



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. 101 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 6 JULY, 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, Hon. 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, Hon. 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	Virden	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, Hon. 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, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKI, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 6 July, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. R. PENNER introduced, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 102, An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

HON. R. PENNER introduced Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act (3).

ORAL QUESTIONS

Finance Ministers' Meeting

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it's reported in today's Globe and Mail that the Finance Ministers' Meeting in Montreal had agreed on the need for continuing restraint. My question to the Minister of Finance is, in view of the fact that Manitoba's spending increased this year as over twice as much on a percentage basis as the spending of at least eight of the other provinces, what will this province be doing to meet its commitment to continued restraint?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The documents that were provided to that conference by the Federal Government indicated that in terms of wages Manitoba was, indeed, in the area of the average - just a little below - in terms of the increases in the last year. So from that perspective one would assume that we were in on target. I haven't had a chance to read the Globe and Mail but if it is somebody's interpretation of the outcome of that meeting that we agreed that somehow we should be in a period of restraint at this time, that that was the issue, then that is an interpretation that certainly I didn't gather from the meeting.

In fact, a number of the Finance Ministers and Labour Ministers present indicated that they felt the first priority, the very, very first priority, had to be the nurturing of the recovery to make sure that it takes hold and that doesn't necessarily mean restraint. That can mean care in spending to ensure that the spending that is done is utilized to the best effect for job creation. That's something that certainly the Minister of Finance for Ontario, the Minister of Finance for Quebec and some other provinces took as their position.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister then telling the House that the report that there was unanimous agreement on the need for restraint is false, and that this government does not subscribe to that conclusion put forward, at least by the Federal Minister, as a consensus?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, we always do our best to be careful and if that is restraint then certainly nobody at that table suggested that we get into some spending programs that didn't make sense. Everybody at that table was concerned to ensure that we would have an economic recovery. As I indicated, I haven't read the report so I don't know what conclusion, specifically, the Federal Minister drew or whether the conclusion he drew was correctly stated in the article.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is agreement on the necessity of creating real and meaningful jobs for people in the country. There seems to be a direct correlation with job creation, creation of real jobs, and an inverse correlation with the rate of inflation.

Unfortunately, lately inflation seems to have been running somewhat higher in Manitoba than elsewhere and higher than the previous record for the province. What proposals did the Minister of Finance put forward at that meeting as a commitment by his government to try and keep the rate of inflation down in Manitoba?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I know of many people who would disagree with the premise on which the honourable member based that question, that is that when the rate of inflation goes down, more jobs are created. Indeed, over the last 12 months, it was while inflation was dropping that employment was dropping throughout this country. In fact, what was happening was that inflation was dropping because of the recession; people were simply not able to pay out money when they were not earning profits in their small companies and larger companies; workers were afraid to ask for wage increases because of insecurity and it was on that basis that we had a decrease in inflation.

As well, the member's question shows the contradiction when it suggests that less inflation produces more jobs. When we look at Manitoba, if he's arguing that our percentage inflation is higher than in other parts of the country, and it has been in the last couple of months, that's true, in Manitoba, at the same time we've had greater numbers of people working than in other parts of the country. In the country as a whole, we have less people working today than we had a year ago when we had high inflation, but in Manitoba we have more people working than we had a year ago.

We have, in total — (Interjection) — Well, the member is referring to one specific sector of the Manitoba economy. Manitoba workers are concerned about how many jobs there are in total. In total, in Manitoba, we have more people working today than we had a year

ago. In Canada, there are less people working today than there were a year ago.

People can refer to specific sectors and say one sector is weak; that means another sector is that much stronger but, in total, we have more people working and that's not good enough. Nobody suggested that's good enough. We've still got more than 50,000 people unemployed and that's why it was Manitoba's position that we must nurture the recovery, that we must have some form of job creation policy as the number one priority in this country. That is why we were saying that we had been happy with last December's Finance Minister's meeting where there was a consensus on that issue. That consensus fell apart by March when many of the Conservative Provinces began to disagree with that and I think that's one of the reasons why, in a lot of the Conservative Provinces, employment is now down from where it was a year ago.

Autopac - McLellan case

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for Autopac. The Minister will recall that during the examination of Autopac's Annual Report I made a special request for one Elaine McLellan who has a particular hardship case involving a serious injury for which she cannot get treatment in Manitoba. The Minister agreed at that time to take that individual under special advisement. Has the Minister been able to discuss this matter with his Autopac officials?

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

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will recall that issue being raised during the Estimates process and I must correct the member, I had indicated that I had been aware of that situation for some time. I had been in correspondence with Mrs. McLellan, I believe, on a number of occasions and there was, in fact, some remedy that was available to her. It was a matter of having her solicitor take the matter to the courts to determine responsibility for the particular accident. At that time, a certain interim payment would be available to Mrs. McLellan to assist with her medical costs and the matter of the quantum of the settlement would be something that could be resolved at a later date. Since sending that letter to Mrs. McLellan some time ago, I've had no further correspondence and I assume that she has taken the advice or direction that was provided to her.

Wayside Parks - closures

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the other day I had some questions asked of me in respect to the wayside park at Mafeking. In rationalizing the operation of the parks system as a result of restraints, a variety of methods were introduced to stretch the available dollars. While the reduction of services at selected sites

and closures were options, the more positive one was to seek interested operators from the private sector who would be interested in increasing their viability by assuming responsibility to operate a campground.

As reported in the House earlier, the Overflowing River Campground was closed this spring pending investigation and negotiations for an operator. This was successful and a new local entrepreneur assumed responsibility as of July 1st. This facility plus the others at the Red Deer River and Birch River would continue to offer suitable facilities for travellers using Highway No. 10.

On the basis of improved facilities now being available, the underutilized site at Mafeking was deemed not to be utilized as a wayside. On this basis, two deteriorated concrete fireplaces were hauled to the dump as not salvageable; two pit privies in poor shape were removed as well as two picnic tables, one of which was not useable. The low use made of the site allowed for the redevelopment of maintenance staff for the balance of the year as travellers could be accommodated elsewhere in appropriately maintained and staffed sites.

The recent background with respect to the Mafeking wayside is of interest, as earlier negotiations with the department by councillors of the Unincorporated Village of Mafeking had resulted in land from the wayside being committed to the site for their fire hall. More recent discussions had been entered into regarding the provision of additional land for the RCMP.

In addition, the department had been asked by the Local Government District if the remaining land could be used for building sites as the former park area is superior to surrounding land in the village. Parks Branch files do not reflect any commitment or interest to maintain and operate the facility as a park by the local community.

This Monday, the department was contacted by a local member of the community suggesting that the park area could be cleaned up and then STEP students could be utilized over the summer to maintain the facility. Formalization of this request was asked for, but has not yet been received.

Over the past several years, as the site had a low level of use, ongoing maintenance was carried out pending completion of the fire hall and RCMP facility negotiations. On the basis of the community interest that appears to be now forthcoming, we are prepared to provide further facilities like a pit toilet, picnic tables, barbecues, fireplaces with ongoing responsibility for maintenance and upkeep being transferred to the local community, if that local community actually formally asks us to do so - which they haven't done to date, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Honourable Minister for his answer. I wonder though, in whose opinion was it that the wayside park was not being utilized. Was it from his staff, or was it from the representative of the unincorporated village district committee?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, there is no formal indication on the file of interest by way of a written

request by the community. I know that staff do maintain statistics as to use and the advice I have is that this wayside park, which happens to be right within the village, is very, very much underutilized.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I had directed a question to the Minister of Natural Resources back on May 27th and he took the question as notice and responded on June 7th, and indicated that the Mafeking Wayside Park was open and being used by the people. Now how is it that he is reporting today a completely different answer than he did the first part of June?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, on the date that the honourable member refers to I confirmed to him that the Overflowing River Park was closed. It was closed temporarily because we sought arrangements to get a private operator. That park is now open.

The question of the Mafeking Park - certainly if we have difficulties in operating these wayside parks we're going to look at it. The administrative arrangements are not cast in stone. If there is insufficient use . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to try and compete with the hilarity opposite. There are people that came from the Stone Age but I won't reflect on them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we don't take the administration of the system as a laughing matter. We consider that it is important that we provide services and, in the provision of those services, we're going to use taxpayers' dollars very carefully, and we're going to, where it's necessary, make arrangements where public facilities will be operated in conjunction with private operators and with local councils; but we cannot do that with local councils and local government if local government doesn't enter into some sort of arrangement with us.

We've been asked to take of that park, a parcel of it, for the provision of a facility for the town, for a firehall, and now for the RCMP, and if there is still some interest in the community for a park, certainly we'll be happy to co-operate, but we have to have that interest recorded with us and not through the concerns from the member opposite.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Can the Minister give assurance to the Community of Mafeking that the toilet and the picnic table and the barbecue that he has now returned to the wayside park will be maintained there for at least the rest of the summer?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the taxpayers of Manitoba that we will not be throwing money away wastefully in the administration of our system; and where there is insufficient use for facilities, and it doesn't make sense to keep them open, we'll close them.

Where there is community interest and they want to assist us in operating facilities, we'll co-operate with them.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicates that there was no assurance from the community that they would operate this park or have any contribution towards it. Can he confirm that the person in question had phoned the parks office in Swan River and within two hours the parks staff were there to remove the picnic table and the barbecue and the toilets? So how in the world could they have time to put anything down in writing and send it through the parks office in Swan River before that happened?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, obviously the member has some close contact with people, someone whose complaint I don't know about. But if the honourable member will arrange for the community to formally ask the department to do something, certainly I'll be happy to respond. But I didn't receive a telephone call; I wasn't involved in what the honourable member suggests, but the honourable member seems to be just here to find fault with good tight administrative policy.

I can't — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, they want us to squander money on facilities that are underutilized. And if every MLA across wants this government to continue to fund, at public expense, facilities that are underutilized they're wrong because we won't do that.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Natural Resources said that he would take as notice and report back to the House if there were any further campgrounds that were closed. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House today that there is, in fact, another wayside park by the name of Steep Rock that is not being maintained by the department and he indicated in his report on June 7th that it was.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated that we are going to make sure that taxpayers' dollars are spent very carefully. We are not going to throw money away. While we are going to maintain to services to the travelling public, we are not going to waste money. We don't believe in that kind of administration, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Natural Resources is indicating that the constituents of the Swan River area should contact the Minister of Resources rather than their own MLA?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the constituents of the Provincial Constituency of Swan River should contact their MLA and indicate their interest in matters that concern them, but where they want to utilize government property for a specific purpose, I would appreciate it if they communicated with the government because I think that in order to enter into any kind of contract, they should do so. Mr. Speaker, those are the arrangements that most other people respect.

Jobs Fund - advertising

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the Minister of Natural

Resources' statements that the government was concerned with a careful expenditure of the taxpayers' money and not squandering the taxpayers' money, could the First Minister, in view of the saturation of the news media by advertisements related to the Jobs Fund recently, could he advise this House as to the total amount of money spent to date on advertising the Jobs Fund and projects under the Jobs Fund, and the anticipated expenditures to the end of this fiscal year for advertising under the Jobs Fund and related projects?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that would probably be best dealt with by way of an Order for Return which, I believe, is the traditional manner by which such requests are dealt with. I would suggest that the honourable member file an Order for Return and we'll provide the information that he requests.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the squandering of money that is taking place in the advertising media through advertisements placed by the First Minister, as Chairman of the Jobs Fund, of recent weeks, would the First Minister not undertake to accept the question as notice and provide the House with that information tomorrow or the following day?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I suggested that the honourable member do what has been the traditional pattern and that an Order for Return be filed.

Employment Standards Branch re babysitter

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, it's apparent the First Minister does not want to reveal the amount of money spent in advertising to date. A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, now that Cabinet met this morning I believe, can she now advise the House and Mrs. Normand that she will be proposing an amendment to The Employment Standards Act to have retroactive effect so that Mrs. Normand will not have to pay over \$900 as order by the Employment Standards Branch of her department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot inform Mrs. Normand specifically of anything and the member ought to know that that is a case before the Labour Board. Cabinet did deal this morning with that issue, and we will be bringing in a clarification and definition of a child sitter or a person who does stay with an invalid or an elderly person in the home that specifically removes that from coverage under the amendment to the act that was passed last year. Mrs. Normand's case is before the Labour Board and will be dealt with, as I understand it, some time later this month or early next month. I suspect that the Labour Board will reflect on the amendments brought in by this Session of the Legislature.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Mrs. Normand's case before the Labour Board has

been moved up from August 3rd to July 18th and relates to babysitting, could the Minister advise whether or not the amendment which she is proposing will have retroactive effect so that Mrs. Normand will be relieved of the order that has been made by the Employment Standards Branch of her department? Will it be of retroactive effect, and if so, can she not take some steps to arrange to have that matter adjourned so that Mrs. Normand doesn't have to go through this hearing before the Labour Board?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, we are rather constantly reminded of the Rules of this House and one of those is that when legislation is introduced that is when members see it and they see it before anyone else sees it. When that amendment comes forward and I suspect, I certainly hope, that we are getting towards the end of this long Session, it will be very soon and the members will see it just as they do with any other piece of legislation.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I find the Minister's answer totally incomprehensible. We're dealing, Mr. Speaker, with a working mother of four children who has been ordered to pay over \$900 and can't afford to make this payment. Could the Minister not make a simple statement to the effect that the amendment will be retroactive and she will be relieved of having to pay over \$900.00?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We have here a former Attorney-General, a man who professes to practice law, a man who was a House Leader here, asking a question about a matter that is before the courts in this province. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule that out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on the same point of order.

MR. G. MERCIER: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about an order made by the Employment Standards Branch that is going to the Labour Board for a hearing. We're talking about an individual who should be put out of her misery and put her fears to rest and it's the responsibility — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, members opposite can laugh all they want about the situation that this woman finds herself in, in a state of misery caused by the inaction of the Minister of Labour. We are asking for a simple statement to be made by the Minister of Labour that can put her fears to rest, and she can be assured that her situation will be looked after and she will not have to pay the \$900 to her babysitter. That's all we are asking for is a simple statement from the Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, again, on the same point of order, what the member fails to catch as an issue is the question of what exactly Mrs. Normand's employee was, or whether there was an employee. What kind of a relationship was it? Was it a child-sitter, as opposed to a domestic, because if there was a domestic, then certainly the minimum wages of this province apply?

That is not something that I think everybody in this House ought to recognize, that it's not up to us to determine the status of individuals. We are saying that we are bringing forward legislation dealing with those individuals who are primarily child-sitters, as explained by the Minister of Labour, but what category people fall into is something that is for the tribunals we have established to determine, and I ask the Speaker to rule that question out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: To the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance raised the point of order and, of course, points of order may deal with calling attention to a departure from the standing orders or from the customary modes of proceeding. Perhaps if the Minister of Finance would draw to your attention the standing order which has allegedly been violated, or the departure from customary proceeding, it might make it easier for your ruling, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Members might wish to refer to Beauséjour which on Page 118 deals with matters that are before the court. It makes it quite clear that in matters before a criminal court, it is quite clear that questions cannot be asked, or that they can be mentioned in debates. When it comes to civil cases, the same convention prohibiting questions does not apply until the matter has reached the trial stage.

It has not been made clear whether hearings before the Labour Board, in fact, come under the definition of a court, either civil or criminal, and there is no mention of the particular fact under those citations in Beauséjour. The section terminates with the following sentence, "In doubtful cases, he," that is, the Speaker, "should rule in favour of debate and against the convention."

However, since the same question, with slight variations, has been asked a number of times in this House, both today and on former occasions, it might well be better if the House were to drop the matter and proceed to some other question.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as Deputy House Leader . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: A point of order was raised by the Minister of Finance, Sir. I believe that it is your duty to rule on whether or not there was a point of order, and not to give advice, Sir, with all respect, not to give

advice to the House about what should be dealt with and what should be dropped.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that a ruling was given that the Honourable Minister did not have a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order and on your ruling, I would ask that, although there is no reference in Beauséjour, I would like you to consult the rulings of previous Speakers of this House, including the previous Speaker who is now the Member for Virden, the Honourable Member for Concordia, who was a previous Speaker of this House, and take under advisement whether or not this House, by precedent, has not established rules in respect to questions being placed regarding matters that are before our provincial tribunals.

I think that you will find that rulings have been made by previous Speakers, Mr. Speaker, and I think those rulings have as much bearing, in fact more bearing, on your decisions than those that are recorded in Beauséjour. I would respectfully ask you take this matter under advisement and then report to the House.

I am asking the Speaker on a point of order. I am asking the Speaker on a point of order now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I thank the Honourable Minister for his advice, and will certainly check former rulings. There is no point of order before the House.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

Layoffs

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I do now have a matter in which I do want to indicate, and I expect that I will get many catcalls from opposite, but I am prepared to await silence, if necessary, in order to complete my answer.

I do want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that my department has erred in respect to some arrangements regarding employment of unemployed people regarding forestry initiatives in southeastern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the error occurred in this way. We had ongoing tree-planting activity in the southeastern region of the province. In addition to that, we had some further money in our budget to provide for some initial silviculture work, forest thinning, pruning and so on. There was an expectation that one of the applications that we had, as a department, before the Jobs Fund would be approved. Now, given that expectation, there was an error made on the part of staff to somehow commit the department to a period of employment of approximately 26 weeks. While it was indicated to be approximately 26 weeks, I feel that a commitment was made to those people.

Now it was wrong for the department to have assumed that approval would be given. It was also wrong - there was a further error - because there was communication from the Jobs Fund that the matter had been deferred. Somehow the department interpreted that the application had not been approved. A further error occurred when the department, without reference to me, indicated severance to those 18

temporary staff. If I had known that, certainly I would have been able to take the matter up and ask the Jobs Fund for earlier consideration of that item. I have now taken the matter up with the Jobs Fund and that further extended period has been approved.

It was departmental error and I take full responsibility for that, Mr. Speaker, but let me say that these are initiatives that we undertook, to provide employment, to provide useful employment, and I admit its error; but, Mr. Speaker, to err is human. If we were doing nothing, there would have been no error.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for those words and I'm sure the 18 employees who have had a couple of anxious moments these last few days will be pleased to hear that news.

I wonder if the Minister of Natural Resources could tell the House whether or not he has sent out notices to these employees saying that the contract which they entered into with the government, which would see them working till sometime in November, whether these employees will be notified, either by letter or through their supervisors, or in what manner this will be accomplished.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the employees involved were working, as I understand it, to July 15th in any event, and I have communicated the decision of the Jobs Fund so that communication would go as quickly as possible to the employees involved.

Special Wage Assistance Program Engineering & Science grads

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to a question that was posed to me on Monday by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert pertaining to the Engineering Science Employment Program for jobs and some concern that the honourable member had that this would interfere in respect to jobs that would otherwise have been allocated to Red River Community College Design and Drafting Program students. The answer to the question is, no, there will not be any conflict, Mr. Speaker, insofar as those job applications.

The honourable member might appreciate - and I'll table this in the House - there is an Advisory Board which consists of the Associate Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, University of Manitoba; the Vice-President of Manitoba Operations, MacLaren Engineers; Technology Consultant with the Manitoba Department of Economic Development, Jim Reichert; Dave Cross, President of the Association of Professional Engineers; and Mr. Ferris, the Director of Program Policy Development with the Manitoba Jobs Fund Office.

The responsibility in connection with that Advisory Board is to help the program managers ensure that the jobs that are being offered, in respect to businesses, are well matched to the qualifications of the graduates themselves, and the intention of the program is to give both the businesses and graduates the maximum

mutual benefit, which means fitting the employee's qualifications with the job that, indeed, is the subject of the application.

Community Bail Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for St. Norbert asked me a question about the termination of the program for people on bail at halfway houses. I can advise the honourable member that we have people both on probation, as well as on bail, at halfway houses. Budget limitations causes us to give priority to those on probation and that particular program will continue.

Those who are on bail cannot be handled, unfortunately, within the present budget, but I would advise the honourable member that there are only about half a dozen people in question that are in halfway houses, at any one time, under the bail program.

It's very important to note that we have a new program called Community Bail Program, which is expanding, and last year we had 90-100 people on that program and I'm advised that this year it has been expanded to about 200. So this is much more effective, Mr. Speaker, it's much more cost-effective and, in fact, I believe it's even better for the individuals involved.

I point out that, although the honourable member said halfway houses are cheaper than the Remand Centre or Headingley, that's looking at it on an average cost basis, but if you look at it in terms of add-on costs or marginal costs, to have these people at halfway houses is certainly an additional cost to the taxpayers, so I'm satisfied that the way we're going is the right way. It's good for the individuals involved and it is ultimately cheaper for the taxpayers.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister confirm that those people, now that program has been terminated, will be incarcerated?

HON. L. EVANS: Ultimately the people that have been referred to these particular halfway houses are referred there by the courts. It's a decision made by the judges and I'm advised that many of the people who are on our community bail people are of the same category as some of those who go to the halfway houses, so I suggest that, hopefully, the courts will see fit to utilize our Community Bail Program even more so than they have up until the present time.

I can't talk specifically about the individuals but I'm hopeful that we'll have even greater use of the Community Bail Program.

Layoffs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the Minister of Natural Resources. The Minister

frequently reminds us, of course, of the major forestry operations in other parts of the province, other than Hadashville, namely, The Pas. Can the Minister assure the House that there were no layoffs occurring, or errors as he now calls it, in other parts of the province similar to the ones that occurred in the two ridings represented in this Chamber by my Conservative colleagues, the Member for Emerson and the Member for La Verendrye?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the House the other day, the operations of this department and this government are not targeted to deal only with areas of the province that are represented by New Democratic MLAs. We have initiatives under the Jobs Fund, and certainly under the Department of Natural Resources, that do not respect any political system at all, but do reflect the priorities, needs of a resource development in the province.

One of the areas of the province where there is a forest that is extremely heavily used is the southeastern part of Manitoba, and for years governments have, in their programs - and our government is no exception - paid attention to the problem of reforestation in that area. We have, Mr. Speaker, doubled the size of the forest nursery at Hadashville in recognition of the need for reforestation in southern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, you have repeatedly admonished the opposition to be brief in their questions and Minister to be brief in their answers. My colleague asked a very direct question, could he assure us that there had not been any other layoffs. What we get from the Minister is a recitation of the programs that he alleges to have undertaken. Surely, Sir, that is a question which was concise and would lend itself to a short, concise answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, if you read from the Rules, a copy of which you were good enough to send to all the members, makes it quite clear: "In putting a question a member must confine himself to the narrowest limits, making a question observation which might lead to a debate cannot be regarded as coming within the proper limit of a question." That free bit of advice certainly warranted a debate or an explanation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I am prepared to rephrase my question. Were there any employees laid off at The Pas?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, not only were there not any employees laid off at The Pas, there have been more employees involved in reforestation at The Pas because we are developing a very significant forest

nursery there which will increase employment in the forest industry generally.

Mr. Speaker, I don't need to be lectured by members opposite as to answering questions. I know that some answers that provide facts that trouble them, irritate them but, Mr. Speaker, I intend to give full and frank and honest answers to questions in this House without any lecturing from the Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to announce that the Provincial Constituency of Niakwa is a sports-excellent centre in the Province of Manitoba. In making that announcement, I would like to advise that Chris Baraniuk of the Winnipeg Aerials Gymnastic Club, was the only Western Canadian competitor to win a gold medal during the weekend at the Canadian national age class gymnastics championships in Banff, Alberta.

Baraniuk, who finished seventh overall in the novice division - that's the 17-year-olds and under - with a score of 98.10, won his gold medal in the vault with a score of 9.35 in compulsory and 9.45 in optionals to give him a total score of 18.80.

Prior to the Canadian meet, Chris was overall champion for Western Canada where he placed first in the four individual events as well as first overall. He represented Manitoba on the gymnastic team at the Canada Winter Games, and at the end of this month will compete at the Western Canada Summer Games at Calgary.

In addition to his dedication to gymnastics, he is an A-plus grade 10 student at Windsor Park Collegiate, where in the past year he earned three outstanding achievements, the Certificate of Award in English, French and General Business.

I would ask the House to join me in congratulating this young Manitoban.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: If I might direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, we have 16 members of the Selkirk and District 4-H Club under the direction of Mrs. Foster and their guests from the Richmond County 4-H Club from Cape Breton Island under the direction of Mrs. Fugere.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa, that an Order of the House do issue for the Return of the following information:

(1) The log of all Government of Manitoba aircraft showing passenger lists, dates, destinations and purpose for all flights from June 26, 1982 to the date of this Order.

(2) The number of aircraft chartered or leased by the government and Crown agencies during the period June 26, 1982, to the date of the Order, and the date of each flight, the passenger lists, the purpose of the charter or lease and the costs of the said charter or lease.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: In respect for the Order, since this government does want to accommodate the broadest possible information we certainly will accept the Order, but I would like to indicate that a similar Order for Return was filed last year for a seven-month period. That involved the production of 4,000 log sheets and 10 copies that were required by the Order for Return. That was 40,000 sheets, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure that this information could be obtained at a good deal less expense to the taxpayer. We would be prepared to accommodate the opposition in the obtaining of that information in some other way, because it is extremely expensive.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that an Order of the House do issue for the return of the following information: The travel and expense allowances paid for or on behalf of all members of the Executive Council and all members of any board, commission or agency of the Government of Manitoba for the period from June 26, 1982 to the date of this Order.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if my information is correct, all of the information requested here should be obtainable through the Public Accounts. If I am

incorrect about that, certainly I would be happy that we provide this information, but if it already obtainable under Public Accounts I think it's duplication of expense, Mr. Speaker. If someone on the opposition says it is not obtainable in that way, then I certainly will indicate that we are happy to accommodate it. But if it's duplication, I would rather not do that, Mr. Speaker. So we will accept it on that understanding; that information is not obtainable the other way.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for the return of the following information:

For each department and agency - the name, position, classification, annual salary and qualification of each person hired since April 1, 1982, to the date of this Order and also showing:

(1) How that person was appointed, i.e., Order-in-Council, contract, term;

(2) If a Civil Service Competition was held, and if so what the competition number was; and

(3) If the person was a civil servant, what position and salary did that person previously hold?

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that certainly we want to provide all the information the opposition is entitled to, and we'll accept the order but it's one that requires a great deal of time on the part of staff, and it really involves an updating of a previous request; we're prepared to do that but the expectation is it will take a good deal of time and will cost a great deal of money.

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

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: On a point of order. The Minister of Natural Resources seems inclined to debate each of these motions as they are placed before the House. If he doesn't wish to accept the order, then he should have it put over for debate. If he wishes to accept it then it should be accepted without the little gratuitous comments which the Minister likes to throw in.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it is longstanding practice in the House that when an Order for Return is accepted, at that time the Government House Leader, or the Acting House Leader, can explain the problems or any other matters incidental to the production of that Order for Return. That's commonplace, Mr. Speaker, and for the honourable member now to be taking affront at the brief comments I made is, I think, exceptional, Mr. Speaker, and is abuse of the rules.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MESSAGES

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a message from Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Estimates of further sums required for the services of the province for Capital Expenditures and recommends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, \$6 million.
The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the First Minister that the said Message, with the Estimate accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 90, Bill No. 91, Bill No. 3, Bill No. 47, Bill No. 85 and Bill 55, in that order.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL 90 - THE CATTLE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this bill that's before us is really a very strange vindictive piece of legislation that one doesn't often see brought to the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, it again demonstrates a capacity on the part of this government to go out of its way to alienate, and to antagonize, and to create lasting political enemies for no real reason at all. Mr. Speaker, we know, of course, that there are some segments in the farm community that were opposed to the checkoff that is currently in place as a result of the legislation brought in by my colleague, the Member for Arthur, then Minister of Agriculture; but, Mr. Speaker, the facts also speak for themselves that a good majority of cattlemen across the province, by and large, if not in every instance in every action, but by and large support the activities that the Manitoba Cattlemen's Association have been engaged in on behalf of the beef industry in the Province of Manitoba.

Now, for the Minister of Agriculture to act in this vindictive way because one Jackie Skelton told him to do so, or one or two others like that, to respond in this way to a relatively small handful of producers. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in a personal it's understandable, we're all human beings, but I can't understand a Minister of Agriculture that has had some experience in this Chamber, is not exactly a greenhorn in the business of politics, to deliberately go out of his way to kick the cattlemen in the Province of Manitoba in the chin and tell them, look I don't like you, you know I don't like you, and I'm going to show you who's boss. That's what he's doing with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Co-operator is not always the greatest friend of all what Conservatives do or, indeed, of what my colleague, the former Minister of Agriculture did, but they went out of their way in a lengthy editorial indicating support for the measure now in effect, the checkoff that is now in effect, indicating that the Manitoba Cattlemen's Association is doing a commendable job for the beef industry in the Province of Manitoba, and that is should be left alone.

That is the authoritative voice of the farmer speaking, the one authoritative newspaper that we have in rural Manitoba, namely, the Manitoba Co-operator. Mr. Speaker, there is no real reason, other than the ones that I've given, for this government to do this. It's not a question of costing the taxpayers of Manitoba money, that's not impinging on them, Mr. Speaker; it is not impinging in any way, other than ones that I could speculate on the policies of the Department of Agriculture as such. The Minister has the freedom, the department has the freedom, to carry on with whatever other activities, in this case particularly, that are directed to the livestock industry that he may dream up from time-to-time, or that currently are in place. There is no difficulty in having the cattlemen have their independent capacity to collect independently some dollars so that they can run their association.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply cannot understand this legislation and, again, I speak to some of the other members, it's a case where the Minister of Agriculture has bamboozled his caucus. He's responding to a very small minority group to whom he obviously made a commitment way back when this bill came in, and said, well, if we ever get around we'll throw it out, but, again, that isn't what he campaigned on during the election campaign. That wasn't part of the list of promises that the New Democrats made to the people of Manitoba or, in this case, to the cattlemen of Manitoba.

The urban members of caucus should at least realize why it is that the farmers, in this case, the cattlemen, do not like, will not like, do not trust the New Democrats. It's because of this kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, and there's no necessity for it. It's simply a group of cattlemen that want to have the ability to check off — (Interjection) — Well, okay, Mr. Speaker, then I'll say . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . I am just explaining to you and it should concern you, why you will never get the support of the cattlemen in this Province of Manitoba; and there's no reason for you to - you could at least begin to nibble away at some of that support and get some of it, maybe, in the future, but not by this kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when my colleague, the then Minister of Agriculture introduced the checkoff legislation, there was perhaps some validity in the very strong speeches that were made, coming from this side of the House at that time, from the New Democrats. They said to my colleague, if you're going to do it, at least go out there and let them have a vote on it, whether it ought to be done. That's what speaker after speaker, that's what now the First Minister said, that's what now the Minister of Agriculture said and many others speakers said that.

Mr. Speaker, the reverse of course was the fact. We knew that the majority of cattlemen wanted that legislation; we knew that and so perhaps we acted in a somewhat arbitrary way by passing it without a vote, without a referendum. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, one always learns, but I'm telling you I can well remember what you said at the time. You said, put it to a vote, so, Mr. Speaker, if it offends this government that this piece of legislation, if it offends this government that this piece of legislation, and it's there without a vote, then why not do what the cattlemen themselves are asking? What are they saying to this Minister of this government? They say, okay, you want to take away our organization; you want to take away our rights for a checkoff, they say, will you please allow us to put it to a vote?

A MEMBER: That's what they're asking.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, having a referendum or a vote is not an easy undertaking. It costs money; it takes a great deal of effort, but, as their position, they are asking this Minister, before you disband our organization - because that's what he'll be doing - Mr. Speaker, can you imagine this government taking away, making it voluntary for unions not to deduct their union fees? — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: It is.

A MEMBER: Oh no, it isn't.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we have to fight for very special causes. A person has to go to the Labour Board and be able to prove religious reasons for exemption from union dues. The cattlemen don't have to do it. Anybody that doesn't want to belong to this organization, anybody that doesn't want to contribute to this organization, all he has to do is send in a letter and say, fine, I shipped 40 head of cattle this year; send me back my \$40.00. I don't want to be part of your organization. Mr. Speaker, 7 percent of the cattlemen did that; 7 percent of the cattlemen that had their checkoff had the monies taken off their receipts when cattle were sold because that's the only practical way of doing it. Seven percent asked for a refund and they got their refund.

HON. B. URUSKI: What's the problem?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says, what is the problem. That is the question, what is the problem? What could be fairer, what could be more democratic and what is the problem? Why are you now disbanding them? Why are you now ordering stock taken off the checkoff? Yes, that is what he's doing, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister can play games with me but, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that Judge Skelton tells this Minister to jump and he jumps. — (Interjection) — He just asks, how high? That's right, the Member for La Verendrye says. I tell this government and I know this Minister believes that, but again I appeal to the other members that look to some support from other than their immediate areas. They've got to have some

understanding of why rural Manitobans, cattlemen in this case, simply don't like the New Democrats, because they can't understand why they're getting kicked in the shins right now.

They have an organization that is functioning well; they have a democratically elected executive. If something is happening on that executive that somebody doesn't like, they have a chance, the same way as in this Chamber, to change the executive. Anybody that doesn't want to be a member, that doesn't want to contribute to the Cattlemen's Fund simply sends a letter and it doesn't have to go to any Labour Board; it doesn't have to go in front of any quasi-judicial body. They simply say, look, I don't want to contribute to this fund; I want my money back, whether it's \$2, whether it's \$7 or \$50 or \$100.00. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, the Minister says, check on procedures, then change the procedures or ask them to change the procedures, but we know exactly what he is doing. He is deliberately tearing down the Manitoba Cattlemen's Association because they have demonstrated, in the past, not the greatest friendship for this government but, Mr. Speaker, what I'm telling this Minister and this government is what they are doing with the introduction of this bill is ensuring that, in the future, no reasonable, no thinking, no responsible cattleman will vote for the New Democrats; because the New Democrats have gone out of their way to cripple their organization and they will remember that, Mr. Speaker. They will remember.

Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that we will be hearing substantial representation from the cattlemen and their organization, both from their organization and from the individual cattlemen on this bill. I would beseech members opposite; I would ask members opposite, why not listen to their presentations?

Mr. Speaker, just to repeat, in conclusion, it is no skin off our collective noses, if I could put it that way. It is not a matter of public taxation; it's not a matter of interfering from carrying out any public program. It doesn't interfere with your beef plan. This simply enables a commodity group to have some funds to run their organization. Mr. Speaker, I can only indicate to you, as I'm sure we will have to start doing more frequently, that in two-and-a-half years or whenever that particular time comes, I will certainly be very supportive of whoever is then the Minister of Agriculture, to reinstate the kind of legislation that this Minister is now busy tearing down; but I do so, Mr. Speaker, on the basis and on the belief and the knowledge that I would acting in the interests of the majority, a substantial majority of cattle producers, not a handful of activists that have the ear of this Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be closing debate.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the comments made by the honourable members but, certainly what they have been saying is not the fact of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, in his address this afternoon, has indicated that

somehow we are taking away something from producers. The Honourable Member for Lakeside should read back some of the speeches that he had made when this bill was introduced, when we called for a referendum, after the vote had been taken by producers in '74 who turned down that very kind of an association in this province. A vote was called, Mr. Speaker, and almost 60 percent of the producers who voted in that referendum voted an organization like this down. Mr. Speaker, there was a second vote held, and the honourable member - and I will repeat what I said before - there was a second vote held in 1976, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of a marketing board.

That vote was in a negative, but during that debate, Mr. Speaker, there was a so-called freedom campaign in which letters were distributed and approximately, I am told, and in that respect I take the former Minister of Agriculture's word that there were 4,000 letters of producers who signed a form in which, underlined in that form, was: We want - not a marketing board - but we want a voluntary, producer-funded organization.

How did they act? No, they didn't say that producers could join an organization, bringing a bill, setting up an association, or the association didn't need even a bill. How were other associations funded? They went and they incorporated, and they were funded and there are many such associations, Mr. Speaker. There is the Milk Producers Association, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. J. DOWNEY: Turkey board, chicken board.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is totally mixed up, and he is trying to distract me from my comments, the Member for Arthur. He is mixed up, because he believes in his own mind that somehow the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association is somehow a marketing board. It has not been set up under The Natural Products Marketing Act as the honourable member states from his seat. But there are producer organizations now in the province, as I was saying, the Manitoba Milk Producers Co-op, Mr. Speaker, which has, I believe, somewhere around 400 members who have signed up on a letter form saying, we wish funds to be deducted from the sale of our milk to support this association.

Mr. Speaker, we are leaving in this legislation it open to the association to decide how best to deal with the funding of their organization, whether it be by a one-time letter, whether it be by a per time sale. That is up to the association and the producers to decide how they will fund it, but somehow, Mr. Speaker, in their remarks they want to leave the impression - and this is where I find it very, very hard to comprehend the mentality of the honourable members opposite. They are saying that we are now going to kill the organization.

Mr. Speaker, is that how little faith they have in the beef producers of this province, that they do not want an organization to represent them? Is that really the basis of which they established the compulsory checkoff when they brought in the legislation, because they knew that producers would not fund an organization? Then, Mr. Speaker, for all these years, they have been placing a sham on all the Legislatures and the public of Manitoba, saying that this organization represents the 15,000 farmer of Manitoba. — (Interjection) — Mr.

Speaker, if this group - and I believe that there will be a large number of producers who will, in fact, support this organization and I respect them for it. But to come into this House as the Honourable Member for Lakeside says, we are now going to do away with this organization certainly, No. 1, has little faith in the farming community, and certainly shows how deceptive they were when they brought in the legislation and the remarks that he made as to how they collect the fees. Mr. Speaker, I gave the honourable member, and I guess he wasn't listening very well, the procedures that have put into place.

The second point and the fundamental point that we objected to, the honourable member didn't allude to that question when the bill was brought in, this bill gave a private organization, a private association more powers than any other group in society has today about the gathering of information, the forcing of information without public accountability in this Legislature. That is the fundamental difference between the legislation and our position on this legislation. They can't get out of it. Mr. Speaker, no matter how the honourable members want to try to turn this question around, they cannot do that.

That fact of the matter is, it is a compulsory checkoff, and we here on this side of the House believe that producers should have an organization and we respect their right to do so. We respect the producers of this province in having an organization to represent them but, Mr. Speaker, they should make that decision on an individual basis as to how that organization may be funded. To say that we are now doing away with the organization has little faith, Mr. Speaker, in that organization.

Mr. Speaker, if they continue to make those kinds of comments, it will only just go to show how few producers, in fact, support that organization. It may be a self-prophesying matter. Mr. Speaker, it will then show that very few producers actually did support that organization.

They speak of a referendum, Sir. Why isn't there a referendum? Mr. Speaker, there will be a referendum.

MR. H. ENNS: There will be when we have an election . . .

HON. B. URUSKI: No, Mr. Speaker. There will be a referendum on the way the group decides to set their funding into motion. There will be a referendum.

Either they chose the one-time form as the Milk Producers Co-op, that you sign it once. In fact, that group was dealt a pretty massive blow by the Milk Producers Marketing Board where they said, no longer will we accept that signature that you gave to the Milk Marketing Board. They did away with the Milk Producers Co-op. The milk producers went out and re-signed, several hundred producers, to show that there is a voluntary organization and it can survive.

There is also another organization, Mr. Speaker. There is the sheep producers of this province. They have a voluntary checkoff in the province where they place a checkoff on the amount of wool that is marketed to fund their organization. That is a voluntary producer-funded group. It has survived. They are raising funds. We do assist them in terms of providing some secretarial

help and the like. We do that kind of assistance to this small group. I say, they are a small group, but they do voluntarily fund themselves.

But to say that somehow we are doing away with an organization, Mr. Speaker, is not factual. If we were doing away with the organization, Sir, we would be repealing this legislation. We are not repealing this legislation. We are still leaving the legislation, allowing producers to have, the only producer group in terms of an association to have legislative authority in the setting up of that matter. No other producer group has that legislative authority other than, of course, marketing groups.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Did you ever hear of the Women's Institute?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, now the Member for Arthur says, did I ever hear of the Women's Institute? Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that the honourable member is trying to say that the Women's Institute is a producers group. They represent rural women from all across the province. That is not in the same - he is basically talking apples and oranges when he relates to that group.

So, Mr. Speaker, this bill may become the self-prophecy of what the Conservatives were afraid of when they brought the bill in; that really the majority of cattle producers did not support this organization. They did not support it initially, so we had to bring in a compulsory checkoff and allow that group to make the requirements fairly difficult so producers couldn't make a voluntary choice whether to join it or not. That may very well happen what the honourable members say, but I don't believe that the producers of Manitoba should be told that they have to belong; they should make that choice themselves, as to whether or not the funding for this producer group is paid by that producer, whether it's done on a one-time basis, or whether it's done every time a head of cattle is sold, that's up to the association to decide, they will decide which is their best way to settle this matter.

QUESTION put; MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, second reading of Bill No. 90.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Desjardins, Doern; Ms. Dolin; Messrs. Evans, Eyler, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Pawley, Penner; Ms. Phillips; Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott; Mrs. Smith; Messrs. Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Messrs. Banman, Blake, Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham; Mrs. Hammond; Messrs. Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman; Mrs. Oleson; Messrs. Orchard, Ransom.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas 28, Nays 20.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Honourable Member for Emerson has 35 minutes remaining.

BILL NO. 91 - THE REAL ESTATE BROKERS ACT

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I indicated my comments on this bill the other day already, I'd just like to repeat to some degree, in my opinion, the lack of need for this kind of bill. When the Minister indicated that there was only a few instances where the bonding of salesman had come into question at all, to me, at least, it indicates the fact that all the more reason that the bill has been working, that the act to date has been working, it's worked as a deterrent for salesmen not to get themselves into trouble with trust money, and I'd just like to repeat that I think the Minister is asking for trouble. I think he could have left it the way it was, I don't know where the pressure came from to present this bill. With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my comments on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In following up on the comments of my colleague, with respect to these amendments being proposed to the Real Estate Brokers Act, I certainly agree with the intent of what the Minister is doing, that is, to provide a greater degree of protection for the public in dealing with real estate brokers to ensure that there is a sufficient bond available should errors, omissions, deliberate misinformation cause an action. I think it's in the interest of the public to have a sufficient amount of money available under the protection bond. On the other hand, costs have been rising, the prices and values of properties involved in transactions have all gone up so, I think, we can understand and go along with that intent.

I would repeat what the Member for Emerson has said, that in taking away the need to bond a salesman, then I think that we are putting an undue amount of stress, and an undue amount of onus on the salesman's employer - that being the broker in this case - and, I believe, that it's wrong in principle to take away or denigrate from the degree of responsibility that a salesman has in dealing with his clients in a real estate transaction. Admittedly there has been a gathering together of large groups in the real estate sales field so that you're getting more and more salesmen under the employ of a broker, and I can understand the need, therefore, for a greater surety bond on behalf of the

broker; but to take away any sort of responsibility, or any onus of responsibility, from the salesman, I do not think is in the interest of either the public who deal with them or, in fact, their employers, the brokers, and I question the need to do this at this time. As I say, I support the need for an increase in the level of bonding coverage on behalf of the broker, but certainly I don't agree with the move that's being made to take away any responsibility by not requiring a bond on behalf of the salesman, his or herself.

So, consequently, we're quite prepared to pass this along to committee to have it open for discussion to members of the public, and I would expect that there would be a concern expressed by others on this matter.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL 3 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much Mr. Acting Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the other evening we heard a tirade from the Minister of Agriculture that to me was rather astonishing, because first of all he didn't understand what the bill is all about. Secondly, he refused to give us or to substantiate any of the documentation that he used in his arguments. He ended up by saying that the six-month hoist should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that if there is going to be any understanding at all by the Minister of Agriculture on what this bill is about, and if members of the Assembly want to understand what it's all about, then I think there definitely should be a six-month hoist and probably more so they can really begin to understand the purpose of this piece of legislation.

I asked the Minister repeatedly the other night if he would give us the documentation that he was quoting from in the presentation he was making to this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I will read from Hansard, Page 4083, where the Minister says, "Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not have that information at my purview. Even if I had that information, I would not divulge the name of the landholder, Sir. Mr. Speaker, even if I had that information, I would not divulge it."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is asking us to make a decision based on a whole bunch of cases. I believe he cited nine cases the other night. I don't know if they are true or not. He refused to give us the information so we could examine it to see whether or not it was correct. So I would have to assume from that it may be correct or it may not be. I don't know, but the most damaging part about it, Mr. Speaker, was the argument put forward by the Minister.

He cited nine cases. In the citation on all of them, I want to refer, Sir, to his particular comments: Case No. 1, 8,928 acres valued at 5.2 million; Case No. 2, 7,031 acres valued at 7.3 million; Case No. 3, 3,000 acres at 2.5 million; Case No. 4, 5,000 acres at 3.1 million. Then he goes on to further ones: 75 acres purchased for 37,500, but sold later for \$41,250 six

days later, an increase of \$3,750.00; 745 acres for 375,000 and sold later for 409,000, an increase of 34,000, and on and on and on.

In every single case, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is complaining about the increase in price. He's not complaining about the ownership of the land at all. He's concerned about the increase in price. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Honourable Minister that is not the intent of this legislation. That is not the purpose for which it was introduced. I think the Minister is misguided, wrong-headed and ignorant of what the legislation is supposed to do. In every single case that he has cited in Hansard, and I'll ask anybody to refer to Pages 4081, 4082, 4083. His concern has been about the increase in price that occurred when land was transferred from one owner to another.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen many land transfers in my life. I have seen land transferred from one farmer to another, and very seldom has it been at a price lower than what it was purchased for. There has always been an increase in the price on transfer. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I personally bought a half-section of land for \$7,250, and I turned down an offer of \$100,000 for it. I would think that's a pretty significant increase. Yet, I turned down the offer, because I felt that if it was worth 100,000 to somebody else, it was worth 100,000 to me. And I am a farmer.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister seems to be concerned about the price of land. He is not interested in the ownership at all. He's interested in the price. I hope that what the Minister is getting at is not what happens, because if I know the farming community at all, Mr. Speaker, and I think I do and I know that other members on this side of the House do know, a farmer lives his whole life poor in the hopes of dying rich when he sells his farm because the sale price of his farm is his retirement program. He hopes to get as much as he possibly can for his property so that he can retire in comfort. He has lived his whole life, scratching from pillar to post to make ends meet, so that he can retire. That, Mr. Speaker, requires that there be an increase in price of that farm land in order for that farmer to retire.

Now if the Minister of Agriculture is telling me that he wants every farmer in Manitoba to have no retirement program; that he wants to tie everyone of them to the land and say, there's no possible way you're going to get the value for your land when you sell it, then I have to tell the Minister that he is barking up the wrong, wrong tree. The Minister has no comprehension of agriculture and is totally unfit to be a Minister of Agriculture if that is the way he is carrying out the business of agriculture in this province.

Mr. Speaker, it just infuriates me to see this Minister of Agriculture bringing forth arguments, this tripe that he brought out the other night in his defence of this bill. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I know that I should not be dallying too long on the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture. In fact, if I gave five minutes to it, I think that's five minutes too long because it is not worth the paper that it's written on. — (Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to deal with the bill that the Minister has brought forward, and deal with it in a positive way to provide constructive criticism that I hope the Minister will take and consider very seriously when this bill goes to committee. — (Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, I'm not really concerned about who ducked what vote or who the guy is that wants to sit over there and yap, but I would suggest if he wants to yap, he leave the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the — (Interjection)
—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to you, Sir, that we have a member in the Legislature that is not properly dressed, the Member for Radisson. If the rest of us have to sweat in this here hot box, I see no reason why he should be allowed to take his jacket off.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to you that my jacket is on my back.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: If he enjoys wearing a shawl, that's up to him.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a dress code in this House and I intend to see that it be carried out. — (Interjection) — Put his jacket back on.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the Honourable Member for Portage that it is tradition in this House that formal wear has to be in place, or at least worn by the person, but it doesn't indicate that your tie has to be fully up to the neck. I have a tie on, although my top button is loose. The rules do not indicate that the jacket must be worn with both arms through the sleeves as long as the person is properly attired; and the Honourable Member for Radisson is properly attired, Mr. Speaker, and therefore the objection is ludicrous.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage, quite rightfully, has pointed out to you, Sir, as the Speaker of this Assembly, that one member in this Assembly is not properly dressed. He is not wearing the attire properly that one would consider to be properly dressed. His jacket is draped over his shoulders, his arms are not in the sleeves and he is not properly dressed, that I would say, would leave a good public image for this Chamber where we are supposed to be statesmen and present ourselves properly. What they are doing is truly demonstrating how sloppy they are as a government, Mr. Speaker, and won't respect the decorum of this Chamber.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Radisson will explain, perhaps, how the formal wear of a jacket is.

MR. G. LECUYER: No, Mr. Speaker. I propose you take the matter under advisement and in the meantime maybe we'll get this Assembly or this Chamber cooled off a little bit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, when I spoke to you about the dress in this House, that man, that Member for Radisson did not have his jacket over his shoulders — (Interjection) — he did not. And I say to you, Sir, that there is a dress code in this House and if you're going to let that man carry on with his jacket just draped over his shoulders, let the rest of us do it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The real question here is what does wearing proper attire mean? I think we are quarreling about a very trivial matter, but it affects the decorum and respect in the House as well. I don't think the Member for Radisson will object in putting his hands through his jacket so that it will be proper attire.

The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the last 15 minutes was not deducted from my time in the debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member has about seven minutes more.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Could the Speaker indicate again how much I have left?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Seven minutes.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Seven minutes? Mr. Speaker, I have only been speaking 10 minutes on this bill and I believe that I'm entitled to 40 minutes in debate and I would like to deal with the important factors in this bill.

One of the things that has caused me the greatest of concern is in the definition portion where the bill attempts to define who a farmer is. A farmer means a resident who receives a significant portion of his income, either directly or indirectly, from his occupation of farming and who spends a significant portion of his time actively engaged in farming.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like to know what "significant" means. In attempting to find out I went to The Municipal Assessment Act which states that, "in determining whether or not a building is exempt under Section 30(5), it states that where a farmer receives his major source of income is from the farm; and if his income from other sources is greater than his farm income, then his buildings are taxable." I would ask, is this what is intended by saying a significant portion? Does the major source of income have to come from the farm in order for a person to qualify as a farmer under this thing?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it's a very dangerous precedent to just leave that as loosely worded as it is

where it says, "a significant portion." To a farmer 10 percent today, in a depressed economy, is significant. It may be peanuts to the Minister of Agriculture, but I think it is a very significant portion. I think that should be cleaned up when we get to committee.

One of the other parts that bothers me about this bill, Mr. Speaker, is a section that deals with the reverse onus. Reverse onus is always an abhorrent practice that has been frowned on in all legislation for many many years. We find that reverse onus is, again, rearing its ugly head in this bill where it says that "the onus lies on the person to prove his innocence," rather than on the Appeal Board to prove that he is guilty.

So the reverse onus part of it, I think, is one section that should not be allowed to stand in there. If there is any doubt I think the responsibility lies with the Farm Protection Board to prove otherwise.

It is, I think, rather significant, Mr. Speaker, that there are grounds for appeal from decisions of the Farm Lands Protection Board in certain cases. There are some cases, Mr. Speaker, where there are no grounds for appeal. I would think that section is one that is probably the most dangerous of any in this particular bill. It gives the Farm Lands Protection Board the right to exempt any individual, any corporation, or any class of persons, class of farm land, interest in farm land, or class of interest in farm land, to exempt any or any part of that from this bill. That decision of the Farm Lands Protection Board, in exempting somebody from the control, is absolute; it is absolute. There is no appeal from any decision of the Farm Lands Protection Board when they exempt a person from coming under the control of this board.

Mr. Speaker, can you see people who, through devious means, want to circumvent the purpose of this act? The Minister of Agriculture brought this very act in to try and prevent things of that nature happening. Yet, he is building a great big catch-all that will allow those very things to happen. In doing so, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture has opened the door to the biggest payola that could possibly happen in agricultural land in the Province of Manitoba. It would be the most corrupt situation that could possibly happen if he does not allow an appeal on any decision that is made from this board.

On top of it, he has exempted members of the board from any liability for their actions. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that if he is going to leave that in there he should certainly hold the members of the board personally liable for their actions.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be very interesting to see who he puts on that Farm Lands Protection Board, because they will, of necessity, have to be people who have tremendous ability to resist pressure, because I'm sure that pressure would be there - just look, do me a favour, and I'll do you a favour; you exempt me from the actions of this board - and you have the power to do it. That power and that action has no appeal from anyone, not even the Minister. The board can do that without any appeal at all of their decisions.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that is probably the most dangerous piece of legislation, or dangerous section, in legislation that could ever be devised. I don't know who the Machiavellian person was that brought it in, but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, very strongly that, when it goes to committee, must be removed because

it opens the door to graft, corruption and payola, the likes of which this province would never see again. I cannot stress too strongly how dangerous that particular section is, and I would urge all members to consider it carefully when it gets to committee.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are my few comments on this bill. I know that there are many other things that I could talk about on it, but I wanted to point out two or three of the very dangerous things, and the fact that the Minister, in his remarks the other night, was completely misguided. He wasn't interested in ownership at all; the only thing that he was concerned about in every case he cited was the increase in value of the land. So that he has not got the interests of the farming community at heart at all; he doesn't know what he's talking about, and I would hope that members in this Chamber will support the hoist motion. Give the Minister six months to try and clean up his act and understand what farming is all about. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Waiding: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Is it the wish of the House to have the matter stand?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker. I had received this list after consultation with the . . . Perhaps the Honourable Member for La Verendrye could . . . do you want to wait a moment? Perhaps we could go to No. 85 and then come back to that one, Mr. Speaker, No. 85?

BILL 47 - THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs Bill No. 47. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In dealing with Bill No. 47 which is an act which will deal with conflict of interest at the municipal council level, I have several observations that I want to make with regard to the proposed legislation.

One of the things that we have faced in society over the last number of years is a growing cry by many sectors of the public to put in place some types of disclosures for people who are running for public office. This bill, after looking at it, is almost identical I guess in many aspects to the one which we are going to be dealing with as members of the Legislature ourselves, and that is before us at this time. One of the difficulties that one has in dealing with this legislation is that it is geared for the entire province and I wish to elaborate on that statement somewhat and clarify it.

In smaller rural communities this type of legislation will cause a lot of problems. We have many people who are serving on municipal councils who are doing so out of a spirit of public service and who are, in one way or another, very active in the community either through farming ventures, through business ventures or even dealing with such things as real estate and many other businesses that are conducted by people self-employed as well as working for others in the smaller rural areas.

One of the difficulties that this legislation will present is that it will allow virtually anybody who has any axe to grind with any councillor or with any mayor or with any reeve, to go into the municipal office and demand to see what type of assets that individual has even though it might be a small percentage like a 5 percent share in a particular company, or they will be able to see exactly what that individual's wife has, and should that individual have some dependents or some children still living at home that are involved in any operations, they will also have to disclose that.

Now to someone living in Winnipeg that might not make much difference because you are not subject in the city to the type of small-town politics that get played in very many rural municipalities. One has to remember that in a municipal election now for councillors there is very often maybe 125 votes cast in a ward and you have one councillor running against the other one and there, somebody can win with 70 votes. This is a very small close-knit community and if somebody wants to cause a little havoc, cause some problems, this type of legislation is just geared to allow that to happen. As one of the members has pointed out it is tailor-made for that type of action.

One of the things that concerns me and concerns all members and should concern all members of the Legislature, is the effect this will have on people who have expertise in certain fields in the community who have done well in the community, that this type of legislation will, rather than encourage them to run, will definitely have a bearing on whether they feel that they want to go ahead and disclose all their assets.

Now, let me just give you an example of what could happen and it's happened in our community. In a time of tough economic times we see a business, for instance, that is on the verge of bankruptcy. The community wants to keep that business. Four or five people get together and each put in \$5,000 or \$10,000 to try and salvage that business, that means that automatically they now have maybe a 5 or 10 percent interest in that business. They really don't want to be involved. They're not even looking for a return on their investment. They hope to maybe get that capital that they put into that business out of it at sometime but suddenly the councillor or the mayor who has put \$5,000 or \$10,000 into a small enterprise to save that at a time when, as I mentioned, that business is going bankrupt - it might of a plumbing and heating nature in that community, the only backhoe operator that they have - suddenly the mayor has to go to the town office, disclose that he's got an interest in it; this is the type of thing that one sees happening over and over again to people that are involved in public office.

This bill, I suggest to you, makes it virtually impossible for anybody involved in the real estate business to run for town council because they will, in one form or

another, by commission or something else have a 5 percent interest in anything. I think most commissions are running at 6 or 7 percent right now and if you get involved in any venture where you're dealing with properties, I suggest to the members opposite that every time a real estate agent for some reason or other buys a house and it's entered on his name personally or his wife's name to either make a livelihood, for resale or that, that has to be added onto this particular bill.

I guess my biggest objection, and I go back to what I mentioned earlier, the biggest objection I have to it is that anybody for any frivolous reason can go and ask for a disclosure of all these assets. I think, not only should that be changed, I have no problem with people listing their assets and having those filed away with the clerk - or in our case with the clerk and in the municipal councillors' case, with the secretary-treasurer.

But to have anybody just walk in off the street just to maybe cause a little bit of mischief within the community, I think that is wrong. If there are allegations made and there is good cause being shown why there could possibly be a conflict of interest, I think then that can be looked up.

Now the Minister says, how is anybody to know? In a small community, Mr. Speaker, that is just about common knowledge; everybody knows. We've seen some things happen in rural areas where there have been alleged conflicts of interest on situations where there was only maybe one type of business of that nature in the municipality, or in the area, and the municipality has done business with that. We've clarified that to a certain extent in our act now, but that, years ago, was a contentious point; we've cleaned that particular thing up.

But I say to members opposite that, even though there is a hue and cry for disclosure and conflict of interest legislation, most rural areas and most people know if they are being taken advantage of, and that particular individual will not sit and serve on council very long.

So I say to members opposite, to force councillors, mayors and Reeves to have, for public scrutiny, at anybody's whim or fancy to look at these assets of themselves, their wives and their children, their dependents, I think is wrong, and I think there should be just cause having to be shown before anybody can go and do that, because really what will happen, I say to the Minister, what you're really doing is you are, by this bill, going to on the municipal level, cause a lot more problems for people running than you have now.

The Minister realizes that, in some areas, last time we couldn't even find anybody. In some of the towns we couldn't even find anybody to run for mayor; you had to appoint them. We had to hold new elections and I say to the Minister — (Interjection) — That's what I'm saying. Mr. Speaker, the Minister is now missing the point. I'm saying that even without this bill it was difficult to get people; and what I'm saying to you, it's going to be even more difficult now because people will not want to do that.

I feel that this bill will definitely deter a lot of good people, people who do have assets and who want to have some privacy in their private life, it will keep them from running. That is, as I have mentioned, my own personal belief and I really, from my experience in municipal politics, having been there, know this to be a fact.

The other thing I want to just briefly mention is the problem with the government having maybe moved on this in a fashion which I don't think is at all proper at this point in time. The Minister claimed that he has sent these conflict bills out - I know I sent them out to my municipal councils and I've got a lot of comments back - and I say to the Minister, I'm reflecting some of their comments. They agree with some aspects of it because, when they are voting on things that are of possible conflict to them, they would agree with the abstaining portions of the bill and that type of thing; but the total asset disclosure of 5 percent equity or more by both spouses is something that just isn't acceptable to the majority of councils.

I point out another thing in the bill, and maybe this really demonstrates how you've moved on this too quickly, Mr. Minister. You have said that on October 1st this bill comes into force. Well, Mr. Minister, you know what's happening on October 26th, we're going to have a municipal election in Manitoba. So what I'm saying to the Minister is, I think it would be kind of ludicrous to ask all the councillors to file, by October 1st, when maybe a lot of them won't be running on October 26th. For a period of 24 or 25 days I don't think that we should force them to go through all this paper work, because a lot of them might not be there next time. So I say to the Minister, I believe that's sort of indicative of the hastiness with which we've proceeded with this. I don't think this bill, if it's passed, and I wish the Minister would make some substantive changes to it, but I don't think, if it is passed, it should be passed for October 1st. You could maybe make it affective December 1st so that the new councils that come in will go ahead and have to comply with the act.

Then at least the new councillors know what they're running under. If the government insists they want to pass this act in its present form the new councillors will know the type of disclosure that they're looking at and then will have to comply with the act if the government wishes to pass it in its present form.

So I say to the Minister, while there is a large hue and cry for conflict of interest legislation, I believe the public will not be best served by this bill; I believe that it will deter good people from running and, in the final analysis, even though we talk about conflicts and possible conflicts, this bill will hurt municipal governments, and people will not get as good a service, because of this bill, as they would have before.

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

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Burrows wish to speak to this bill?

MR. C. SANTOS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: All I want to do, briefly, Mr. Speaker, is respond to some of the points raised by the Member for La Verendrye.

The member has stated that, because of this bill, many persons of high quality and expertise and skill will be discouraged from running for public office simply because they had made a little investment in some little enterprise in the municipality. He cited, for example, an investment of about \$5,000, and he also stated that anyone who is engaged in the realty business, as a broker or as an agent, would find himself in a difficult position because he would almost always be found in some kind of a conflict situation while acting, at the same time, as an alderman, a municipal councillor or a mayor. But the logic about the inhibition that is being placed by this legislation is to prevent a person who, acting in one capacity, deals with himself in another capacity.

It is too well known that in the large cities, including the City of Winnipeg, and I suppose even in small municipalities, some people who are members of the city council find some information ahead of the public, with respect to a change in zoning regulations of a certain piece of land, and if they are also engaged in the realty business that gives them an undue advantage over the other citizens and the public-at-large. Therefore, they can buy ahead the piece of land and make a killing in terms of quick money or profit. That is the reason why a person who is occupying a position of public trust is now being inhibited to deal with himself in another capacity as an investor or as a businessman, because it will not be right. It is not fair to the rest of the public-at-large that someone will have some inside information about some proposed change in zoning regulation, let's say, of some agricultural land that will be rezoned into another type of land, like commercial development land, and that information is not available to the rest of the public-at-large. It gives him an undue advantage, and it is unfair for the rest of the other people in the community to be deprived of the opportunity which is available to the one who is a member of the city council.

Therefore, the reason is that, instead of putting the person in a difficult situation it, in fact, helps him get out of trouble before he gets into one such kind of difficult situation. Strictly speaking, it may not be moral, but it doesn't look good if a person has advance information about some reclassification of lands and other people do not have such information, and they have a business interest to protect; and they also, in another capacity, will be acting as members of the city council, or as mayor of the municipality. So it is very, very logical and fair that everybody should have the same footing with respect to business opportunities for investment.

The other point raised by the Member for La Verendrye is that anybody who has an axe to grind, a member of the public, will easily come to the municipality and inquire and snoop around a person's possessions. Therefore, he said that it may not be a problem with respect to big urbanized cities like Winnipeg or Brandon, but in the case of a small municipality that might be a difficult problematic situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, when this bill is next before the House, the honourable member will have 35 minutes remaining.

The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour.

MR. B. RANSOM: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: I would just confirm then that the bill will be standing in the name of the Member for Burrows and not the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not put the question to the House on the motion by the Honourable Minister since another member wished to speak. The bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Burrows who will have 35 minutes remaining.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first resolution before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, Resolution No. 14, and the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Concordia. The Honourable Member for Kirkfield has 10 minutes remaining.

RES. NO. 14 - UNPOLLUTED WATER SOURCE FOR WINNIPEG

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it might just be wise to reread the amendment, to reread actually the resolution. It says:

"WHEREAS Shoal Lake is the only developed source for the essential service of water supply for the residents of the City of Winnipeg; and

"WHEREAS development on Shoal Lake could increase the risk to Winnipeg's water supply and might result in water quality that is unsatisfactory without full treatment prior to use at a large increase of cost; and

"WHEREAS there is currently under consideration a proposed 350-foot lot cottage development on the shores of Shoal Lake;" and the original amendment:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of the Province of Manitoba protect the right of the people of Winnipeg to an unpolluted water source without unnecessary cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba."

The resolution was then amended to say:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of the Province of Manitoba continue to work with the City of Winnipeg, the Government of Canada, and Shoal Lake Indian Band No. 40."

I want to ask the members of the government, how long do we continue to work towards a solution to an unpolluted water supply? It is now July, and there does not seem to be a solution in sight. How long do we continue to work? Do we go months? Do we go years? When is the Band impact statement to be filed with FEARO?

Back on November 30, 1982, when I received a letter from the Mayor of Winnipeg about the Shoal Lake, it said, "The city believes that the best way to guarantee the safety of the water is to have the Band's proposal scrutinized by the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, FEARO. FEARO panel to assess the Band's proposal was appointed by the Minister of

Environment on January 13, 1981. However, to date, the Band has refused to submit its development plan for review."

I don't think, to this date, that the development plan has been filed. I may be wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think that has been filed. In the meantime, how long do the citizens of Winnipeg have to go before something is done about their water supply? You can only work so many months, so many years.

Manitoba has got one of the purest water supplies that there is. It is a supply that we have had for years, and we hope to continue to have. How long is this particular government planning to put our water supply in jeopardy? I don't imagine that the NDP Government wants to be known as the government that helped wreck Winnipeg's water supply and yet, that's exactly what could happen.

Here we have a proposal for 350 cottages that may, or may not, be built with all the pollution and sewage problems that go along with it. We are in a time when no one seems to be doing anything; people, again, have sort of forgotten. I'm sure the citizens of Winnipeg have put it into the back of their mind that Shoal Lake is there; their water supply is always there. But I hope they don't wake up one day, Mr. Speaker, and find that something has happened, that their water is polluted, and then we have a massive problem on our hands. We have got a massive problem on our hands today, and yet this government doesn't seem to want to deal with it.

I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that as a government it has to be dealt with now. It is not a problem that is yesterday's; it's a problem that's today's, and it is going to be a problem in the future. I think that we have to be very concerned and very aware of what might happen to our city should we lose this particular water supply. It would be strictly through negligence and sitting back and thinking, well there is always tomorrow and we can wait another day. We'll continue to work with the feds; we'll continue to work with the Indian Bands; we'll do anything but try and solve the problem.

I think that the big problem today is that this is the government that was going to solve every problem. They promised the people of Manitoba they were going to turn the province around and now they say, what did we do? Well, they said they could do it all. We really didn't have to do anything. In fact, anything that happened we were to blame.

But, Mr. Speaker, they're the government of the day and the government today will be the one that will be blamed if something happens. They screamed and cried about this particular problem but nothing has happened. Here we are, we're consulting with the Feds; we give in to any situation; we interfere in everything where we shouldn't have our noses in; there's The Farm Lands Ownership Act, there's any number of bills, any number of things that aren't needed and yet what is needed is some help for the people of Winnipeg, for the City of Winnipeg, to help give us some solution to the problem that's facing us now.

It's not just enough to blame, and we don't want to lay the blame, what we want to do is solve the problem and that is what I am saying to you, is try and solve the problem. — (Interjection) — Oh, they just sit over there and laugh and the Minister of Urban Affairs especially sits and laughs because I know that he in

particular has been the one that has been holding back on what is happening. He's the one that wants to consult. In fact, I think he'd like our water supply to just go somewhere else, disappear, but it won't disappear, hopefully it won't disappear.

I think if this government would just come to grips with the real problems that Manitobans face - and the Winnipeg water supply is one - not The Election Act; not to give us money for our own elections; not to give us pieces of paper to send out to our constituents, we can do those things ourselves. Give us the help we need that we can't do without. It's only problems such as this that this government can help work out and yet they are doing nothing.

You're sitting in this House, content and hiding, plan to stay here all summer, that's fine, but these are problems that when we bring them to the attention of the people of Winnipeg that you're not doing anything about, believe me the problem is there and they will rise up and they will say, what are you doing? I cannot tell you how important this particular issue is. It's not — (Interjection) — oh, the Member for Thompson laughs. I want to tell you he laughs at anything that doesn't happen in Thompson; but Winnipeggers sometimes, and even us that are in the suburbs, we like our water supply too and we have some say even though you see us as sitting there just very comfortable.

This is very important to us and believe me we'll get the message. We'll get it into the St. James constituency and into Inkster constituency. We'll get it into — (Interjection) — oh, eat them? We won't bother eating the words. What we want to be able to do is have a safe supply of clear water that we can drink, not some polluted water that has garbage and sewage in it. We want our water supply protected.

I say to you, through you Mr. Speaker, let us get on with the job of saving Winnipeg's water supply. It does us no good to be sitting around consulting any more. How much more can you consult. For heaven's sake get on with the job and let's get something done and let's, by all means, do something about the problem that we face with the Shoal Lake.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to have the opportunity of speaking on this resolution though I'm somewhat perplexed and don't quite understand why we're dealing with this resolution.

The resolution suggests that the government hasn't been taking a clear position with respect to the protection of the City of Winnipeg water supply and I think the record, and I'll relate it to the members opposite just to refresh their memories, that the record is clear with respect to this government's role and this government's position with respect to the City of Winnipeg water supply.

So given that record, Mr. Speaker, one has to ask the question, why is this resolution here? If the government's record is clear with respect to the protection of the City of Winnipeg water supply, why is this resolution here? As I understand the kind of resolutions that come up from time-to-time in Private

Members' Hour, they are there for a number of reasons to give direction to a government, to place issues of importance to the people of the province, to other governments; or sometimes, Mr. Speaker, they are used by members in order to make their position clear.

So I'd suggest the reason behind this resolution being here for those members opposite to get their position clear in the record because it hasn't been, it hasn't been, Mr. Speaker, and one would have to look at what happened during the years that they were in government and what they did with respect to this issue. There must be some feeling of guilt, Mr. Speaker, that they brought this resolution forward. There must be some feeling of guilt, that they wanted to make sure the record was clear with respect to their position with respect to the City of Winnipeg water supply. They must have some guilt with respect to that, Mr. Speaker. That's why . . .

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

MR. G. FILMON: I believe it's improper for any member to impute motives for bringing forth a resolution or for any other action taken in this House. I'm sure the member doesn't understand the rules but perhaps you could edify him on them.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Honourable Minister is quite aware of the rule that prohibits the imputing of motives to other members of the Legislature.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not want to impute motives to the members opposite; that seems to be some sensitivity from some members opposite with respect to that, but it's certainly my impression as to why this resolution is before the House.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The stone, Mr. Speaker, hit another rather shaky windshield over there, but that is up to members opposite to speak to, but it seems that they are very sensitive when I suggested that it may well be part of the reasons behind this resolution.

The position of this government, Mr. Speaker, has been clear with respect to Shoal Lake, with respect to doing everything that's possible to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply. The member that spoke previously made fun of the amendment saying wherein the amendment calls for the government to continue to work with the Federal Government with the Band, with the City of Winnipeg to protect the Winnipeg water supply, somehow implying that we ought not to continue.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for all my colleagues on this side, that we will continue to work; that we will do everything in our power to work with the other levels of government to protect the Winnipeg water supply. If that takes days, Mr. Speaker, if that takes months, Mr. Speaker, if that takes years, we will continue to do that. We're not going to stop our efforts because of members opposite. They seem to think that the amendment that we've proposed, that if we continue

to keep our efforts up is somehow ridiculous, but I'm not going to stop my efforts to do everything in my power to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply because I think it's important for the residents of the City of Winnipeg.

There seems to be a lot of sensitivity on this issue opposite, especially when I made comments earlier. Well, I think times always seems to prove things out, Mr. Speaker, and I think if members opposite are a bit more patient over the next while and the people of the province, they'll clearly understand the position of this government and we'll, hopefully, in due course, understand the position of members opposite when they had an opportunity of being in government and had the opportunity of protecting the City of Winnipeg water supply.

I would like for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to just outline what has taken place, what actions have been undertaken by this government, in particular, actions taken by my department with respect to the City of Winnipeg water supply. This was an issue that we inherited when we formed government in December of 1981.

It was within weeks, I believe within two weeks, of assuming office, of being appointed to Executive Council that I held a meeting with the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, a number of councillors from the City of Winnipeg, key staff from the City of Winnipeg and my colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs responsible for the Environment. We met with the city to listen to them, to get an understanding of their concerns with respect to the proposed 350-cottage-lot development on Shoal Lake Indian Reserve No. 40.

It was shortly after that that we met further with representatives of Indian Band No. 40 to hear their position with respect to the development proposals that they had been making for a number of years, in fact, a number of years prior to us coming into office, proposals that they had discussed with the previous Conservative Government over a number of years, Mr. Speaker.

As a result of those meetings, this issue was discussed by my Cabinet colleagues and myself. We decided that we were going to do everything that we could to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply, and to ensure that no development would take place on I.R. No. 40 that would in any way have the possibilities of degrading the water supply of the City of Winnipeg.

There were further meetings held throughout that winter, in February and May with various representatives. It seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that those discussions were not taking us anywhere; that there was not in sight any resolve to the problems.

I suggested to all the parties, both to the City of Winnipeg, to the Mayor, to Chief Red Sky and to the federal Minister - in fact, I wrote to all of them on June 23rd of last year suggesting that we all meet to see if we can look at identifying solutions to the problems.

In the early part of July of 1982, I travelled along with my staff to I.R. No. 40 on Reserve land and toured first-hand the area so that I could get a better understanding and met with the full membership of the Band Council of I.R. Band No. 40. At the same time, I had arranged a tour by city officials of the intake of the City of Winnipeg water supply at Shoal Lake, and had a good briefing by city staff on the way that the

intake and the associated works there operate with respect to drawing the water out of Shoal Lake and sending it on its way down the aqueduct to the City of Winnipeg.

This was actually the second opportunity that I'd had. A number of years previous, I had the opportunity of travelling to that area by train, but I certainly didn't have the kind of briefing that I received this time. I was certainly impressed, Mr. Speaker, at the operation there, impressed to the extent that that was developed many years ago. I was impressed also with the fact that very little was added to the water in the initial stage and, of course, at this end to make sure that it's safe for human consumption in the City of Winnipeg. So it is a unique resource that we have for the City of Winnipeg, the water that does come to us from Shoal Lake.

As a result of my letter, we were able to convene a meeting with the Federal Minister, Mr. Munro, with also in attendance the Federal Minister of Employment and Immigration, Mr. Axworthy, and the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, representatives from the Executive Policy Committee and Chief Red Sky and his advisors and Band Council members. At that meeting, we outlined the various problems that were associated with I.R. No. 40, dealing with the specific proposal for a cottage-lot development, dealing with the potential sewage and solid waste problems.

We did reach a tentative accord at that meeting, calling for the development of two parallel processes. It was decided that each of the parties would go back to their respective councils, governments - what have you - to get agreement on that accord. That accord allowed for two parallel developments. One was that the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Panel would be asked to adjust its guidelines to restrict its consideration of the proposed project to the impact on matters related to the water quality, and to proceed through the normal hearing and reporting process as soon as possible. Related to that was that the parties would agree to submit all relevant information to the panel as quickly as possible.

Secondly, contingent on the above, Canada, Manitoba, Winnipeg and the Band would designate negotiators to begin to prepare a draft agreement on possible compensation on a cost-shared basis in order to restrict developments on Reserve No. 40 to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply. So we were able to reach an agreement at that point in time on July 26th at that meeting with all of the representatives to take back that proposal and reply by September 1st.

That proposal was unique in a number of ways. It did, for the first time, bring recognition to the fact that we had to look at the possibility of some kind of agreement to limit development on I.R. No. 40 and, for the first time, there was a commitment from the Federal Government that they would cost share if need be in such a process.

We also discussed at that time, as I indicated previously, the concern with the Band sewage and waste solid garbage problems, and indicated that we were prepared to co-operate in that regard to find both short-term and long-term solutions to the problems on the Reserve for the disposal of their sewage and garbage.

Unfortunately, the September 1st deadline passed without responses being received from the various parties. I indicated and confirmed with my colleagues

in Cabinet, the province had accepted the Accord reached on July 26th, and unfortunately the other parties did not reply and did not indicate their concurrence with it, but that did take place shortly after with respect to the Federal Government and the city, except the city would not authorize their negotiator - they named a negotiator - but would not authorize their negotiator to enter into negotiations until the FEARO process actually commenced and that was one area that there was some disagreement with, from other parties to the Accord, but that nevertheless was the city's position.

Unfortunately the Band initially indicated that they would not go along with that accord, which distressed us, and it was some months subsequent that they finally did agree to the original tentative agreement that was reached on July 26th.

We did continue through the fall and winter months meeting with both the city and representatives of the Band and the Federal Government, to look at bringing about solutions to the particular problems on the reserve lands with respect to the sewage and solid waste disposal. So continuing throughout that time, Mr. Speaker, we were working on the problems associated with the disposal of sewage and garbage on reserve land. That is very important, Mr. Speaker, because one has to appreciate that the reserve land is located on the shores of Shoal Lake and if sewage and solid waste isn't disposed of in a suitable matter, that that in itself may even with the present population and present activities on the reserve land, that can cause problems with respect to the City of Winnipeg water supply.

There has been lots made in discussion on this issue, both in this resolution and on other occasions that it's been discussed in this House either in Estimates or in question period, much has been made of the fact that the City of Winnipeg decided to issue a leaflet with respect to the problems there and some members suggested the reason that the city did that, was that the province was not supporting the city; and that is simply not true, Mr. Speaker.

The province has indicated to the city at all times, that its major concern and its guiding principle in all of the discussions, all of the meetings, all of the actions that we have taken since December 1, 1981, has been to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply. In doing that, Mr. Speaker, we have recognized that there are people, there are human beings that are living on the reserve land located adjacent to the Shoal Lake area and that you also have to deal with the human problems of those people; that you can't simply ignore them and say that we are not going to deal with your problems with respect to economic development; we are not going to deal with your problems with respect to your own sewage and solid waste disposal; we are not going to deal with the fact that you've lost any likelihood of having any kind of meaningful economic activity.

We are not going to ignore that; we are not going to turn our backs on the people there. But we, on the other hand, were not going to take actions that were going to bring about any damage to the City of Winnipeg water supply. That position has been made very clear and as I indicated, in all our actions to date, Mr. Speaker. It has certainly been made clear to the City of Winnipeg and I think the city understands it even though members opposite don't.

I'll just quote from a letter, one of many that I sent regarding this issue. This was sent to the mayor in December: "In conclusion," I wrote, "we appreciate and share the city's concern with respect to its water supply and we look forward to participating actively in co-operative efforts to resolve the immediate and the long-term problems associated with development pressure from Band No. 40 and other land owners and resource users in the Shoal Lake watershed."

I know others may speak about other activities that we're taking with respect to protecting the whole Shoal Lake watershed area, Mr. Speaker, but I submit and repeat, and unfortunately have to repeat and repeat, that the province's position is clear with respect to the protection of the City of Winnipeg water supply.

In that regard I still don't understand, I'm still somewhat perplexed why this resolution is here. I can only conclude, from my own understanding, it must be that others wish to make their position clear because this government, on this side of the House, have made their position abundantly clear, that we are doing all in our power and we will continue, as the amendment says, Mr. Speaker, we'll continue to work with all levels of government, including the local Band government there and any others, we will continue no matter how long it takes to ensure that the City of Winnipeg water supply is protected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Speaker, my contribution to this debate is going to be a little bit short. The Minister doesn't understand why this resolution is here. I will give the Minister credit for having done some work toward this end, but recently nothing much has been happening.

Mr. Speaker, it boggles my mind to think that here we are playing politics with something that isn't political. We're discussing something that is imperative to life, water.

This resolution is asking that the Provincial Government to take greater efforts to make sure that the City of Winnipeg has an adequate supply of pollution-free water. This affects us all, those of you that live outside the urban boundaries of the City of Winnipeg as well as those that live in the City of Winnipeg. If you are working in Winnipeg, water is important to you as well as it is to us who live in the City of Winnipeg.

Again I say, all that we are asking the Provincial Government of Manitoba to do is everything in its power to resolve the problem that is at Indian Bay and to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply. I mean, that isn't all that much to ask, I don't think. I think it's important to each and every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution put forward by my colleague, the Member for Tuxedo, echoes the concerns of about 600,000 people in the City of Winnipeg - half of the population of Manitoba, or better - who for almost 100 years have taken for granted that each time they turn on the water tap, that they're going to get fresh, clear, cool water, unpolluted. We've all been made aware of how our forefathers had the foresight to build the aqueduct and have the courage and vision to develop

the water supply that we have and the residents of Winnipeg really, all they're asking for is clean, unpolluted water.

We need a clear commitment from the government to do this. We got it, but we get bogged down every once in awhile and nothing happens and I think it's just about time that all this resolution does is bring this back into focus and get the people who are sitting on their hands on this - and I'm not necessarily saying the Provincial Government either - maybe the City of Winnipeg is sitting on its hands too, but between the two of them they've got to get together and resolve this. I realize that the Indian Band at Indian Bay has some rights as well, but surely to goodness between the three of them, the Provincial Government, the City of Winnipeg and the Indian Band, if they can come to solution, if it's a tradeoff of lands or whatever, but surely to goodness we can come up with something that will resolve this situation.

As far as I personally am concerned, this resolution is just bringing it forward again and if nothing happens any faster than has happened in the last four or five years that I'm aware of this situation, if nothing happens in the next three or four years, I think maybe next year we'll bring the same resolution forward again. Something has to move and if it takes a resolution like this to move, then so be it, okay.

That is all I have to say on the subject, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Minister will give me the courtesy of listening as I did to him. If he has to prod Mayor Norrie and the powers that be, not only in his own government but at City Hall to get something moving, then so be it, do it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too, would like to add a few words to this resolution. I won't speak at length, probably not much longer than the Member for Assiniboia.

I'd just like to say that what I've heard to date is pretty well not much more than a list of platitudes. So many people have gotten up and they've given the history of the great Winnipeg water supply. We all know how important the water supply is to Winnipeg, but that doesn't tell us what to do, that just tells us what we've got to save. They haven't really offered us any positive approach as to how to solve this problem. They've just simply said, like the Member for Kirkfield Park, do something, do something, do anything and that's not the way we work, Mr. Speaker.

I could get up, do like they do and say that we have a great water supply. I could say that I live in an area right now where I'm on a well system and I look forward to getting back to Winnipeg's water supply because I don't like country water. I do appreciate the water supply we've got even more now that I've experienced country water.

I also have a more personal - that's no slur, of course, on the country members who don't have the benefit of nice water from the Shield but I do have a preference for Shield water - but I also have a more personal interest too, Mr. Speaker, I have a cottage on Shoal

Lake. It's eight miles from the intake - in case you're worried about it being in the subdivision - it's eight miles away and I watch what happens in that lake. I often worry about what's happening out there too.

I see the gold mines coming in that are reopening. I see Consolidated Professor with its diamond-drilling program, and they're getting ready to open up on an island in the middle of Shoal Lake. I see Dennison exploring around the old Mikado Mine. You drive by the Cedar Island Gold Mine and you can see the cyanide flats stretching out into the lake. There's been a lot of problems there in the past. What we've got now is maybe an unpolluted system, water supply, but there have been threats in the past and there are threats that are coming up in the future. — (Interjection) —

The Member for Kirkfield Park says, when are we going to stop working toward something and do something, all I can say is that you don't stop working, you're always working. Maybe the members on that side of the House have the impression that you can work for a few years, make lots of money, and then retire, and they translate this into political activity. But on this side where we work day after day after day all of our lives as working people, we know that you don't stop working. You always have to be on guard. You don't just simply say, well this is solved and now that's that, we can move onto something else.

So I have to wonder why the opposition brought this resolution in. The Member for Tuxedo got up and at the beginning of his explanation, he said quote: "To ensure that there is no question in the minds of the administration or the elected representatives of the City of Winnipeg, or indeed any of the residents as to what is the position of the Provincial Government and the members of the Legislature with respect to that very serious commitment and concern to protect the water supply, the domestic drinking water supply of the residents of the City of Winnipeg."

I would imagine that he is almost half right on that point, Mr. Speaker, because I know that we have given a commitment on this side, but I have to wonder about what kind of commitments his government gave in the past. You have to consider what Mr. Jorgenson said in 1980. He said: "Certainly we will do what we can to ensure that the legitimate interests of the City of Winnipeg are protected." He didn't promise a carte blanche protection of the rights of the City of Winnipeg for their water supply. He didn't promise anything. He didn't bring in a resolution that says that we will quote, "protect the right of the people of Winnipeg to an unpolluted water source." He didn't say that.

Why do they want us to say that? Why do they want us to guarantee something which isn't within our real power? We live in a federal system. We don't live in a system where one government can dictate everything that happens in its environs. There's the Government of Canada to consider. There's the Indian Bands to consider. When we say in our resolution that we will work with the Indian Band, that we will work with the Government of Canada, we're reflecting reality because we don't have it in our power alone.

We don't also try to pass off the responsibility to somebody else. This is what the Minister - well, Don Craik, what was he Minister of at the time - February 16, 1981, he says: "We've been in communication with the City of Winnipeg who are principally responsible

because they own a part of the land that is adjacent to the water intake, and we have encouraged the City of Winnipeg to make appropriate arrangements they can make, including the purchase of more land in that area," etc. He didn't say he was doing anything. He was communicating, he was encouraging, but he wasn't doing anything.

Now the members of the opposition seem to think that we should be doing something, do anything. — (Interjection) — Stop talking and start working says the Member for Kirkfield Park. What did the Member for Tuxedo do when he was in power? I haven't really heard much. He told us when he introduced this resolution: "I met personally with the Honourable John Roberts. I wrote to the Honourable John Munro." Well, that's powerful stuff, that will really get lots of things done, I'll tell you. Writing and talking and meeting personally with all these people, what are they doing that we didn't do? What did they do? They didn't do anything, Mr. Speaker, they just left us a mess, and now they say clean it up, clean it up, do something.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's just not the way this government works. Who are they trying to fool with this kind of a resolution? It's nothing more than another one of the petty political tricks that the Member for Tuxedo likes to come up with. You've got to remember how he got his hand slapped by everybody on that French immersion school - where was that, south of town, Iles des Chenes or what is it? - he's always meddling into these things. He gets his wrist slapped by the press, and he gets them slapped in the House and he is just a rookie. He was here two years before I was, and he likes to be the old pro. This isn't going to get him his leadership, Mr. Speaker. It's certainly not something that is going to get a lot of news coverage, at least not now, because there's nothing new in what he's saying. He's not telling us that he did any great things.

I would like to hear what he did as the Minister, something more than talking to this Minister and talking to that Minister, I'd like to hear what he did. The Member for Kirkfield Park I think would like to know what action he took, because he's saying do something, do anything. Well, what did he do, Mr. Speaker? I'm still waiting to hear that. — (Interjection) — The Member for Minnedosa says, am I going to support it or am I going to be opposing it? Well, I'll support it because it's been amended properly so that it reflects reality.

The way we have amended it, we say we'll continue to work with the City of Winnipeg, the Government of Canada and the Shoal Lake Indian Band to protect the right of the people of Winnipeg to an unpolluted water source. We're continuing to work. We're not going to say we're going to do something overnight. I haven't even seen anybody pull out the Bible that they have on all the great promises we made. I guess we didn't put that one in there. — (Interjection) — Where? Why don't they quote us that we promised to do something overnight for the water supply of Winnipeg. That's what I'd really like to know. What did they do? They come in and say do something, well what did they do? They didn't do anything.

I know the Member for Sturgeon Creek is getting ready to pop up here, but I'd like to hear the Member for Tuxedo tell us what he did. Something more than just talking to this Minister or that Minister. I'd like to

know if he did anything other than simply waffle and sway with the winds, and go this way and that way, and whichever faction happened to be interested in it, that he'd go with them. What was he doing? Did he do anything in his two years? It may be that he had a slow start because he just started in '79, he was just a rookie then - I'm not faulting him for not doing something immediately, it takes time to learn the ropes - but I'd like to know more about what he did, rather than just simply talking to the Ministers and the Federal Government. So, I'd like to have him pop up instead of the Member for Sturgeon Creek now and tell us what he did. I'd like to hear the Member for Tuxedo tell us just exactly what he did, and what he accomplished in regard to the Winnipeg water supply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm just amazed at what I just heard. The person who knows very little about the history of the water supply of Winnipeg, and gets up and expounds about what we did and what we didn't do, and he reads from Hansard answers from Mr. Craik, and answers from Mr. Jorgenson, but those questions were put to us by the NDP Party saying, what are you doing about it? What we were doing about it is that we said, no road, no development, no nothing until we get the environmental impact study, period. If anybody had started up, put the cottages in there, without authority, without that, we'd have stopped it.

A MEMBER: How?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I want to know what the Minister's opinion is at the present time, is if the Band goes ahead and does something that will harm, in time, and harm the water supply of Winnipeg, what are you going to do? Very simple. This is the Minister, this is the decision-making Minister, we hear it all the time, this is the Minister that meets with the City of Winnipeg, and the CPR, and everybody, as far as that's concerned and, when they couldn't come to a conclusion or agreement, he walks in and says here's the bill, this is what you will do; this is the decision-making Minister. Now, let's have a decision for the City of Winnipeg's water supply, or can you do it or not?

I'm now hearing from the Minister of Resources, and when he and I were on council together, in the City of Winnipeg, St. James-Assiniboia, if somebody had stuck their big toe in Shoal Lake without authority to do so he would have been down there with an axe chopping it off.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Now we have the great environmentalist that comes up and tells us about our environment for the Province of Manitoba who has nothing but meetings with people, and all he does is have meetings, he doesn't do a darn thing, we never get a report, we never get anything. Is he saying to the Minister of Urban Affairs; look, Mr. Minister of Urban Affairs, you get that impact study, or else, you don't let anything happen. Is that the position we have for

the City of Winnipeg, is that the type of protection that we're going to have for the City of Winnipeg from this government? He keeps on talking, he gets up and he keeps on talking very clearly, here are the words, we are looking for solutions, we are writing, we are talking. That is really great. Mr. Speaker, he said, what are we doing? Then he gets up and he says, the second week I was in office, in 1981, I started to have meetings on this. Does the Minister know the date today? Have you got the impact study from the Reserve; have they done what you asked them to do; have they done what the City's asked them to do; have they done what the Federal Government's asked them to do? They haven't done it, and I want to know from this Minister that if they don't do it, and they move ahead to put the City of Winnipeg's water supply in jeopardy, be it with garbage, be it with a cottage project, or whatever, I want to know what the Minister is going to do.

A MEMBER: Careful.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: An they say, careful about the cottage, careful about the cottage development. Mr. Speaker, I'm not intending to be careful about the cottage development whatsoever. If the cottage development, if the environment study says that the cottage development is going to be harmful to the Winnipeg water supply I want to know what those Ministers over there are going to do about it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: So, Mr. Speaker, and now we're back - you see, Mr. Speaker, it's the same old story. You corner a socialist, they change the subject and you hear from the Member for Thompson, what did you do about it? I told him in the first two lines what we did about it. We said, no road, no development, no nothing, until we get the environmental impact study from the Reserve.

A MEMBER: What would you do right now?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It's very clear. And you know, Mr. Speaker, we have a group of gentlemen over here, and I agree with them, they say not one drop of water from the Garrison to protect the water supply of the Province of Manitoba; and then they don't stand up and say, there will be not one bit of garbage, there will not be a cottage development put in, there will be nothing done on Shoal Lake that will harm the Winnipeg water supply.

Now, this is the type of standards we have, the double talk that we get from these men opposite. We'll play at our game, we'll play it the way we feel like it when we feel like it. The Minister of Resources goes down to Washington, he sets offices up downstairs, he lobbied, he worked hard, and we say, not a drop of water from that basin that will harm the Manitoba water supply, and we are all sticking by it.

Now, we said there will not be any development, or there will not be anything done on Shoal Lake without an environmental study that will prove that we won't harm the water of Winnipeg. Those things will not be done without that study; and that's what we said, and we stick by it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs on a point of order.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: No, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would permit a question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Oh, sure.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I wonder if the member would indicate whether or not he is in favour of a cottage lot development on the shores of Shoal Lake, or if he is opposed to a cottage lot development on the shores of Shoal Lake?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I just finished saying it, and I got a stupid question asked of me, so he'll get a straightforward answer. I am opposed to a cottage lot development on Shoal Lake if an environmental study shows it'll be harmful to the water and the people of Winnipeg, very simple. The same as I'm opposed for anything going on Shoal Lake that would be detrimental to the people of Winnipeg; that's very simple. It's so simple that even the Minister should realize it. — (Interjection) — I don't care; he thanks me. Do you want me to say it in public, do you want me to say it to some friend you've got? Do you want me to say it to anybody?

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear, again, that I am opposed to any type of development whatsoever on Shoal Lake that will be detrimental to the water supply of the City of Winnipeg, period. Do any honourable members in this House oppose that?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I am opposed, Mr. Speaker, because as the member, my colleague from Assiniboia, just finished saying, that we have had forefathers in this province that had the foresight to do something that made Winnipeg famous internationally for one of the best supplies of water ever; and all during the time that we've had that we've protected it very sincerely; and I don't have any damn qualms whatsoever telling you I'd protect it, again, regardless of what somebody wants to do on that lake; very simple.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Do you want me to say it, again; our position was no road, no development, no nothing, until there was an environmental impact study presented that showed there would be no harm to the people of Winnipeg's water supply. Very simple, Mr. Minister, very simple just get up and have the internal fortitude to say it. — (Interjection) — Very good.

So now we have those gentlemen over there with their two standards, one principle for Garrison, another principle for the water in Winnipeg and they don't have the internal fortitude and I've said in this House, I can't use that word, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a word that I can't use, the internal fortitude to get up and make any decisions about it. Just say what we said. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister to just say what I said - nothing will be done to harm the City of Winnipeg's water supply. Very simple. It's not hard to say, you learn

the words in grade 3 or grade 4, not hard to say whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I can only confirm very clearly that the Minister doesn't have the ability or the fortitude to carry out the impression that people have of him, this tough Minister that makes decisions. — (Interjection) — That's right, he sure has. You've got a lot of fortitude right there, I'll tell you that. Mr. Speaker, I know he said now, Frank, but it wasn't me who said it, it was the yapper from Inkster who said it, it wasn't me who said it.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say very sincerely that when I was on council in St. James-Assiniboia when the Minister of Resources was my colleague on the St. James-Assiniboia Council, we had at that time representation from the City of St. James-Assiniboia on the Greater Winnipeg Water District; we had input into it, all the cities that were involved in the Metro area; Metro used to be regularly with us with the Greater Winnipeg Water District and we always had very great concern, a real concern to protect the marvelous City of Winnipeg water supply. There were never any questions asked; there was never any discussion about maybe we should let this happen, maybe this should happen or we should look at this alternative. There was only one rule in those meetings: nothing will be done on Shoal Lake that will be detrimental to the marvelous water supply we have in the City of Winnipeg. The

Minister of Resources knows that and any of you over there who have been involved with the Council of the City of Winnipeg, the Member for Ellice knows the same thing, all of the members on this side that were on Metro Council or were on the City of Winnipeg Council - every single one of them knew that rule. Now we have a Minister of Finance who jokes about trying to keep the water clean in the City of Winnipeg, who laughs, the group of people who were laughing about the fact that we say let's do something but, first of all, let's say there will be nothing happen to the Winnipeg water supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this resolution is next before the House the honourable member will have seven minutes remaining.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a change on Law Amendments, the Member for Emerson for the Member for Niakwa.

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