's going to have problems.

It's got problems today. The Federal Government's got problems with it and I think that we have to work at it and work hard and work long to try and take some of the wrinkles out of the system that prevails in this country today because, on the one hand, the Minister of Health stood in his place last night and told us in the committee, Mr. Speaker, that the feds - for some unknown reason - had withdrawn \$700 million from the health delivery system in this province over the next five years. Well, is that fair if we're going to be dealing with a universal Medicare system in this province and across Canada, Mr. Speaker? Is that fair for the Federal Government to stand up and all of a sudden, out of a clear blue sky, draw \$700 million out of the health delivery system? I think that we have and the Minister has a just reason to be concerned because \$700 million is a lot of dollars in the health delivery system of our province. People that are dependent on the system must know that that's a lot of bucks and that's what makes the system tick.

Mr. Speaker, I hear members opposite talking about other provinces. I don't know the problems in Alberta, I don't know the problems in Ontario, or the problems that my honourable colleague has mentioned in the United States. I'm talking today in this resolution about the problems that we have in this province, Manitoba, to try and stabilize and build upon the system that came in when I was a member here and try and make it better, and try and make it so that we can afford it.

Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution is timely. I think the resolution, if all the members in the House offer their contribution to the debate, we'll get maybe to the root of some of the problems that are in the system. I don't think there's any member in this House that doesn't realize there are some problems, financial problems. Because if it's going to escalate in the next

10 years as much as it has in the last 10 years, then goodbye Medicare. Where are we going to get the money? That's going to be a problem.

I still think with the million people or so that we have in this province, by this resolution coming in today and more debate and more discussion with the government and the Minister of Health, we can, with our knowledge and the ability of all of the members of this House deal with this subject rationally, build upon it, make it better than it is today and, hopefully, get a tag on the cost factor. That's the one that scares me, Mr. Speaker.

I daresay that maybe we shouldn't be calling it "free" Medicare. Sure it's free but it's costing somebody. It's costing every man, woman and child in this province a thousand bucks. And maybe we should be telling the public, maybe we should. Well, I know, we turn phrases, user clause, free Medicare, etc., etc., and it builds and the system goes. It's not free by any sense of the word. Maybe the public would take another look at it if we tell them it's not that free, the fact that it's costing you a thousand bucks whether you know it or not, through direct taxation or indirect taxes.

The other problem in the system, Mr. Speaker, that continually comes to me is the abuse of the system by people who, for whatever reason, continually feel that maybe they are ill more and more and more, and because of the way the system is they have access to all the health facilities in this province. I am told by some of the practitioners and others that there are abuses at that level. Certainly, sure some people talk about, we were talking about - was it Ontario, or Alberta where there's a deterrent fee? - I don't know whether that does any good or not. I have no statistics, I have no information to back up.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution is a timely one. I think it's one that we must deal with in this Legislature because of the escalating costs of the system. It is extremely expensive. In my time, as I say, in this Legislature, the cost of this province has escalated from around \$35 million to \$40 million until we see a billion and some odd dollars today.

Now, I don't know of any other thing in this province, even though interest rates were such as they were, or inflation such as it was, has escalated to that level. But I think the resolution is a good one, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that all the members of the House will see fit to express their opinions on it and we can build upon the system that was started when I came in. I think a year after I arrived in this Legislature, Medicare arrived, and I've been pleased to be part and parcel of it and I hope that we can together work and make it more stable than it is today and clean up some of the problems we have with the system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in debate on this resolution. I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, that all of us indicate, so far as we can, our dedication to the universality of comprehensive health care.

Mr. Speaker, there is concern throughout the length and breadth of Canada today, about people who are voicing concern about costs, concern about systems.

Mr. Speaker, we must be concerned about the effect on people. I want to take a few moments before the hour of adjournment and talk about the human side of a comprehensive health care system.

Mr. Speaker, my mother, who is now 93 years of age, very much aware of what's going on in Manitoba and in Canada; very concerned about the well-being of others in society, has recounted to me the times when she, knowing that she was ill, would go to a doctor - the doctor would indicate that corrective surgery was needed - but in view of the fact that there was limited money in our family, my mother couldn't proceed to have that surgery.

Some time later, growing concerned about it, she went back. The doctor agreed that he would perform the surgery and she could pay the amount of the medical bill by so much a month, and so she did that, and over the course of time she finally paid off that medical bill. Of course, there was always the hospital bill to have to face and many people in this province, when they couldn't pay the bills — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, honourable members are not interested in what I have to say, but I'll address my remarks to you.

When they couldn't pay the bills, Mr. Speaker, they had liens registered against any property they owned. That was the system. If you had money, if you had wealth, you could get health care. If you didn't have those things, if you didn't have that kind of income or wealth, you had to wait. Perhaps you could go - and there were outpatient services - but you sat and you waited and waited until a young intern or a nurse could spend the time with you, but it was very very much a question of a very very limited amount of charity towards people in need.

Mr. Speaker, because of the dedicated efforts of people in the Democratic Socialist movement, in the fight that went on — (Interjection) — and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says, "This is crap." Well, Mr. Speaker, in the 1940s, the struggle for the establishment of Medicare in this country went on in Saskatchewan. Doctors went on strike. They refused to provide services. Mr. Speaker, that government held out . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Oh, shut up you rotten sneak.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, insults just seem to be flying in this House.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Why don't you ask him to leave, Mr. Speaker, because he's nothing but a little . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: How about you leaving first? — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition refuses to give credit to the dedicated effort of people, including people like Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, who looked at the problems, at the behest of a Conservative Prime Minister, and through the dedicated efforts of people like those in Saskatchewan. I must remind honourable members that Mr. Justice Emmett Hall was a resident of

Saskatchewan. That out of the trauma, the struggle for development of comprehensive medical care the Democratic Socialist Governments waged in Saskatchewan, we finally got the development of a comprehensive health system in this country. That's a matter of public record, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30 p.m., when this resolution is next before the House, the Honourable Minister will have 16 minutes remaining. The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow afternoon (Thursday).