



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXII No. 49 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 22 JUNE, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. 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, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
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	Rupert Island	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, Hon. 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.	Fiin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 22 June, 1984.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on Thursday, June 21, 1984 at 8:00 p.m. in Room 254, Legislative Building and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:

No. 4 - The Blood Test Act; Loi sur les analyses du sang:

Mr. Sidney Green, Manitoba Progressive Party;
Mr. Harry Peters, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties.

No. 9 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act:

Mr. D. Perfumo, Executive Vice-President of Manitoba Hotel Association.

No. 12 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les écoles publiques:

Dr. Linda Asper, Manitoba Teachers' Society.
Your Committee has considered:

No. 5 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act;

No. 12 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les écoles publiques;

No. 15 - The Canada-United Kingdom Judgments Enforcement Act; Loi sur la Convention Canada-Royaume-Uni en matière d'exécution des jugements;

No. 19 - An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act;

No. 23 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act and The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine et la loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered:

No. 4 - The Blood Test Act; Loi sur les analyses du sang;

No. 10 - An Act to amend The Family Maintenance Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to announce major changes to Manitoba's rural sewer and water program which will provide local communities with an additional \$6 million in additional support over the next five years.

Sir, I'm sure that all members will be pleased to note that an additional \$2 million is being made available this year through the Jobs Fund.

As members are aware, Manitoba's current rural sewer and water program was introduced in 1972 by my colleague, the present Minister of Business Development and Tourism.

The program, administered by the Manitoba Water Services Board, has proven to be highly successful. It has contributed significantly to the development of rural and Northern communities and to the improvement of the quality of life experienced by residents of rural Manitoba. The program has not only supported the development of sewer and water facilities in rural and northern regions, but has also created substantial employment opportunities in the engineering and construction industries in Manitoba.

Over the past decade, the formula used to calculate provincial and local contributions to sewer and water projects, has remained unchanged. Recently, my staff and I have conducted a thorough review of the program, including the grant formula. On the basis of the review, the province has made some significant changes to the formula, which are aimed at achieving the following objectives:

(a) to increase, generally, Provincial Government support for construction of sewer and waterworks in rural and Northern communities;

(b) to compensate communities for abnormal costs, associated with bedrock and northern location, which are beyond their control; and

(c) to provide smaller communities, with populations of under 300, with increased support for sewer and waterworks.

Sir, the specific changes to the program are as follows: The discount rate in the grant formula will be adjusted in order to increase assistance to communities.

As members may be aware, local communities, before qualifying for Provincial Government assistance, are required to provide "front end" contributions to sewer

and water projects. The contributions are equivalent to 20 mills applied to communities' equalized assessments over a period of 20 years. In order to calculate the present value of these contributions, a discount rate is employed.

Ideally, the rate should be equal to the long-term (20 year) interest rate. But as members may know, the discount rate in the formula has been pegged, since the inception of the program, at 8 percent. The result then is that as interest rates have increased above 8 percent, the financial burden on local communities has increased. This has been the case, particularly in the late '70s and early '80s, when interest rates were in the range of 15 to 20 percent.

My intention then is to increase the discount rate in the formula from 8 percent to a rate which is consistent with the prevailing long-term interest rate. The rate, to be adjusted annually, will be pegged at 13 percent during the current calendar year.

The effect of the increase in the rate will be to assist several communities to qualify for increased Provincial Government assistance and thereby reduce local contributions to the projects.

I anticipate that over the next five years, the changes to the discount rate will increase provincial assistance for rural sewer and waterworks by \$3 million.

(2) Special compensation will be extended to communities with major problems which are beyond their control.

In Northern Manitoba, for example, construction costs are often significantly higher than in the south. Recognizing these additional expenses, the province will increase its maximum assistance to most communities, which are situated north of the Northern Affairs boundary, from 50 percent to 60 percent of the total construction costs.

The province will also provide special assistance to communities in which construction costs have escalated, due to the existence of surface bedrock. Specifically, a special grant, equivalent to 50 percent of the additional costs associated with bedrock, will be extended to those communities. The remaining 50 percent of additional costs will be included as part of the capital costs of the project, for purposes of computing communities' "front end" expenses and the provincial grant. Communities which stand to benefit from this change include, for example, Stonewall, Stony Mountain, Fisher Branch, Flin Flon and Snow Lake.

(3) Sir, communities, with populations of under 300, will qualify for assistance from the Manitoba Water Services Board. The province will provide maximum and minimum levels of assistance for these communities. They will be eligible, in general, for maximum provincial assistance of 50 percent of project capital costs and for minimum assistance of 30 percent of capital costs.

By incorporating smaller communities into the rural sewer and water program, administered by the Manitoba Water Services Board, the Community Water Disposal and Sewage Collection Activity of the Agri-Water Program has become redundant. This activity, therefore, will be discontinued.

As a result of these changes to the program, the province will increase significantly its contributions to sewer and water projects in rural and Northern Manitoba. The extent of the increase will, of course,

depend upon the nature and location of future projects. Based on a five-year Board projection, however, I would estimate that the changes to the formula will increase provincial expenditures for sewer and water projects by approximately \$6 million over the next five years.

I should advise the members, as well, that in the current fiscal year, the province will make available \$2 million through the Jobs Fund in order to assist local communities to initiate or accelerate sewer and water works. The \$2 million of Jobs Fund monies will supplement the \$3 million in grants provided to communities through the regular program budget.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to say that these initiatives, which I have outlined, demonstrate, once again, the commitment of this government to the residents of rural and Northern Manitoba. I'm confident that the modifications to the program will benefit greatly many communities in rural and Northern regions.

I look forward to future discussions concerning our Jobs Fund monies and the entire sewer and water program when members want to raise them.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this natural expansion of a program that was initiated by a Conservative administration that I was privileged to be part of in the middle '60s. In case some are wondering why some of us are wearing this carnation today, it's a rather, I suppose, sober reminder that some of us have been in this House for 18 years this week - but that is indeed the situation.

I also want to remind the members opposite that fortunately sewer and water programs were being delivered to rural communities long before Manitobans ever heard of a Jobs Fund. Perhaps without that inclusion in this announcement, I could desist from making that somewhat cynical observation with respect to the Jobs Fund which we tend to call the "fraud" fund, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what this announcement does is, it recognizes the inflationary costs on an existing program that, as I indicated, has been in place for a number of years. It also recognizes that there have been special circumstances in special communities that the regular program did not adequately provide for, and I do appreciate and thank the Minister and the government for taking into account those special circumstances. It hasn't escaped my notice that several of those communities are in my constituency. It worries me a little bit about all the attention they're paying to my constituency, Mr. Speaker, but I assure the honourable members opposite, on behalf of my constituents, I accept that support very graciously.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition welcomes these kinds of programs, this kind of investment for the enhancement of the quality of life, particularly in rural Manitoba. This is how monies should be spent. This is how taxpayers' money should be spent. We could do a great deal more in terms of satisfying legitimate concerns of Manitoba taxpayers if the government stayed to these kinds of programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's no difficulty at all for me to acknowledge and to generally appreciate and applaud

the announcement they made this morning by the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I've just been handed a report from the Department of Natural Resources regarding water levels and I wish to table it for the information of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to oral questions, may I direct the attention of members to the gallery. We have 22 students of Grade 5 standing from the F.W. Gilbert School; they are under the direction of Miss Hancox. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Business Development.

There are 21 students from the Milltown School in Elie, under the direction of Mr. Giesbrecht. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Thunderstorms - June, 1984

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

My question is for the Minister of Urban Affairs. It follows on the experiences of the past number of days that have deluged Winnipeg with some very large rainstorms causing basement flooding damage, clean-up expenses and so on. My question to the Minister is: is it the intention of the government to declare the City of Winnipeg a disaster area so that the province can participate in the expenses of the clean-up and damage repairs that are going to be necessitated by two major rainstorms and some very major damages during the past number of days?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Having just returned, I can assure the member that as far as I have checked in my mail there has been no request from the City of Winnipeg to have the city declared a disaster area. With regard to other disasters in the province, I think the member is aware that is not handled by my department.

Transit - pending strike

HON. M.B. DOLIN: There is another question though with regard to the city and while I'm on my feet I'd like to tell the parties opposite that I think it was the Member for St. Norbert who asked the question with regard to

the transit workers and conciliation officer. In fact, a request from the union has been received and a conciliation officer either has been or is being appointed today.

Thunderstorms - June, 1984

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to mention to the Minister that she needn't apologize for her lack of knowledge on just returning. In fact, I wasn't holding her responsible for the rainstorms.

My question therefore is to the Acting Premier, and recognizing that the second major onslaught of rain only occurred yesterday and there wouldn't have been opportunity for the city to have contacted the province as yet, although there has been a great deal of discussion on the media, my question to the Minister is: in view of the fact that recently when we had the major ice storm, various rural communities were declared eligible for disaster relief assistance; and in view of the fact that in 1974 under similar circumstances in a May rainstorm the city was declared a disaster area in order to allow for provincial participation and funding in the clean-up, is it the intention of the government to consider taking this route, declaring a disaster area, so they can assist many people who need assistance in the clean-up and damage repairs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, we do have a process for determining disasters and for dealing with all those issues, and of course we will look at the situation and make a determination, according to the process that we've agreed to.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some concerns are being expressed that because there are combined sewers that have backed up and there is sewage involved and that there may be some health concerns, will the Minister give us her assurance that she and her colleagues in Cabinet will look at this matter immediately, or certainly within the next 48 hours, to arrive at some determination for assistance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps, as Minister of Urban Affairs, I can assure the member that we are meeting with the city on Monday - anyway, I'm sure this will be under discussion at that time. It's one of our regular meetings, but we do deal with emergency items at that meeting.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask a question of the Minister of Government Services, following upon the questions of my Leader.

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Government Services consider, when reviewing this matter, that the report just tabled in the House indicated that the water level at the Red River in Winnipeg peaked last night

at 12.1 feet, and that similar circumstances occurred in May of 1974, when water levels in the City of Winnipeg were high and the province agreed to participate with the city at that time in a program to compensate owners of homes whose basements had been flooded - I think they are similar circumstances - would he give that consideration and act as quickly as possible, because people whose basements have been flooded will have to maintain records of the damages, etc., and they'll have to know as quickly as possible what the province's position will be?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, as was indicated by the Minister of Urban Affairs, the city will be meeting with the province on Monday, and I am sure that any concern on the part of the city as to the extent of the flooding will be made known to the province at that time. It is, as the member is aware, that the first response is the local government in any assistance that is required in a disaster. We are always prepared to review the extent of damages, whether it be in the City of Winnipeg, or whether it be in southern Manitoba, or whether it be in the Interlake area where there has been some twisters, I understand, that took place last night, some tornadoes.

We have not received as yet any reports from the city or from the Interlake or anywhere else, as a result of the last couple of rainstorms that we've had. But we are certainly prepared to review the extent of the damage and consideration will be given, as in the past, and expeditiously as is possible.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, disasters are not just the responsibility of the local government, they're the responsibility of the Provincial Government. I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, to take into consideration the fact that the city's storm sewer system is built to accommodate storms one in five years, and that the last three storms, June 6th, June 16th and last evening, were all at least one in 25-year storms - in many areas of the city, much greater. Would he not take that into consideration, as well as the weather forecast, which forecast heavy and potentially severe thunderstorms? The ground is clogged and the basements are being used as reservoirs for water and some immediate action is required by the government.

Grasshopper infestation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

My question is for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. In view of the fact that there's a severe grasshopper outbreak in southwestern Manitoba, could the Minister indicate why the government, through his department, is refusing to pay spraying costs to the municipalities when they spray to control grasshoppers along provincial roads and provincial trunk highways?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member from Pembina, there is a longstanding provincial policy in which the Province of Manitoba does assist rural municipalities in a program to provide for the replacement of costs of the chemicals involved in spraying of public roadways and public areas. The Province of Manitoba, a couple of years ago, had gone through its supply, its old supply that it had in stock, and is now continuing the program by paying for the costs of the chemicals required, regardless of where the public areas are. Whether they are provincial roads, whether they are Crown lands in the municipality that they're in, the responsibility for spraying on the program has been on local government, but the province, through its regular program covers the costs of the chemicals.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I thank the Minister of Agriculture for reaffirming a policy that's been in place for a number of years for grasshopper control.

My question to the Minister of Highways was, why are they not paying the municipalities for the application costs as they do to the municipalities involved in weed control costs along provincial roads and provincial trunk highways?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, traditionally weed control has been a matter that the Highways Department has been involved in, but it has not been involved in insect control. That has been a matter that has been under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture has indicated quite clearly that the same policy that has been in place for a number of years, will be followed in this particular case. That is the case, that they are being reimbursed for the costs of the spraying.

Railway cabooses - removal of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

The tail-end crews on freight trains are responsible for a variety of duties including train inspection, rail inspection, watching for shifting of loads and overheated bearings and sticking brakes. Having worked in that craft for 17 years, I believe that they carry out a very important task. Both the CN and CP Rail are seeking approval to operate these trains without cabooses. Can the Minister of Highways and Transportation tell me the position he is taking in this issue?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, even though the opposition wouldn't listen to the question, I did, and I want to thank the member for his concern in this area. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and tell the members of the House that we're very concerned about this latest move by the railways to remove the cabooses from the trains across Canada. I want to mention a couple of points.

We have recently met with the Canadian Railway Labour Association and they've raised a number of points with us. We're going to take a strong position on this issue.

First of all, there's the matter of safety. The member quite rightly pointed out that the person in the caboose carries out a number of tasks that are safety related and these will no longer be available if the cabooses are removed. This is a matter of extreme concern. In addition, we are concerned also about the employment aspects of this move.

We want to ensure that all of these aspects are adequately considered in any move that is made by the railways. As a result of that, we have asked that a hearing on this issue by the CTC be held here in Manitoba so that we can put forward all of the pertinent information and facts and that all of the aspects of that issue can be considered.

In addition to that, I have written to the other Ministers of Transportation in the western area of Canada and across Canada as a matter of fact to have their active intervention in this issue, also the Federal Minister of Transport, Lloyd Axworthy, to ask for his active intervention in this issue.

I can assure you that our staff are drawing together all of the information. They are meeting with all affected groups to quantify the impact on safety. I'm sure the honourable member should be as concerned about safety as well as we on this side and the people who are involved in working in this industry.

I would ask the members opposite to support this initiative that we've taken.

Plan Winnipeg

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs and ask her whether the City of Winnipeg has indicated to her that they are now considering withdrawing approval of Plan Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: No, Mr. Speaker. The city has not indicated that to me.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that the department has drawn a line limiting growth right in the middle of an existing South St. Vital development?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I did read the news report on that and was quite surprised, in fact, to hear the interpretation that was given.

I had a long meeting with the deputy mayor at one point a couple of months ago. At that time, we decided that it would be advantageous to both the city and the province to talk about a single line. At that point, the member may remember since Plan Winnipeg has been around for awhile, that there were two lines. They were staged to come into effect in different years.

In drawing the one single line, a great deal of compromise was involved. What has happened with regard to the South St. Vital development, a compromise was put into place there. That is what was agreed upon by the province. The section that he is referring to was a part of that development by a

developer where the city has any intention, as I understand it, to approve that development but had not already clearly indicated that it had given its approval.

We will be discussing that with the city on Monday at the same meeting I was referring to earlier. We will be taking a look at that section. It has been a part of the city that has some problems. I suspect the residents of those homes will discover those problems later. But we will be talking about whether that line should include those homes down in South St. Vital that are outside of the line that had been agreed upon originally. But the line was extended quite a bit south of where the province had originally indicated that it should be, to take in the part of the development that had already been approved in that area by the city.

There's a little drop down to an avenue, Ward Avenue, something like that - I can't remember the name of it - where homes being built by the developer that have not received official approval yet by the city. We haven't included that. It will be under discussion.

Sound system - Legislature

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

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

My question is to the Minister responsible for Government Services. When the new sound system was installed in the Chamber a while back, we were ensured that it was going to be far superior to the system that we had. Lately there seems to be an inordinate amount of static. You turn your head, as the Minister may well recognize, it cuts out and cuts in and we've been changing earphones, not that I use it very much, but it must be annoying to those that have to use it.

I wonder if the Minister could tell us what the problem seems to be with the system or how it can be rectified and produce the quality of sound that we were told we were going to have.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think that matter is not within the administrative competence of the Minister. Perhaps the honourable member would talk to the Chair privately.

Railway cabooses - removal of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued by the answer given by the Minister of Highways and Transportation regarding the question presented to him by the Member for The Pas. I would ask him this question. Given that any investigation or analysis with new technology replacing the caboose, the traditional caboose in a train; given analysis that would indicate that safety standards will be maintained; given that railways are given some type of saving, which they undoubtedly will pass on to those of us who ship grain, I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether his government would be opposed to a saving that would be passed on to those farmers of the province who ship grain?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question seeks an opinion and should be clearly with the administrative competence of the government. Does the Honourable Member for Morris wish to rephrase his question?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I was just trying to question the Minister to determine whether the government of the province would be in opposition to any change of technology in the railway that would effect a saving which could be passed onto the farm community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to see the member's concern about the price of transportation of grain. Where were they when the Crow rate debate was going on?

We on this side of the House are not against new technology being used wherever it is possible, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, we encourage it. However, it should not be done at any cost in terms of safety and if the member is saying that that matter is not worth consideration, then he should say so in this House.

We are very concerned about the safety aspects of this matter. It is our understanding that many near disasters have been averted because of the people that are stationed in the caboose of the trains. We want to make sure that safety is not sacrificed and that's why we've asked for a hearing here in Manitoba so that all aspects of this issue can be considered and looked into.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, we are as concerned about safety as the Minister opposite. Those were the words that I used in my preamble.

Could the Minister indicate whether members of this side supported unanimously the resolution on the Crow rate put forward by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member knows that he should not ask questions about matters . . . Order please.

The honourable member should not ask questions of a historical nature which are to be used as arguments.

Broiler chickens - restriction of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

My question is for the Minister of Agriculture and it stems from regulations that were passed to The Chicken Broilers Producers Marketing Board Act last summer. Could the Minister indicate whether he will attempt to reverse the board decision and provide to the small producers of broiler chickens in Manitoba the same opportunity to produce them and process them as they have had in the past and remove this restriction from production and safe processing that is being imposed by this change in the regulation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware, in the initial changes proposed by the board, the board wished to do away with certain exemptions on producers. The province was not supportive of that. We indicated to them that if they wished to have any kind of quotas on less than the exemption that is in the Province of Manitoba that there should be a vote of those producers who, in fact, have been exempted under those regulations. As it stands now, there has been no vote and there is no intent of the province to further regulate the industry without the producers themselves wanting it.

The member should be aware that Manitoba is one of the few provinces in this country in the chicken industry that does continue to have an exemption, I believe it is 1,000 birds for any producer, and while most provinces have taken it down to 200 and some have no exemptions in their industry, we've left ours where they are, that it's really a producer decision, and if they wished to come into the industry to be regulated that should be done by a vote of the producers.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has approved and allowed regulation changes which effectively block anyone entering the broiler industry with less than 1,000 chickens because they must go to the board for a permit. I ask the Minister, can he assure those new entrants to the market that those production permits of less than 1,000 - and the example I use is of a constituent whose children are raising 300 birds - can the Minister give the assurance that those children will be able to raise those broiler chickens without having a permit for processing refused by the board?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice. I should mention to the honourable member that the intent of the unregulated product was for domestic use and not to be sold commercially. That was the intent of the unregulated product and those exemptions were there when they were in office. Sir, I will take the question as notice just so I can be clear and be brought up to date on exactly how the regulation is operating by the Chicken Marketing Board. I will bring back the information for the honourable member.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I would appreciate that undertaking by the Minister. Whilst he is pursuing that avenue, could the Minister also pursue the avenue that refusal of the permits as required by his change in regulation will now force the small-flock producers of less than 1,000, it will deny then access to a licensed killing plant where inspected meat will be the final product and will force those producers into unlicensed processors? Would the Minister not make an undertaking to the House and to the people of Manitoba that he will allow licensed producing plants to kill and properly inspect birds from those flocks of less than 1,000 for the protection of the consumer?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member should be brought up to date as to the nature of the bringing in of the Broiler Marketing Board. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member leaves the impression that this government has brought in a board. The former

Minister of Agriculture of this province, my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, refused to bring in the Broiler Marketing Board for the precise reason that the bulk of the industry at that time was controlled, was vertically integrated, controlled by very large corporate producers. The Conservative Government of the day allowed that board to come in. A lot of the quota, a lot of the production, was controlled by corporate interests. Now we have Conservative members of the Legislature rising in this House saying, why won't you allow a lot of producers to enter into broiler production and the selling of chickens, Sir?

What you find, Mr. Speaker, is that they speak from both sides of their mouth. On the one hand, they bring in a board and allow the production to be concentrated and continue to be concentrated in the hands of very large vertically integrated producers; and now, on the other hand, when new producers want to enter the industry, then because of regulations that were passed by the bringing in of the board and putting it into a supply managed commodity, they now scream that no one can get production rights. Mr. Speaker, they speak from both sides of their mouth on this issue.

MR. D. ORCHARD: In view of the fact that since the inception of the board, anyone producing less than 1,000 birds was not under any restriction or permit requirement, and that circumstance has been changed by this New Democratic Government in regulations passed last summer which go directly against the small producer, my question to the Minister is, will he . . .

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

This is oral questions. If the member wishes information, would he ask for it and not argue the point? The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

In view of the fact that the Minister's regulation, which was passed on August 2, 1983, removes the right to produce less than 1,000 chickens, requires application for permit for processing in a licensed killing plant, which is directly against the . . .

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

If the honourable member wishes to ask a question, would he ask it and not make his question argumentative.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister assure the same rights to those small producers of less than 1,000 birds that they enjoyed a year ago, two years ago and three years ago and remove the restrictions that have been placed by this government on these small producers?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly review those regulations, but I want to tell the honourable member and members of the opposite side, that when they agreed to supply management in the broiler industry, which is heavily vertically integrated, the implication of the Manitoba situation on the national

quota that they agreed to in terms of Manitoba's share, they knew - they should have and if they didn't realize then now they don't know what they're doing - that implicit in the signing of the agreement that there would be controls vis-a-vis the national quota that Manitoba would be allocated.

Mr. Speaker, either the Conservatives didn't know what they were doing, or they were deliberately placing the livelihood of many small producers on the line, Sir. Because when you sign a national agreement, there are national quotas that you agree to. Then if there is no control on the production vis-a-vis the national quota, there are penalties levied at the national level on provinces that overproduce. Implicit in that, there had to be down-the-line controls on small producers and the very nature of what they had agreed to is the result of what is happening today.

Compensation re ice storm

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I took as notice a question from the Member for Arthur a couple of days ago and he wanted to know . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, somebody says that the member is not here. I don't think we should comment on the presence of a member. But I took the question as notice and the member wanted to know how many claims had been received as a result of the ice storm. I want to indicate that up until Friday last, we had received 30 claims from private individuals and 12 claims from municipalities. Now I haven't got the latest figures; there may have been a few more coming in this week which have not been brought to my attention.

Thank you.

Capital gains on farm land

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, I would address my question to the Minister of Finance if he would care to listen to it. I would ask him whether, under the provincial policy of rebating the province's share of the capital gains attributable to the sale of farm land, this policy is attributable to all farmers within the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the policy applies to all farmers in the province, but there are certain restrictions on that policy, as I'm sure the member knows. The sale must be to another farmer, etc.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, does it also then include those individual farmers who have chosen to use the corporate instrument to order their own personal affairs?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before you call the Orders of the Day, I would like to make a brief statement with respect to House business and the scheduling of committee meetings, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we had scheduled the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources for Monday morning to continue consideration of the Manitoba Energy Authority and Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board. At the committee meeting last night there was a request from members opposite that that meeting be rescheduled for Tuesday morning. We're agreeable to that request, Sir, and I would ask the Clerk to schedule the committee for Monday night at 8:00 and Tuesday morning at 10:00. It's our understanding, Sir, at the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition, that those additional two meetings should be adequate to complete that committee's work.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, we had scheduled the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, if necessary, for Monday night. I can confirm, Sir, that there are bills which were not completed last night and I anticipate there will be additional bills referred to that committee meeting, with any additional bills referred today and Monday, will proceed Monday night, and, if necessary, Sir, we can consider that for next Tuesday morning. There might be just a few left over at that point.

Sir, as well, to allow public information to go out, but in no way anticipating second reading, I would like to advise the public through the House, Sir, that assuming second reading will be granted by Tuesday evening, it would be our intention, in anticipation of that, to call Bill 22 at the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations for Tuesday evening. I, of course, Sir, cannot announce that committee, but that does provide four days notice in advance, that that would be the first possible day on which that committee would hold hearings.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, members yesterday in Public Utilities and Natural Resources had expressed a concern regarding the availability of the transcript of last evening's meeting. I am advised by Hansard, Sir, that will be available at approximately 3 o'clock this afternoon, so that members who wish to peruse that over the weekend before next Monday's meeting on Hydro can do so, and I'd like to thank Hansard for their diligence in providing the transcript so quickly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the bills on Second Reading, Bill No. 20, and then the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading, in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper.

SECOND READING

BILL 20 - THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1984)(2)

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 20, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1984 (2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, again, in accordance with past practice, there has been distributed to members of the House, explanatory notes. Bill No. 20, of course, is The Statute Law Amendment Act, bilingual, and relates obviously to those statutes which are bilingual. And again, in accordance with usual practice, the bills that carry with them any matter of more than technical significance have been asterisked, so that they will be drawn to the attention of members opposite who may want to consider further or, at this stage, ask any question of the appropriate Minister, the designated Minister, and have an opportunity to discuss the matter with Legislative Counsel between now and committee stage.

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of the Environment, Bill No. 11, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Stand please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Bill No. 14, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL 16 - THE CHILD WELFARE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 16, the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks with respect to this bill. There certainly are aspects of this bill that are positive and hopefully will make an improvement in the child welfare system.

What causes me concern, Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of the actions of this government over the past number of months, is that parts of this bill indicate that the director of welfare may issue a written directive to the agency and that the child caring agency must conform to a written directive of the director, and further, that there's provision whereby the Minister and the government may prescribe provisions to be contained in the by-laws of any child caring agency.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that by virtue of these amendments, never again will a Betty Schwartz, dedicated to protecting and speaking up for the best interests of children, be allowed again to act in that manner and to oppose the government not for the politics of the government, but out of concern for the best interests of children. There's certainly ample evidence over the past months that suggest that there have been political considerations placed above the best interests of the children.

Mr. Speaker, we have media accounts of proceedings before the Interim Board of the Children's Aid Society, where child care workers have indicated that certain members of the board have been acting politically by raising certain cases to be brought forward by the board. We have an instance - one clear instance, Mr. Speaker, I submit - where political considerations have been placed before the priority of the child involved, involving a young child placed with foster parents since the day she was nine years old.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that concerns me very much. I believe that would concern and should concern all Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, that there are indications that this government is prepared to set aside the best interests of children in favour of political considerations. This Minister, having been made aware of these situations, has not acted, Mr. Speaker, has not acted at all to protect these children. So what confidence can we, as members of the opposition, have in giving to this Minister of Community Services and to this government the power to issue written directives to agencies, the power to compel those agencies to conform to those written directives, and the power to prescribe provisions to be contained in their by-laws? Mr. Speaker, I do not have any confidence in this Minister, in this government, by virtue of their actions to date.

Mr. Speaker, this bill of course deals with the changes in the Children's Aid Society and the Minister has noted in her press release that we are ensuring that these new Child and Family Service Agencies are firmly rooted in the communities which they will serve and that they will be sensitive to the social needs of children and families who live in these communities, this, at the same time that the Minister is indicating in the bill that they will be able to compel agencies to follow directives of the government.

Mr. Speaker, the jury is out on this whole question whether or not this dissolution of the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society into six regional communities will serve any benefit. The mere fact that there have been elections in communities, in the six communities, to elect some members of the board of directors of these agencies does not, I submit, Mr. Speaker, really indicate that this means that the agencies are going to be firmly rooted in the communities.

I attended, in fact, the election of the directors in the Winnipeg south area, Mr. Speaker, and there

certainly were a lot of well-intentioned people there, many of whom have been active in this area for many years and many of whom do have the interest of children sincerely at heart. But I suspect what has generally happened though, Mr. Speaker, at these meetings, is that the people who attended them certainly have very special interests in this area that other people attended because they were the friends of a candidate for election and were prepared to come out and vote for their friend as a candidate for that director but may not have had that great an interest in the service that's being provided by the agency in their area. I frankly suspect that if that is to be, and I suspect that it is the only connection with the community other than those people who have been successfully elected, will continue no doubt to discuss and speak to their friends who came out to support for election. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether that process is going to provide any real direct or firm roots in the community as the Minister has described.

We have seen, for example, Mr. Speaker, and it perhaps is a very analogous situation, the advisory committees in community committees under The City of Winnipeg Act, where the Government of the Day in 1971, attempted to legislate community involvement by establishing advisory committees, in the first year, Mr. Speaker - and I was a member of council at that time - there was a great deal of interest in the first year and perhaps continued for a year or so after. But people soon found out that there's really no direct responsibility in the six community committees and that the members of the public who attend those meetings can't really make any decisions because the councillors can't really make any decisions, and that whole situation has really withered on the vine, Mr. Speaker. It may very well be an analogous situation to this whereby the Minister and the government maintain the direct control of the operations and the agencies through the provisions in the act and allow them to issue these written directives and require the agencies to comply with those written directives.

Mr. Speaker, human nature, being what it is, and having seen what has happened to advisory committees at the city-municipal level, I suspect and would predict that community involvement that the Minister speaks about will really not take place and will really not be very effective over future years. What will we be left with, Mr. Speaker? We'll be left with six agencies in place of one.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to note the remarks of the Member for Ellice, who I think raised some very good points when we were discussing the Estimates of this Minister and expressed a concern over how special needs of children, for example, would be accommodated within the political policy of this government with respect to the adoption and the care of children. I, Mr. Speaker, suspect that there may very well be some real problems occur as a result of the disintegration of the Children's Aid Society into the six agencies, that there is really no support for taking that position other than the pure political consideration, that the government has been able to eliminate Betty Schwartz, who spoke up for the best interests of the children. Now they have weakened the strength and the positions of Winnipeg Children's Aid Society as a child caring agency. They have spread it out into six different groups, weakened the strength and the power

of the agency. Mr. Speaker, if there were some changes needed, and there probably were some changes needed, I don't doubt that, that could have been done in another manner without weakening and disintegrating the whole Children's Aid Society.

Mr. Speaker, I have some very real concerns about suggestions that political considerations have been allowed in a number of instances to take priority over the best interest of children. In view of that, I have great concerns about the powers that are given to this Minister and this government to compel child caring agencies to conform to their written directives and I have very real concerns, Mr. Speaker, that a strong organization has been weakened when the mandate of that organization was to speak up and protect the best interests of the children.

Mr. Speaker, having seen the actions of this government, that agency and that strong voice for children and for the concerns of child care workers is needed more than ever. For those reasons I have very great concerns about the bill that is before this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate on Bill 16 to amend The Child Welfare Act.

I rise in support of this bill and see that an important measure to strengthen our provincial child welfare system. An important amendment in this bill is the provision to give the Director of Child Welfare agencies authority to issue directives to child caring agencies when necessary in order to ensure that the best interest of the child in care is met.

I am confident that this amendment will instill greater responsibility and accountability in care of the children. I do not expect that the director will be required to issue these directives frequently.

However, the existence of this section in a Child Welfare Act will make agencies more conscious of the need to consider carefully how the child and family matters are dealt with. This is important. As we have seen, there have been occasions when cases could have been handled better. There have been sometimes inefficient follow-up of child placements and permanency planning. Furthermore, there has not been enough attention given to the placement of children in culturally appropriate settings.

While I feel that agencies and their staff are becoming more sensitive to these and other issues, it is essential for the Director of Child Welfare to be in a position to demand greater accountability by agencies on these matters and others.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to speak briefly about the decisions that we are taking in the Child and Family Services in Manitoba. First, let me say that this government has been very open and willing to address the very serious problems in the child welfare system. For me, these problems involve particularly the placement of Native children in foster care. I am pleased that the government has supported the principle of placing children in culturally appropriate settings. I am pleased that it has given its whole support to the development of mandated Native Child and Family

Services Agencies to provide support services on reserves.

I am also pleased that it has put into place a moratorium on out-of-province placements of children. These are encouraging steps. They support the principle that Native people must have an opportunity to develop their own resources to deal directly with child welfare matters.

It is an important beginning in terms of correcting the many decades of wrong and finally to begin a trust between our community and the rest of society.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I welcome the opportunity to make some remarks on Bill 16 and essentially to register my deep concerns over the legislation and the results of changes to child welfare legislation in the province under this government thus far.

As you recall, Mr. Speaker, I had strong criticisms last year of the new child welfare legislation piloted through the House at that time by the previous Minister of Community Services, the Honourable Member for Brandon East. My concerns that I experienced and expressed at that time remain where they were, Sir. I haven't seen, up to this point in time, evidence that satisfies me that the very traumatic process that this Legislature was put through last year with respect to child welfare legislation and the very traumatic process that persons in the Child and Family Services field, particularly the child welfare field, were put through last year with respect to that new legislation has produced any improvements in our system of protecting children at risk.

Now I recognize, as my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, has suggested, that the jury is still out on this whole question. I do not wish to put myself into a position at this point, Sir, of prejudging the impacts and the ramifications of Bill 16. But I can say from my personal observations of the child welfare system, particularly that part of the system at which the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg was the centrepiece and the linchpin that the system has been under particular pressure for the past considerable length of time, remains under considerable pressure and in fact its viability is in serious question.

So coming from that perspective of having deep concerns about what was done last year to change child welfare legislation, coming from the additional perspective of the experience of the past year and the experience with the new legislation which has been a disappointing experience for many of us, Sir, if not for all of us, I have to place on the record and place before the Minister, the current Minister of Community Services, my questions and my deep concerns about the direction that is proposed in Bill 16.

I'm still not happy with the break-up of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg into six new agencies, which in fact, Sir, provides the very real opportunity for six new bureaucracies and six new empires and six new budgets which will be very hard to contain and control as time goes by. I don't suggest at the moment that

new bureaucracies and new empires have emerged, but we've all had sufficient experience with human nature and with the development of services and agencies in the field of public administration and public welfare generally to conclude I think, Sir, that the opportunity is there, the potential is there, in the steps that have been taken for the creation of six new bureaucracies. They may well turn out to be six new highly competitive bureaucracies, or subtly competitive bureaucracies, and six new fiscal empires.

We haven't seen any evidence at the present time that satisfies me that danger does not exist. We haven't seen any evidence at the present time that satisfies me that steps have been taken to ensure that kind of unfortunate development will occur, and who will be the loser when that happens, if that happens, Mr. Speaker? The loser will be the child. The loser will be the children at risk in our society. The loser will be those people, those citizens, for whom child welfare systems are constructed. That's what child welfare presumably is all about, not positions of influence and leadership and direction, not positions of satisfaction and professional gratification, not positions of administrative clout, not positions of bureaucratic competition, not positions of competing services. What it's all about is children at risk and, unless the system is designed to ensure their protection, then it is a travesty, and it is a direct contradiction in terms of what its name stands for and a direct contradiction in terms of what child welfare is all about.

That is the major question mark for many of us at the present time, Mr. Speaker. I think that in rushing to achieve a particular objective that was held by this government, and in particular by the previous Minister - vis-a-vis CAS Winnipeg, vis-a-vis some of the personnel there, in particular Miss Betty Schwartz - somewhat precipitous actions were taken, somewhat hasty actions were taken. I think the government rushed into a situation here which is one that betrays an insensitivity in many respects to children at risk. I think what we've got here is a system that satisfies some particular administrative and legislative ambitions, and perhaps even ideological ambitions, but has lost sight of the *raison d'être* for the whole system and that is those children who need protection.

There are two or three difficulties, in particular, that I think have to be addressed and watched very carefully. One is the whole question of communication. I don't see any guarantees here, Mr. Speaker, for meaningful communication between agencies, between professionals, between clients, between legislators, between the children and their advocates themselves, between those groups, those bodies and those other institutions and agencies in our society, such as our police force and our school system and our churches, who also have some responsibility and fulfill major responsibilities with respect to Child and Family Services whether official or unofficial. I don't see the necessary channels of communication here that will permit the free exchange and the free flow of vital information between case worker and agency and police department and teacher and social worker and family and other agencies that can guarantee the kind of adequate response, adequate sensitivity, that's necessary to protect children at risk in a proper manner.

So that's one of my primary concerns, the absence, insofar as I can determine, of any meaningful and

workable communication system. This of course flows from the breakdown of CAS from one agency into six. You always run the risk in those cases of setting up, establishing separate barriers, separate walls and making communication much more difficult, and thus far I don't see any meaningful protection against that or defenses against that sort of thing. They may be there in the Minister's mind, there may be there somewhere in the legislation, but it remains for practical experience to demonstrate whether there are methods there to provide the communication that's so important in this field.

Then there's the whole question of tracking, keeping track of the children at risk in this city, Mr. Speaker. That's one of the most extremely complex and important and difficult parts of the whole process of protecting children, keeping track of them. Once you take an operation that although it could be decentralized in the way it was applied, but it was operated from a central system and a central office and a central tracking registry, and turn it into a system that is broken up into a number of different pieces and fragments, that whole question, that whole problem, that whole challenge of tracking becomes infinitely more difficult. So that's another one of the problems that I have with the legislation of last year and the legislation of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I said last year, and I have to repeat that I feel that last year's campaign to ram through the new child welfare legislation was essentially political in nature, if not indeed ideological from a child welfare philosophy point of view, and that the object of the exercise was to get rid of Miss Betty Schwartz at CAS Winnipeg. The object of the exercise was to remove those people in the child welfare system and in CAS Winnipeg whose views and philosophy with respect to child welfare didn't coincide precisely with the views and the philosophies of certain officials in the Community Services Department that had been moved into positions of senior advice and senior policy-making and senior planning at the right hand of the Minister.

The senior planners and advisors who were moved into top advisory capacities with the previous Minister and who are serving with the current Minister were determined to pursue a particular philosophy in this field, and what perhaps is worse or what is unquestionably worse, Mr. Speaker, were determined I think to muzzle argument and objection to the particular philosophy that they pursue, the particular philosophy that they follow. They didn't want to have to go through debate and argument in the field of child welfare as to what ideas were good and viable, and what ideas were poor and non-viable. They wanted to have a clear course of action, and they knew that with the administrative establishment that was loyal to Miss Schwartz and with Miss Schwartz herself they faced formidable adversaries in terms of debate on philosophy and policy in the child welfare field. I think that there was fairly obvious evidence that part and parcel of the whole objective of last year's legislation was to whip this field into line and put it under the thumb of the Minister, the Minister of the Day, whoever that Minister might be. That campaign to sacrifice Betty Schwartz was, in the view of many of us, truly cruel and truly unfortunate. I believe that the child welfare system in Winnipeg is the poorer for her going.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me add my question to that of my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, with respect to the objective as stated in this legislation of achieving greater community involvement through the changes that have taken place in child welfare and the changes that are proposed here in Bill 16. There may be greater community involvement that results from the proposed course of action. There may also be greater intra-community competition. There may be greater intra-community rivalry. Indeed, even if there is greater community involvement, will it be community involvement that asserts itself where the system and where the agency should be asserting itself? There is one thing to develop community involvement that permits people to feel involved in decision-making, in formulating policy and in effect taking part in the development of directions that certain agencies and certain organizations follow. It's another kind of community involvement to involve people from the community in actually being out there on the front line doing the work that needs to be done and that particular agency stands for, in this case, protection of children at risk.

So when the legislation and when the Minister talk about moves and changes that have been made and that are proposed to bring more community involvement into the child welfare system in Winnipeg, I think the question that has to be asked, Mr. Speaker, is what kind of community involvement? Will they be involved in planning? Will they be involved in philosophizing or will they be involved where personnel and child welfare should be involved - on the front line of the battle to protect those children who are at risk?

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who express concerns about this legislation and wish to place those concerns of mine on the record. I was one in this Legislature last year who fought vigorously against the dismantling of the CAS of Winnipeg, fought vigorously against the sacrifice that was being made of Betty Schwartz, fought vigorously against the politicizing through the Minister's office of the Children's Aid Society system in Winnipeg, fought vigorously against all of those insidious contents and aspects of that legislation.

So I can hardly be expected, Sir, on the basis of the last year's experience, which shows child welfare and the child welfare system in Winnipeg in deep confusion and under deep question, to be able to accept Bill 16 with much faith and much confidence.

I'll hope for the best. I won't prejudice it as yet, Mr. Speaker, but I think that the Minister and those who are involved with this legislation and those who are involved in this field, have to address very seriously those concerns that I have expressed and that my colleague has expressed, because they're not merely my concerns and my colleague's concerns. They are the concerns of a great many people who are in this system, who are affected by this system, who are touched by this system and a great many of us who perhaps are only indirectly touched by it.

What the Minister shouldn't forget is that, in essence, the whole of society is at least indirectly touched by it because we're dealing here with the most important ingredient and the one that can be the potentially most damaging, that is, the child and family at risk. Whether or not we've had direct experience, all of us have a

very direct vested interest in a healthy and successful child welfare system.

These concerns are shared by a great many Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the Minister and her officials will address them very seriously.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in support of Bill 16, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act. My colleague, the Member for Rupertsland, and the Minister have indicated some important reasons for this bill and I wish to add my voice in support of the legislation.

Members are aware that the amendment intends to provide for the establishing of a legal authority for Winnipeg's six Child and Family Service Agencies. As well, it expands the definition of child abuse to include physical injury, emotional disability and sexual exploitation of children.

Unfortunately, there seems to be an increase in society in this area of the exploitation of children and this is a subject that needs to be addressed. This change makes provincial legislation consistent with our government's recently announced legislation identifying and reporting child abuse. The amendments will ensure that Manitoba maintains its recognized leadership role in the fight to stop child abuse.

Mr. Speaker, other minor changes in wording provide for the newly established role of the "Master" of the Unified Family Court to deal with preliminary appearances and scheduling of court cases under the province's soon-to-be-established Unified Family Court. I believe that this will improve the system for the clients and it will speed up the process by a large degree.

As the parent of a handicapped son, I am aware of many cases where the young adults fell in-between the cracks between the ages of 18 and 21. So, I am pleased to see that another important provision of this amendment is to provide for the legal framework for transitional planning on behalf of permanent wards who turn 18. This amendment will support continued care for wards of the Director of Child Welfare or a child caring agency who are experiencing disruption in support when they turn 18.

Unfortunately, because of their personal situation and in some cases personal disabilities of an individual, there are always some permanent wards who face added difficulties because at the age of 18, they are unable to become non-wards.

Under the amendment, permanent wards would be allowed to receive continued assistance up to the completion of the transition of their non-wardship status. This will not go beyond the age of 21; 21 will still be the cut-off for it. This is an important change which will give the government greater range to be able to deal on an individual basis with the cases where wards are facing transitional difficulties.

With those few short words, I would urge the members to support this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity just to comment on a few of the issues raised by the members opposite in their comments.

There were concerns raised by the first speaker about some of the procedures and numbers that occur in the bill as to how new agencies can be incorporated. What we have is the advice of a corporate lawyer. The minimum requirements of a legal sort to facilitate the formation of agencies and the transfer of authority, fiscal, programmatic and so on, so that we don't run into any snags in accomplishing an orderly transition of responsibility to the new groups.

The fact that a bare minimum of numbers required to make a legal application appears in the legislation, leaves to the regulation side, more detailed information. We believe that it's better to keep that side of the operation more flexible and just put the bare minimum into the legislation.

I think some of the fears that the Member for Rhineland had about staff possibly forming agencies and having conflict of interest and so on, stem from a misunderstanding that what we have here is just a minimum of legal requirement to accomplish orderly transition. In fact, there are many safeguards against the proliferation of agencies not forming an integrated system. So, again I would be happy to talk to him in person and go through some of those items. But I think his main concerns may be laid to rest.

With regard to the other comments that have been made, I do welcome the input from the Member for St. Norbert and the Member for Fort Garry, and their willing suspension of judgement on the new child and family support system in Winnipeg. They have expressed concerns. I don't agree with their interpretation of all those concerns, but I do realize that when a change of this magnitude is occurring that it's natural that people raise concerns and try to see that they're dealt with in advance rather than after the fact.

I did listen very carefully to the concerns raised and feel that we have been aware of those and have been dealing with them. There are concerns that somehow creating six agencies where before there was, I must say, not one, but one large one and two rather smaller ones. What we have done is build a system that has a degree of autonomy at the service delivery end and a clear line of accountability to the political level where the overall responsibility for legislation, for designing programs and allocating resources, to see that children are indeed protected from abuse and neglect, where that responsibility lies. It might be comforting, Mr. Speaker, for a Minister to say that that's not my responsibility, it rests with local agencies. But, in fact, that's not the nature of the system. Responsibility does lie with the government and specifically in the Minister's office. I think it would be an abrogation of leadership not to give clear policy direction and set a framework with clear procedures, within which the agencies can operate with a considerable degree of autonomy.

The other purpose of the change has been to deal with abuse and neglect in a more basic way, and that is to see that more resources are available to support families, prior to the crisis point, prior to the point of which would necessitate an apprehension and removal

of a child from families. We have never said that we would give up on the primary role of protecting children from abuse and neglect. What we are stating, though, is that it is more effective if one can develop preventative programs and family support programs, so that we minimize the number of separations which are necessary.

The new agencies fit into a system that has different roles at different levels. There is a co-ordinating service that will be co-ordinating the six and also relating in a two-way flow of information and policy development with the department. I do wonder at people engaged in the political arena querying people being political. I suspect it's because their interpretation of political is somehow a jockeying for power and position, and not dealing with what really is the essence of politics, which is debate about policy directions and the underlying values that are being supported. So we make no apology on this side for addressing those issues in a coherent and an up front, on-the-table way. I think that what we are building is a system where many more people can have input into the development of policy and the determination of best interest of a child.

I find it strange that all our moves are posited on the assumption that we didn't like one person or her opinions, when what we are trying to do is set up a system where many people's opinion can be heard, through open membership, open elections, access to the board, decisions of the agencies by many more people, where a system of resource centres that will be established in the communities, where many more people can become involved, all the networking with community centres, schools, churches, other agencies out there will have a natural relationship and there will be opportunity for a great deal of input by community people.

So, I think we have greatly expanded the openness of the system, the opportunity for input; but, at the same time, we have put it in an orderly framework, whereby the politicians in this system, and we, at the Provincial Government level, accept fully we have some responsibility to give political leadership, to identify values, to set policy direction, where it can occur in an orderly way. What we were faced with in the old legislation and the previous conflict with a major agency was no power in the legislation short of dissolution to resolve a conflict.

Why we are putting in the capacity of the director to issue a directive is not that we wish to overuse that power, but that in failure to negotiate a resolution of conflict in the ordinary way we will have some action available to us, that will not cause chaos in the system, that will maximize the orderly working through of issues.

Finally, a comment on best interest of the child. We recognize that culturally appropriate placement, wherever possible, is an important factor in determining best interest of the child. We have never said and will never say that it is the only or the primary interest in determining best interest. Nor will we say that one person, one professional worker, or one director, either at the staff side or on the board side, is the best determiner of that best interest.

We are saying there are many factors which must be balanced in an individual case, that a judgment must be made by a group of people who weigh the different factors, and we also recognize that occasionally

there will be a resort to an appeal process, and that, in the final analysis, must be the court.

So what we are building in the co-operative planning of the system is a system that we think has the dual opportunity for community input, and yet the capacity to make decisions and to deal responsibly with the responsibility of the mandate that the provincial department has to protect children, so it can be best exercised.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 18 - THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1984)

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments with respect to this bill, but because the bill is so comprehensive, I'm sure there will be other colleagues who will wish to speak to some of the other matters contained in the bill.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that there are amendments to The Public Insurance Corporation Act which will increase the members of the board. There are amendments to The Legal Aid Services Society Act that will increase the members of the board, I believe. There have been amendments to The Liquor Control Act which have increased the members of the Commission in past years. But there is an amendment, Mr. Speaker, which will reduce the members of the Law Reform Commission.

Mr. Speaker, we discussed this during the Estimates, to some degree, of the Attorney-General. I simply want to go on record - and I think the Attorney-General himself has in the past - that the Manitoba Law Reform Commission has provided an invaluable service to members of this Legislature for a good number of years. This Legislature has been well served by the Law Reform Commission. It probably has one of the most enviable records in Canada, with respect to having its reports and recommendations adopted, in one form or another, by way of legislation in this provincial Legislature.

I must go on record, Mr. Speaker, as questioning the priorities of the government in increasing these other boards, at the same time that the membership in the Law Reform Commission has been reduced. I do not agree, Mr. Speaker, with those priorities that are indicated by the government.

I note, Mr. Speaker, the amendment to The Amusements Act which will allow the Film Classification Board to classify, I take it, video discs, videotapes. I believe that the Province of Ontario, in recent months, has taken some steps under their legislation, which is not classification but censorship, with respect to video discs and videotapes. The quality of many of these discs and tapes has certainly caused a great deal of concern among many people in this province, being surprised - once they turn some of these discs and tapes on - about what kind of offensive material is contained in so many of them.

I hope, Mr. Speaker - and the Minister is present - that he will be available at the committee stage to

discuss how the Film Classification Board is going to do this. It's certainly a tremendous task, I would think, because of the thousands and thousands of tapes that are available. How this will be done, I would think, poses a real practical problem for the board. I'd be interested in the Minister explaining how that is going to be done.

Mr. Speaker, there is one amendment in respect to The Legislative Assembly Act, which will allow constituency allowances to be paid in one fiscal year in respect to expenses which were incurred in a previous year. I hope that the responsible Minister will explain what sort of expenses are being referred to that occur after the death of a member, or that occur after dissolution of the Assembly, obviously for the purposes of an election. That certainly raises a concern in my mind and in other members' minds, as to what types of expenses a member is going to be allowed to incur after an election has been called and really when he is no longer a member of this Legislature.

I'd be very concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the types and the amounts of any expenses that would be allowed to be incurred by a member after dissolution, for the purposes of an election. I would ask that some comment be made by the responsible member either during this debate or during committee consideration of this Statute Law Amendment Act.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the main issues I wish to raise at this particular time. I know there will be other members who have concerns with different aspects of the bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Following on the words of my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, I know he dealt primarily with The Amusements Act, there are a few general comments I would like to make on Statute Law Amendments which, to me, has always been a catch-all, but it has been and should be of a non-controversial nature.

We find that the Attorney-General has provided us with notes and he has put an asterisk beside those points which he figures are of significant intent, and I thank him for doing so. But it has always been my general feeling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that anything that's wrapped up in a Statute Law Amendment bill should not be of a controversial nature. It should be purely housekeeping, and having said that, I have to then say there are some things that are in here, that I feel should not be in.

I think, for instance, that the amendments to The Automobile Insurance Act should not be in a Statute Law Amendment Act. I think they're of significant nature that they should be discussed separately, as a separate bill.

So I want to address myself to a few of the points that are involved in The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act and some of the points that are being changed here, I think are much more significant than what the Attorney-General indicated. I notice he did not put any stars beside this act, at least for the first two.

He doesn't think it's very important that the general manager should suddenly want to have his title changed to become president and general manager. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's been a generally accepted philosophy in the business world, that when a person is president of a company, he generally is a significant shareholder and here we're dealing with the Public Insurance Corporation. I think it's quite inappropriate that the general manager should also have the title of president. But then maybe you should ask the question, why would he want to have the title president along with the title of general manager?

I would have to suggest, Sir, that there's a possibility that maybe this is one way of getting around The Civil Service Act and paying the man a little more money than what he is entitled to under The Civil Service Act. In doing that, they will be doing something which I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can cause a great deal of difficulty in the Civil Service. If it came out and was found that the general manager of the Crown Public Insurance Corporation suddenly got \$140,000 a year because he was president, what was that do to the head of Hydro or the head of Telephones or all of these other Crown corporations? Immediately there would be a real push for everyone to come up to that same classification as this particular civil servant. I don't know the gentleman; I have nothing against him, but I do not believe that this is a good move by including president and general manager in the changes to The Public Insurance Act.

I think that our chief civil servants in this province should be recognized as managers of the various corporations, Crown corporations that we have, but the pay that we pay them has to be consistent with a scale that doesn't put one out of line with any of the others. I know the Deputy Premier last year hired a person on her staff at a pretty high salary and that caused a few ruffles in the Civil Service. So I don't think is a good move, in the interests of the Civil Service and the people of Manitoba.

I would also have to wonder why they want to increase the membership of the board from seven to eight? I understand the Member for Minnedosa asked the Minister the other day and he refused to answer. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we can't get answers to legitimate questions on legislation and proposed changes in legislation, then we should not be changing the legislation. The Minister must answer. The Minister must answer, give us the reasons why he wants this change in the legislation, otherwise it should not be in there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member for Minnedosa had a very legitimate question yesterday, and it was indeed unfortunate for the people of Manitoba that the Minister was unable to answer or didn't know or probably had not been apprised of the fact that there was even a change in the act, even though it comes under his jurisdiction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I notice that in the notes from the Honourable Attorney-General dealing with one particular part of The Automobile Insurance Act he said, "This will allow an MPIC contract to reduce the limitation period of two years." Mr. Deputy Speaker, I read the section in the bill and I see the changes, but I find it somewhat strange . . .

A MEMBER: So do we, Harry.

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . that we would want to reduce a statutory standard of limitations for a Crown corporation. If the Statute of Limitations in the Province of Manitoba is two years and that applies to all citizens of the Province of Manitoba, why would we want to reduce that for a particular Crown corporation? I don't read the change in the act in that way, but if the Attorney-General tells me that this is the intent, then I would hope that he would clarify that when he closes debate because I find it unsavory, to say the least, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to have special consideration for Crown corporations to be exempt from the Statute of Limitations which applies to everyone else in the province. I would hope that the Minister would change that. Otherwise I feel that when it comes to committee, there will be more words said at that particular time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are other things in this omnibus bill and I don't intend to deal with all of them at all, but I feel that I should make a comment or two about one section that deals with amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act. This deals with constituency allowance and the Management Commission or as many of us wish to refer to it, the "human greed commission." Mr. Speaker, I find it particularly strange that members on the other side who obviously made this proposal, would want to draw expenses after the next election when they know that most of them will not be back in the House and yet they want to draw expenses.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Certainly.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, just one brief question to the honourable member opposite. Was the honourable member advised by his colleagues on the Management Commission that this amendment was recommended by Legislative Counsel and agreed to by all members of the Commission and recommended by the Commission for inclusion in this bill?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had great difficulty detecting a question in the so-called question that the honourable . . . Questions of awareness. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you've known for many years that the Speaker does not recognize questions of awareness as being proper questions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I read the notes that were provided by the Honourable Attorney-General who says that, "A new Section 63.(3) of The Legislative Assembly Act, which will allow constituency expenses to be charged in respect of a period after a member ceases to be a member because of death or disillusion of the Assembly." Mr. Speaker, that is enough reason for me to be concerned. I couldn't care less what members of the "human greed committee" wanted. I appreciate . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order is being raised.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm not a member of that committee, but a committee of the Legislature has been referred to twice by the Member from Virden as the "human greed committee." That is entirely inappropriate. They are members of that committee. It's a committee that works substantially on consensus and that way of describing a Committee of the House is unparliamentary. It is clearly unparliamentary. It's a slander on the House and it ought not to be permitted. It's a disgraceful remark.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R. PENNER: Disgraceful.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: And the Speaker is a member of that committee.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I apologize to the member. I apologize to the House for the use of the term "human greed."

Mr. Speaker, I sat and listened the other day and I could come to no other conclusion, after listening to members of that committee, listening to them. I could come to no other conclusion, other than the fact that it was human greed that made them act the way they were acting.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order is being raised.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Those are my own personal comments.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: On a point of order. It may be late Friday afternoon, but that doesn't give leave and licence to break the rules of the House. The member has now gone from a slander on the House to attributing motives. That, too, is unparliamentary and ought to be withdrawn.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I refuse to retract any words that I said. I very clearly stated . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R. PENNER: I'm asking for your ruling. I've raised a point of order very seriously, and to attribute motives to members of this Legislature is clearly unparliamentary and that remark ought to be withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: The Attorney-General, just a few moments ago, acknowledged that he has never been a member of that committee or that he has not been involved in some of the meetings most recently held with respect to that committee. This, Mr. Speaker, is a committee that deals with acquiring, if you like, additional benefits to the individual members which the Honourable Member from Binscarth was part of, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, he is not attributing motives. He is describing actions.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. According to Citation 316, a member, while speaking, must not impute bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged to a member.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I have read the rule in this House that a member while speaking must not impute bad motive. If that rule has been violated, the member should withdraw.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was very careful in the choice of my words. I was describing what I saw happening and those were my words. I did not attribute them to anyone else; they were my words, my description of what I saw happening in that committee. That is a truthful account of what went on, and I have no intention of withdrawing a truthful statement in this House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I regret the difficult position in which a former Speaker of this Legislature places you. The former Speaker, the Member for Virden, in addition to violating Citation 316.(e) and his description of what he purports to have seen at a committee meeting, or a meeting of the Legislative Assembly Management Commission, Sir, clearly is an imputation and, even more than an imputation, his description of what he says he saw.

He, Sir, is making that description and that is specifically what the citation forbids. I draw your attention further, Sir, to Citation 319.(3) which provides, in part, ". . . a Member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself as a political institution; or to impute to any Member or Members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case; . . ."

I submit, Sir, the member's last description of what he said in his remarks is in direct contravention of the citation and he should be requested by you, Sir, to withdraw immediately.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On the same point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We are dealing with amendments to the The Statutory Law Amendments Act and, if I am prevented from dealing with what is involved in that bill by the words of the Government House Leader,

then truly we have come to the finest in strangulation of debate in this Assembly.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, with respect, reject totally and completely the suggestion by the member opposite that the right to debate allows the right to impute unworthy motives predicated on words, such as, "greed."

Those are strictly forbidden under Citation 316, 319 - the member knows that and he should withdraw.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. If any member of this House reflects a motive to any member or to any of his committee or to the institution itself, he knows for certain that he is violating the rules of the House. The member had enough warning; I have no reason to change my appraisal of the situation that the member had imputed motive to the Legislative Management Committee and must withdraw.

The Member for Virden, as a matter of honour, should withdraw his statement.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in order to save you any further embarrassment, I will leave the Chamber.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Despite the fact that the member had voluntarily withdrawn himself from the Chamber, it does not erase the fact that he had not obeyed the ruling of the Chair and, therefore, I will be compelled to name the Member for Virden.

The Honourable House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, as required by Rule 14, I move, seconded by the Attorney-General that the Member for Virden be suspended from the service of the House until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 26th.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion before the House is to suspend the Member for Virden until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 26th.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. H. ENNS: Ayes and nays.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Ayes and nays. Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: Order please. The question before the House is, it is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader that the Honourable Member for Virden be suspended from the service of the House until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday.

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

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Corrin, Cowan, Dolin, Evans, Eyley, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Kostyra, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Banman, Blake, Brown, Doern, Driedger, Enns, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Manness, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Sherman, Steen.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 24; Nays, 17.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

The second reading of Bill No. 18. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that debate be adourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn.

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