



**First Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**  
**(HANSARD)**

---

37 Elizabeth II

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXXVII No. 96B - 8 p.m., MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1988.**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
Thirty-Fourth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
<b>ALCOCK, Reg</b>	Osborne	LIBERAL
<b>ANGUS, John</b>	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BURRELL, Parker</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>CARR, James</b>	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
<b>CARSTAIRS, Sharon</b>	River Heights	LIBERAL
<b>CHARLES, Gwen</b>	Selkirk	LIBERAL
<b>CHEEMA, Gulzar</b>	Kildonan	LIBERAL
<b>CHORNOPYSKI, William</b>	Burrows	LIBERAL
<b>CONNERY, Edward Hon.</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>COWAN, Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.</b>	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
<b>DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>DOER, Gary</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James Hon.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Herold, L.</b>	Niakwa	LIBERAL
<b>DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.</b>	Riel	PC
<b>EDWARDS, Paul</b>	St. James	LIBERAL
<b>ENNS, Harry</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>ERNST, Jim, Hon.</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>EVANS, Laurie</b>	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
<b>EVANS, Leonard</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary, Hon.</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FINDLAY, Glen Hon.</b>	Virde	PC
<b>GAUDRY, Neil</b>	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
<b>GILLESHAMMER, Harold</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>GRAY, Avis</b>	Ellice	LIBERAL
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupertsland	NDP
<b>HELWER, Edward R.</b>	Gimli	PC
<b>HEMPHILL, Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>KOZAK, Richard, J.</b>	Transcona	LIBERAL
<b>LAMOUREUX, Kevin, M.</b>	Inkster	LIBERAL
<b>MALOWAY, Jim</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>MANDRAKE, Ed</b>	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
<b>MANNES, Clayton, Hon.</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McCRAE, James Hon.</b>	Brandon West	PC
<b>MINENKO, Mark</b>	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
<b>MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.</b>	River East	PC
<b>NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.</b>	Rossmere	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte Hon.</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald Hon.</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PANKRATZ, Helmut</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>PATTERSON, Allan</b>	Radisson	LIBERAL
<b>PENNER, Jack, Hon.</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>PLOHMAN, John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>PRAZNIK, Darren</b>	Lac du Bonnet	PC
<b>ROCAN, Denis, Hon.</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>ROCH, Gilles</b>	Springfield	LIBERAL
<b>ROSE, Bob</b>	St. Vital	LIBERAL
<b>STORIE, Jerry</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>TAYLOR, Harold</b>	Wolseley	LIBERAL
<b>URUSKI, Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>YEO, Iva</b>	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, December 12, 1988.

The House met at 8 p.m.

## COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—NORTHERN AFFAIRS

**Mr. Chairman, Mark Minenko:** I call the Committee of Supply to order, please. I draw to the Members' attention that we are continuing to consider the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs. We are presently considering item 1.(c) Financial and Administrative Services: (1) Salaries—the Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland):** I believe we have about 13 minutes left. I wanted to ask the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) on the Native Affairs Secretariat, and I was just wondering if the Minister would provide us with a copy of the contract for the Urban Native Strategy so that we can look at it and make some comments on it and provide some constructive criticism and some advice for the Minister of Northern Affairs.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs and responsible for Native Affairs):** Mr. Chairman, I was not clear as to the Member's question. Just so I understand it, did he want the contract of the Urban Native Strategy? Is that what the question was?

**Mr. Harper:** Yes.

**Mr. Downey:** As well, I am preparing the request for the contract on the Native Affairs Secretariat Review. I have indicated I will provide it. I will provide the one on the Urban Native Strategy as well.

**Mr. Harper:** Yes, thank you. I was just wondering, I believe the contract was signed and I believe that copy could be made available as soon as possible. Could that be done as soon as possible?

**Mr. Downey:** In view of the fact that his Leader had most of the details of it the other day, the amount and when it was signed and all those things, I am sure if he asked his Leader for a copy of it that he could probably get it but, as I indicated, yes, I will make one of those available to him.

**Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa):** On the same line here, below the Grants on page 51, regarding the funds disbursed by the Native Affairs Secretariat, you have a line itemizing \$600,000 for the Aboriginal Development Fund. Could you please, for us, indicate the objectives to which this fund is to be placed?

**Mr. Downey:** This appropriation covers the funding to the Assembly of Chiefs and to the MMF tripartite negotiations.

**Mr. Herold Driedger:** It is my understanding that the Assembly of Chiefs and the Metis tripartite negotiations

are essentially to explore the achievement of self-government. Is that correct?

**Mr. Downey:** Not for the Assembly of Chiefs, Mr. Chairman. There were, I think, five areas that they initially were discussing as far as the chiefs' activity was concerned and one of the areas that—four, I believe, no, five—one of them being the ability to use those funds to appear before the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry, if they wanted to use the funds for that, and there was gaming, health, child and family services. There are five areas, but the one that we indicated and have been indicating was for the use into the research for the Native Justice Inquiry.

\* (2005)

**Mr. Herold Driedger:** In the review of the Native Affairs Secretariat, under—if I remember correctly, I am not sure of the page, I have it here somewhere under all this pile of documents. The indications for the Assembly of Chiefs did not at all list the research preparation for presentation to the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry. In fact, what you did reference, the gaming, the lotteries and things of that nature, they were listed but the actual term of reference as indicated in the Order-in-Council, which was referenced by the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), did not in the review of the Secretariat indicate that same kind of usage. Would the Minister please indicate if in the Order-in-Council, if that happened to be written in later or if that was simply an understanding that was achieved at a later point in time?

**Mr. Downey:** I am not sure of the timing of it but the one that really counts is when the Order-in-Council is written. That is the Government authority as to the use of the money, and it clearly spells out in there that they could use it for that purpose. That is what really counts.

Just to the point of clarification, as we have only 10 minutes left, is it normal procedure that we will just pass it all at once or will we be doing it line by line? Oh, I get the assurance from the two Opposition House Leaders we will do it all at once. Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, please.

**Mr. Harper:** It is unfortunate that we do not have enough time but that is the case of the process. I wanted to ask the Minister responsible for Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) in terms of some initiatives that we had carried out as Members of the Government. One is in the area of lotteries, gaming, as to what input he has had in terms of reviewing that situation, the lotteries issue.

**Mr. Downey:** At the current time, there is an exercise of meetings being carried out between the Department of the Attorney-General's office and the Minister responsible for Lotteries (Mrs. Mitchelson), and it is in

discussion at this particular time among the different departments.

**Mr. Harper:** In regard to the treaty and aboriginal rights, directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs, does he uphold the treaties of the aboriginal people that we had made with the Government? I am sort of relating to what is paramount, whether he holds the regulations paramount, whether he holds the treaties paramount because there seems to be some conflict, especially in the area of fishing where treaty people cannot fish unless they have received a licence first in order for them to exercise that right. Can the Minister explain as to what policies this Government is placing?

**Mr. Downey:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Member is trying to get at. It is my understanding that that current issue is currently before the Supreme Court, as far as a judgment is concerned, and it would be unfair for me to make any comment in that regard at this particular time.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, please. I am having some difficulty in hearing various Members. So I am just wondering, if some Honourable Members would like to have private conversations, they can step outside the Chamber.

\* (2010)

**Mr. Harper:** I wanted to get some answer from the Minister in terms of where he places the treaty obligations of the Government. This is not specifically relating to the case, but rather placing the issue of treaties in respect to Government regulations. It seems to me that in one instance at Iron Lake, where a fisherman got his net removed because he had not obtained a licence or a permit and under the treaties he was guaranteed to fish, it seems to me that regulations are overriding the treaties for them to fish. I was wondering—I want some clarification on that matter.

**Mr. Downey:** Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, and I appreciate again the question the Member is asking, as I understand it at this particular time, until otherwise determined by the Supreme Court of Canada, the law of the land prevails for everyone. That is my understanding of it, and that is what basically would have to be upheld.

**Mr. Herold Driedger:** I understand that we are fast approaching the end of our time and there are many areas of the Estimates, of this department, that I would very much like to ask questions on. Some really are quite detailed as to individual problems had by, you know, with people as they either have dealings with this department or not. As I indicated in my opening remarks, the exigency of time which is not either the fault of the Minister nor the fault of these two critics have forced us to have to cut short the actual questioning and probing that we would like to do, but I would like to have it put onto the record that I do not intend to stop probing just because the Estimates process is over.

I will, if the Minister concurs, with his staff after the Estimates process is over, we will sit down perhaps with Mr. Tomasson and some of the questions that are of the operational nature which I would like to ask and some of the detailed questions I would like to ask, and also go on record as stating that in the next Estimates process he can rest assured that we will not be moving over as quickly as we did in this last little while in our effort to expedite the process of these 240 hours.

**Mr. Chairman:** Item 1.(c)(1)—pass; 1.(c)(2)—pass; 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass; 1.(e)—pass; 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(2)—pass; 2.(a)(3)—pass.

I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee of Supply because the 240 hours allowed for the consideration of Supply-related matters by the Rules of the House has expired.

Order. Therefore, I will forthwith call the question in order on each Supply resolution not yet considered by the committee in accordance with the rules. I should point out these questions may not be debated, amended or adjourned.

Resolution No. 130: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,581,600 for Northern Affairs, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989—pass.

Resolution No. 131: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,010,100 for Northern Affairs, Local Government Development, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989—pass.

Resolution No. 132: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,405,600 for Northern Affairs, Agreements Management and Coordination, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989—pass.

\* (2015)

Resolution No. 133: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,426,100 for Northern Affairs, Northern Development Agreement - Canada-Manitoba, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989—pass.

Resolution No. 134: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,789,600 for Northern Affairs, Native Affairs Secretariat, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989—pass.

Resolution No. 135: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,609,400 for Northern Affairs, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989—pass.

Resolution No. 142: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,750,000 for Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1989—pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

**IN SESSION**

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Mr. Mark Minenko (Chairman of the Committee of Supply):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gillshammer), that the report of committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**TABLING OF REPORTS**

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to revert to Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable First Minister have leave to revert back to ministerial statements? (Agreed)

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Order.

**Mr. Filmon:** Pursuant to Section 10(2) of The Electoral Divisions Act, I am pleased to table the report of the 1988 Electoral Divisions Boundaries Commission. I understand that the Clerk has copies available for all Members of the Legislature.

\* (2020)

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Bills in the following order: Bill 53; by leave, Bill 48; Bill 49, that would be by leave as well, I believe; Bill 21; Bill 30; Bill 45; Bill 47. That should take us to about the normal hour of adjournment for the evening. However, if we do not complete Bill 47, I think there would be leave, on the part of all Honourable Members, to carry on until we complete consideration of Bill 47 this evening.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

**SECOND READINGS**

**BILL NO. 53—THE MANITOBA OIL AND GAS CORPORATION CONTINUANCE ACT**

**Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for The Oil and Gas Corporation Act)** presented Bill No. 53, The Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation Continuance Act; Loi sur la prorogation de la Société manitobaine du pétrole et du gaz naturel, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**Mr. Downey:** Mr. Speaker, my speech will be very short but, before I get into the substance of the Bill, let me

be very clear and explanatory to the Legislative Assembly and put the Member for Concordia's (Mr. Doer) mind at ease in the big issue of some form of conflict that I may have had in dealing with The Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation.

As it states in The Conflict of Interest Act, one has to declare any shares or ownership of property or that type of thing. I guess, Mr. Speaker, what upsets one is the manner in which, first the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) and his approach at committee tried to drag it in as if it was going to be a big explosive issue and then a press release issued by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) to get the weekend press. Let me fully disclose that I have 49 shares, or a company that I have has 49 shares, in Antler River Resources, of which there are some 839 shares. I am not a director. Mr. Speaker, we have never done business with the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation.

In fact, Mr. Sadler, the manager of the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation, phoned on Friday after he had heard the news clearly indicating that, if I wanted, he would go on the record to clearly state that I had no way, shape or form done any business with that corporation. One could virtually say that the shares are held in a blind trust.

\* (2025)

Let me further say that probably the closest to conflict of interest that one could come would be that with all the advertising that the Member for Concordia has given it, it may have in fact raised that company up in the minds of a few people and it may be worth something. That could well be the conflict, I want it clearly stated here in this Legislature publicly precisely where I am at. I have 49 shares in a company, not a director, never done business with the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation, never intend to.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I can say that when I returned home on the weekend, I have received information that the company is not doing very well and if the Member wanted to see me later, if he thinks it is such a value, I will give him quite a deal on it right this evening. Let me clearly state that if he has any more difficulty with it, I would appreciate him coming to me directly and pointing it out rather than the approach that he took.

Let me just say, as far as the Bill is concerned, as we have clearly indicated from all the term in Opposition, clearly indicated in the election campaign that a commitment of ours was to divest of the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation. There was a board appointed with that mandate. Mr. Speaker, this Act will, as I understand it, merely accommodate the sale of shares in a Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation, if and when the decision is finalized to sell that corporation. I appreciate the Member's interest in the maps. No one is paying a lot of attention to my speech. It is a big laugh now for the Member for Concordia.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, this will allow the provincial Government to divest of the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation shares which are currently held by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). I would recommend that this Bill go on to committee for further discussion.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), that debate on this Bill be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** I would like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would there be leave to leave it standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock)? The Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), would like to speak on this Bill.

**Mr. Storie:** If it has already been moved and seconded, I can wait my turn.

### **BILL NO. 48—THE EXPROPRIATION AMENDMENT ACT**

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General)** presented, by leave, Bill No. 48, The Expropriation Amendment Act; for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**Mr. McCrae:** Mr. Speaker, this Bill is brief and my remarks will also be brief. This Bill arises as a result of a decision by the Manitoba Court of Appeal in 1987 in a matter regarding the Leather Ranch, one of the businesses expropriated for the North Portage Development.

The judgment of the Court of Appeal is rather interesting. I quote the opening paragraph of that judgment as follows: "The primary issue on this appeal is one which the parties did not wish to raise, but which affects the jurisdiction of this court. It involves a consideration of the precise role which the Legislature intended the Land Value Appraisal Commission to play in the settlement of the amount payable as compensation for land expropriated by the Crown. Does the commission determine the compensation payable or is the commission's function that of a moderator?"

\* (2030)

Mr. Speaker, as Honourable Members can tell from this quote, the parties to the action had no desire to review the nature of the Land Value Appraisal Commission's role. From its inception in 1970, the commission has set values for land and this value has been binding upon the Crown. The party being expropriated has had the right to appeal to the courts if it is unhappy with the values set by the commission. The commission has had a great deal of success over the years and not many of its appraisals have been appealed to the courts. (Interjection)-

If Honourable Members were as interested in the Land Value Appraisal Commission as they are in the new maps put out by the Electoral Boundaries Commission, Mr. Speaker, the debate here tonight would be far more interesting indeed, because I am sure all Honourable Members would be listening. Unfortunately, in reviewing the wording of the legislation,

the Court of Appeal came to the conclusion that the commission was intended to be a moderator, providing advice only.

The results of this decision have shown clearly that the commission, as a moderator, is not a useful tool. Parties have not been willing to submit contentious issues to the commission. In fact, the decision of the court was rendered on July 9, 1987. Of course, that was the tail end of the Session and no legislation could be presented. Within a week of the decision, the first case was withdrawn from the commission and case after case has been withdrawn since that time.

This Bill is designed only to restore the situation to what it was considered to be prior to the Court of Appeal decision. It will require the expropriating authority to offer to the person being expropriated the amount that has been certified by the Land Value Appraisal Commission. It will not disturb the right of the person being expropriated to appeal to the courts if that person feels that compensation set by the commission is inadequate.

As we wish this change to become effective as soon as possible so that the backlog of cases which should be going to the Land Value Appraisal Commission can be handled, the Bill will come into force on Royal Assent.

I thank Honourable Members, Mr. Speaker, for allowing this Bill to come forward, and I ask them for their support.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), that debate on this Bill be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL NO. 49—THE PUBLIC WORKS AMENDMENT ACT**

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Government Services)** presented, by leave, Bill No. 49, The Public Works Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les travaux publics, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**Mr. Albert Driedger:** In giving second reading to Bill No. 49, there are some very minor changes in there. We apologize for having brought it in relatively late in the Session. It is not of a major nature. I am prepared to give my opening remarks and any further information that is required, I will also be supplying.

The Public Works Act sets out the legislative authority for the Minister responsible to acquire, construct or dispose of a public work. It also outlines the Minister's responsibility for the care and control of Crown property. Overall, the amendments being proposed to the Act are minor but are important to the effective administration of Government Services. Some can be considered housekeeping amendments and others pertain to the fines that are specified for contravention of the Act.

Most of this Act was written 35 years ago, so it is not surprising that there would be a need to

contemporize some of the language being used. Where these kinds of housekeeping changes are being proposed, it is for the purpose of making the Act more understandable and direct. There are also some sections of the Act that are being repealed because they are no longer necessary.

This is the case with Section 25, which references the application of The Summary Convictions Act to the offences contained within The Public Works Act. Changes within The Summary Convictions Act itself and the development of an offence notice system several years ago have eliminated the need for this section in The Public Works Act. A number of other references to summary conviction have also been deleted as they are no longer necessary.

The more important changes, as I said, relate to the fines that apply for offences under the Act. The maximum fine of \$50 for removing a notice or trespassing under Section 5(2) and the maximum fine of \$100 and/or the 60-day imprisonment provision for damaging a public work under Section 14(1) have been deleted. Instead, a maximum fine of \$250 has been added to the general offence and penalty provision of the Act in Section 24.

The penalty cited in Section 7(2) for contravening the height restrictions on buildings close to the Legislative Building was changed from \$100 to \$200 per day maximum. What this means is that, unless otherwise specified, the penalty for contravening The Public Works Act or its regulations will now be a maximum fine of \$250 as opposed to the \$25 maximum and/or 14-day imprisonment provision that exists now.

Regulations 103 and 75 respecting parking and traffic on Crown property were made pursuant to The Public Works Act. It details a variety of parking offences and traffic violations.

The changes being proposed to the Act mean we will now be able to establish a schedule of fines and regulations that are consistent with those charged by the City of Winnipeg. This will include increased fines for parking and traffic offences on Crown property and a reduced penalty system for payment within specified time periods.

Contrary to the assertions that have been made from across the House, these changes have absolutely nothing to do with the implementation of a paid parking program for Government. There is already sufficient authority in Section 26(c) of The Public Works Act for the Government to implement that program.

The main reason for introducing the proposed amendments is to bring our parking fines in line with those charged by the City of Winnipeg and other jurisdictions. Our parking fines have been \$3 and \$5 for a number of years now and this is hardly a deterrent for violators. In fact, with the \$3 fine, people would just as soon pay the fine for \$3 a day and park all day. It is one of the factors that makes parking around the Legislative Building and the legislative core area extremely difficult to control.

The regulations concerning parking fines, meter charges, and fees for paid parking are presently being

drafted. I am prepared to discuss the thrust and contents once they are completed. When it is time to proceed through the amendments on a clause-by-clause basis, I would welcome your comments and the opportunity to provide details on the proposed changes. Thank you.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), that debate on this Bill be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

\* (2040)

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### BILL NO.21—THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger), Bill No. 21, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan).

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### BILL NO. 30—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (TAXATION) ACT, 1988

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 30, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1988; Loi de 1988 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak).

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### BILL NO. 45—THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL CONFLICT OF INTEREST AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon), Bill No. 45, The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Conflict of Interest Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les conflits d'intérêts au sein de l'Assemblée législative et du Conseil exécutif, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock).

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** I would just like to put a few remarks on the record with regard to this specific Bill. In essence, the Liberal caucus supports this particular piece of legislation. We believe, as the Government indicated earlier, that there should indeed be a cooling-off period for those individuals who have had senior positions with a Government and move into the private sector. Such a cooling-off period, of course, not only eliminates a conflict of interest but also eliminates the appearance of a conflict of interest and, to that end, it is a good piece of legislation.

I have to be somewhat surprised that special assistants and executive assistants have been removed from the legislation, specifically, and that often such assistants have access to Government documents. One question why those individuals would not also be considered to have a conflict of interest, particularly as the basis of their appointments are normally 100 percent political whereas many of those who are affected by the legislation have not derived from their positions by virtue of their political credits. Having said that, perhaps the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) can take that message to his caucus and ask them to provide us with an explanation as to exactly why special and executive assistants were specifically put outside this particular legislation.

Another question, of course, that we have some concerns about is that we wonder why the limit on fines was at a \$10,000 level. While that appears to be a lot, it is not a lot if one compares it with a \$500,000 contract. Now we do realize that there is some potential within the legislation for reimbursement and perhaps that was felt by the Government to be an adequate method of dealing with an alternative to a fine, but we again would like to hear from the Government in some more detail as to why exactly the \$10,000 limit was placed on this particular piece of legislation.

Our concern on the legislation is really not what is in this particular piece of legislation but what is not in the legislation, and that was that we thought that there would be some method of addressing a very serious problem in this Government, as with previous Governments, and that is the whole issue of the tendering of contracts for Government work. There is no mention in this particular legislation of tendering or the requirement for tendering or the reasons why such tendering is indeed a valid objective. We know that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is on the record in such events as the CF-18 when, despite the fact that tendering was supposed to be used, the bid did not go to the best-tendered bid.

We also have listened to the Premier, on the record, talk about the need for tendering Government contracts as a means of accomplishing two things: first of all, avoiding any implication of conflict of interest; and the second, of course, making sure that we are managed in the most efficient way possible and ensuring that we always get good value for our money.

We have watched with increasing concern the number of contracts that have been let, if you will, by this Government, untendered, beginning immediately with the audit of the various Government departments and continued through to the Ministry of Northern and Native Affairs and the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. We believe that the legislation has missed a very significant need in the Province of Manitoba, and that is to ensure that Government contracts are indeed tendered and that tendering is followed within a prescribed form and that we do get both good management and no apparent or real conflict of interest.

We are pleased to allow this Bill to go to committee because we certainly agree with the intent of the legislation. We hope the concerns that we have raised will be raised at the committee stage and perhaps answers given in the committee stages to this legislation.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I move, seconded by the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), that debate be adjourned on this Bill.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## BILL NO. 47—THE LIQUOR CONTROL AMENDMENT ACT (2)

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 47, The Liquor Control Amendment Act (2); Loi no. 2 modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock).

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne):** I would like to pass my opportunity to speak on this Bill to the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards).

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Again, I wish only to put a few brief comments on the record about this Bill on behalf of our caucus.

This Bill, while a fairly brief piece of legislation, we feel is fairly important. I must say that it was not without some serious looking at this Bill, some serious thought about the implications of it, and some serious thinking about the role of alcohol and the role of liquor in our society and the promotion of liquor in our society that we have come to the conclusion that this Bill should be supported. However, I do feel compelled to put these thoughts on the record as some of the things that we thought and talked about in our caucus as we looked over this piece of legislation.

It is my feeling that while liquor should certainly not be illegal in our society, it should not be promoted. We believe that advertising of alcohol is not a good thing for society and, to that extent, we would prefer that all provinces in this country and the United States did not promote alcohol and do not feel it is in the best interests of the public to promote alcohol, but that is simply not the case. The fact is that we must also recognize the unfairness to Manitoba media outlets and, in particular, Manitoba television stations and, as well, Manitoba liquor producers when they are in the marketplace and up against other jurisdictions which allow the advertising of alcohol in a much freer environment.

Of course, I am speaking particularly of the restrictions on when advertisements for alcohol can be aired. The law as it stood was that advertising was allowed after 10 p.m., the thinking being that is when the children, the teenagers, those susceptible perhaps to the advertising, those who we did not want to have alcohol promoted to, would be in bed. I think that may be unrealistic in and of itself as a time. However, I think the thought was clear that while some liquor advertising should be allowed, it was to be restricted. This in a sense opens up that time restriction in terms of the media outlets and while, as I say, we would prefer that there would be no liquor advertising, we do recognize the unfairness of the law as it stands now.

I feel compelled to point out that when the law came in, cable television was not a fact of life as it is today.



I think probably, when this law came in, Manitoba had one television station. We probably had the CBC and, since then of course, we are now susceptible to all of the American channels that are beamed in from Detroit. Of course, alcohol is advertised regularly and in fact we are inculcated with alcohol advertising.

I do not believe that alcohol should be advertised and, if it is going to be, I personally support restrictions in terms of whether or not it is a lifestyle ad, if it is aiming toward our youth, as I believe a lot of these lifestyle ads do, and seem to suggest that in order to have a good time you have got to have a beer in your hand. I personally do not believe that all of these advertisements only affect brand selection. I have yet to have that proven to me and, although I have issued that challenge, however, it has not been taken up. I think that perhaps in a saturated market of California where I know one of the studies they rely on was done, they say, well it only affects brand selection. But I suggest the California market as it is saturated with liquor advertising, as ours was not, is perhaps a wrong test area for the purposes of Manitobans.

• (2050)

However, with that on the record, we do recognize the injustice which is being perpetrated upon our media outlets and upon our liquor producers and, for that reason and that reason only, we are willing to support this withdrawal of the restriction.

With respect to the rest of the Act, I expressed an early concern when this Act was tabled in the House that the allowance of 24-hours' serving of alcohol in our international airport or in transportation facilities would in fact create 24-hour bars when other bars of course have very tight time restrictions. I suggested, without proper ability to monitor who was going into those liquor outlets, there would be a problem and quite reasonably the other liquor outlets would complain because there would be others who would be able to be open 24 hours.

I have been assured that the Winnipeg International Airport bar which will serve liquor 24 hours will be behind the security pass. Therefore, only people who are in fact in-transit, who have gone through the security check and are either going somewhere or simply waiting to catch another plane somewhere, will be served alcohol. To that extent, it is clear that Winnipeggers will not have a 24-hour bar, which I am sure all the other alcohol proprietors in the city would be a little upset about.

The other sections of this which deal with the responsibility and the rights of licensees to require proof of age and also to in fact take a proactive approach and not allow those under the age of 18 to consume alcohol, I think is very progressive and is very good and I think it is representative of our increasing desire in society to monitor the use of alcohol and alcohol abuse.

In particular, I think alcohol abuse amongst our youth, our teenagers in our schools, the statistics are shocking. We are learning that the majority of our high schools students are involved regularly in the use of alcohol

and often it is the abuse of alcohol, I would suggest, because of the peer pressure and the general feeling that you cannot have a good time at a party or a dance without throwing down some alcohol or some other form of inebriant, and I believe that that is something we have to get away from. It is something that society wants us and Manitobans want us to work against.

My honourable friend, the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness), suggests raising the drinking age. I have looked at the statistics about raising the drinking age and I am not convinced that is the way to go. In Ontario, the studies show that very few, if any, lives are saved by raising the drinking age. What is more important is the teaching of the responsible use of alcohol and the fact that starts with parents, the school system plays a role, and I believe the state plays a role in instructing our youth as to the responsible use of alcohol in getting away from the notion that you cannot have a good time without alcohol.

It is not so long ago that I went through the high school system, and I know the peer pressure that is there and the abuse that takes place and the drinking and driving and everything else. Quite frankly, I fear for the people in our high schools who are put to the pressures of their peers and their society and indeed the advertisements, which we all know are probably the slickest on TV. I think they are very powerful weapons.

I look forward to proprietors of liquor institutions welcoming this new responsibility, as I am sure they will, and the new rights which go with being able to say to someone who cannot definitively prove that they are 18 that you cannot consume alcohol. I think that they will welcome this responsibility of seeing in their establishment who is 18 and challenging that person to prove their age if there is a question because I believe they are responsible citizens. I believe that the hoteliers and the people who run licensed establishments also want to play a role in the responsible use of liquor and alcohol.

To that extent, our caucus is pleased to support this piece of legislation. However, I refer back to the very serious concerns we have about the use and abuse of alcohol in our society generally. Thank you.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I would like to rise on The Liquor Control Act.—(Interjection)— That is quite correct, Mr. Speaker.

This is a very important piece of legislation. It is a very important piece of legislation because it really has to exemplify the vision and the principles of this Legislature and the people who represent Manitobans on a very important issue in our province, and that is the whole use of alcohol within our society. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, I am quite frankly very concerned at the clip-and-cut way in which this Bill was put together by the present Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) in terms of the direction it goes. I raise that point in all seriousness. It is a not a partisan statement. I wish Members opposite would think about it.

Two and a half weeks ago, we asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Mr. Ernst), we asked

the Minister responsible for the Environment (Mr. Connery), we asked the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) and we asked the Attorney-General what was their policy in terms of beer distribution in this province? Had they looked at the possible impact in a change in the beer distribution system within the Province of Manitoba? Had they looked at the environmental aspects? Had they looked at the job aspects in the province? Had they looked at the potential loss of jobs in our economy at a time when there is rising unemployment? We have four of those questions taken as notice.

Not one Minister has come back to us with answers to those questions about the environmental problems of recycling the American beer cans that are recyclable now, about the Industry, Trade and Technology concerns dealing with the local breweries of Manitoba, about the change in the marketplace in terms of the potential for sales on liquor.

Last week, we heard the Attorney-General speak on the Bill. You would think he was on a different planet in terms of the research that was conducted, and it is a very serious issue.

When the policy was changed in the Province of Saskatchewan, American beer sales went up to 20 percent. With the American beer sales going up to 20 percent, there were plants in Prince Albert that were closed and workers were put out of their jobs. The beers sales in Alberta right now, I believe if my figures are correct and I am just going from memory, are up to 30 percent in terms of the sales of American beer and they are radically cutting into the local industry. There is the prospect now of plants closing in the Province of Alberta. Yet our Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) says in this House, and I would defy him to produce his research to show that there will be no effect on the jobs and the market in Manitoba with the change in the distribution system.

As we asked him two and a half weeks ago and will ask again today, let him produce the facts on that issue because, if he looks at Alberta and he looks at Saskatchewan and he looks at other provinces, he will find that there is indeed a radical increase in the sales of American beer, radical decrease in the sales of domestic products and plants that are closed and workers who are put out of their jobs.

Now the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) stands in his place here last week—I think it was Friday, I am just going again by memory—and tells us that this will have no effect in Manitoba. Did the Attorney-General of Manitoba check with Carling's, which has offered the plant and the first refusal of the plant for sale to the City of Winnipeg, and the hundreds of families that are going to be affected in this province with a change of policy? Are the Ministers who are taking these questions under notice coming back with the impact on Manitoba families? Are they coming back with the impact on the families in terms of the malting industry in this province, many jobs in terms of the malting industry? Have they done any studies at all?

Not one shred of evidence have they tabled in this House to back up the points that they have raised. In fact, I believe they cannot, it is the opposite in terms

of the evidence. So I think that this Bill is a clip-and-cut Bill, produced by, quite frankly, a clip-and-cut Government when it comes to policies like this.

\* (2100)

The left and the right hand, or the right and the right hand, do not know what each other are talking about in terms of some of this legislation and there is absolutely no industrial impact study, no environmental studies, no effect in terms of the marketplace, just glib speeches without any shred of evidence at all.

The proposal on the airport is, I think, a symbolic change. I do not like the fact, and it has been proven the drinking behaviour on airplanes is well documented. The fact that the high altitude affects the influence and effect of alcohol on people is well known medically. Why do we want to have people drink on the airplane, land in the airport, drink in the lounge, get on the airplane, go to somewhere else, in terms of the effect it has on people and rent-a-car? And I have not had one constituent phone me the last couple years and say, "Oh boy, do I ever want to be able to drink in those airports." That is really a burning issue in terms of our province. I really want to sit in those lounges and look at those Salvador Dali prints and have a few cocktails in between the cocktails I had on the airplane out on the other plane. I like Salvador Dali, especially some of his melting clock paintings that are very appropriate to the perceptions of some of the people who end up in those lounges.

I would like to see us go in a different direction in the broadcast policy. I would like to see us try a different route in terms of the broadcast policy in this province. Rather than dealing with the discrimination on the advertising on the one hand, and I agree it is discriminatory against local broadcasters, why do we not go the other way? Why does not the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) sit down with the other Ministers of Health and with the federal Minister of Health and suggest we do with alcohol the same thing we have done with cigarette advertising in this country?

I believe we should take one year to have a massive attempt to try to change the advertising policies nationally. When we were in this House during the Health Estimates, and this is why I call it a clip-and-cut Bill, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) admitted that the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba was totally opposed to this changing of this broadcast policy in terms of its symbolic message in terms of a more permissive society in terms of alcohol.

I recognize that we are trying to put our finger in a bit of a technological dike. There is no question about that. I recognize that alcohol consumption is a problem that goes well beyond the advertising in our province. I recognize that it is discriminatory, that Ontario-based firms with cable television will advertise into Manitoba, American-based firms will advertise into Manitoba because of the cable television systems, etc., and it is not fair to our local broadcasters.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mark Minenko, in the Chair.)

But how do we deal with that discrimination? Do we deal with the discrimination on the basis of going to

everybody else's level, or do we try to go to the other provinces and the federal Government? Do the Ministers of Health and the Ministers of the Alcoholism Foundation go to the other Ministers of Health and take a strong stand on behalf of lifestyle, a strong stand on behalf of the dangerous effects of alcohol consumption.

Why do we not go the other way? Why do we not solve discrimination in the other way? Why do we not go to the national table with a strong voice from Manitoba? The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) knows that the Alcoholism Foundation will support him and give him evidence to support him. Why do we not go and deal with this discrimination in a way that bans liquor advertising right across this country, as we have had the will to do on tobacco products of a few years ago?

I believe we have a clip-and-cut Bill before us. I recognize there are problems in terms of the existing inequities in our alcohol system and our broadcast system, but I believe we should solve those problems on the side of health. I believe we should change those inequities in terms of people coming to our standards and going beyond what standards we have in this Bill.

If we fail, what have we lost? What have we lost if we try to change the liquor advertising in this country to get a ban on liquor advertising? We have not lost anything by trying, in terms of giving out a strong message to Manitobans and a strong message to Canadians that we believe that advertising increases consumption and we believe that increasing consumption is not a socially acceptable goal in our society today.

**An Honourable Member:** It did not help milk.

**Mr. Doer:** It is only because you use McKim Advertising, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the same firm you used in the last election, that your milk consumption did not go up.

**An Honourable Member:** Do not tell him.

**Mr. Doer:** Oh, I am sorry. I believe we have an opportunity to take a different position. I believe we can send our Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) out with the strong message to take the ban the other way, to deal with the discrimination the other way, to have alcohol consumption as a symbol in our society, Manitoba society, dealt with in a fair and progressive and principled way, rather than going the way of eliminating the discrimination, which I admit exists, but eliminating it in a way that gives a message that we are a more permissive society in this area.

I think we should give it a year. I think the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) should express his strong position to the Minister responsible for the Alcoholism Foundation (Mr. McCrae). I believe the Minister's Health position in this House to the Alcoholism Foundation was different than the Minister responsible for the Attorney-General's Department (Mr. McCrae), and I am worried in the haste, the bringing in of these Bills at the last minute as we are seeing here today that we are giving out the wrong message in terms of our attitude towards consumption of alcohol products in this province.

We are giving out the wrong message when it comes to opening out an airport lounge. It is not the end of the world to sit for a couple of hours in-between flights without a drink at 2:30 in the morning. It is not going to kill anybody. Why should we be changing the laws for travellers in terms of those lounges?

Why should we be dealing with the distribution of alcohol to put Manitoba families and their parents—why should we put parents and affect the malting industry? Why should we put our local people out of work? Why has not the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) not tabled an economic impact study of the effect of the Minister of Alcohol, or the Minister of—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Doer:** The Minister of Alcohol—why has he not tabled a study to show how many jobs are going to be lost? His facts in this House last week were totally incorrect, and so we are supposed to put the facts of Saskatchewan and Alberta totally aside and believe Pollyanna words when they just, quite frankly, cannot hold water.

I want to know whether Carling's is going to close. I want to know whether Molson's is going to close by changing the distribution system in this province. If those plants are going to close by passage of this Bill, let the blood of those workers' jobs be on the hands of the Government and whoever goes for it, because it will not be on our hands in the New Democratic Party. I guarantee it.

I think we should take one year to deal with this discrimination. I believe we should take one year to change things the more progressive and socially responsible way. I admit the local broadcasters have taken it in terms of the discrimination for a long period of time, and I do not believe many of them are going to go broke over the next year. I respect their position of trying to get as much work as possible in the local situation, but why do we not give it a try for a year to take the country the other way, rather than just going the same way as the rest of the country?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we believe that this Bill gives out the wrong messages in terms of permissiveness of alcoholic consumption. We recognize the discrimination in terms of the technological changes in our society, but I would like to deal with those discriminations. We would like to deal with that discrimination in a way that gets the whole country with us, rather than us going down to the level of the whole country. Those are the comments we would make on that Bill.

We approve the technical change on the birthdays of the 18 year olds, but I believe we are sending out the wrong message. I think the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), who is responsible for the health and social services of Manitobans and who is responsible for the Alcohol Foundation, should take this fight the other way and not just go down to the lowest common denominator. Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to take just a few minutes to put my own thoughts

on the record on this very important issue. I am sympathetic to the efforts that my colleague from Concordia (Mr. Doer) is proposing and the method of trying to sway the whole country to his way of thinking. However, I am concerned that Governments forever have had difficulties legislating morality.

It becomes increasingly difficult if you do not recognize the need to get your head out of the sand and educate people on the evils of excessive indulgence in alcoholic beverages, the abuse on the body, the abuse on the system, and the abuse on your friends. I do not believe that you can accomplish that by sticking your head in the sand, by saying that it is not a problem, and by not bringing it out into the open and forcing the people who are participating in these activities to be aware of the consequences that overindulgence can have on their physical being, on their mental being, on their friendships, on their social graces and other things.

\* (2110)

We have got a problem. By shutting down in Manitoba the advertising, it does not exclude the advertising that filters in because of technological advances in terms of radio, TV and other advertising from all over the world. So we are biting off our nose to spite our face by curtailing the activities of our own people in this province instead of addressing the problem in a real fashion, and that is one of education through the Health Department, through the school department, through industry, trade and technology, and through supporting other organizations like Alcoholics Anonymous, etc. Thank you for this opportunity to put a few comments on the record.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Order.

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to place a few comments with respect to Bill 47, The Liquor Control Amendment Act. There are a number of significant amendments proposed in this Bill which raise concerns for myself and I am sure for other Members in this House, regardless of the side of the House they sit on.

The area dealing with advertising is the first major amendment to this Bill. It really begs the question as to really where our priorities lie as a society. I can recognize the Government's dilemma in terms of what is occurring in advertising with the stations that beam into Manitoba or primarily the Winnipeg market in terms of liquor advertising and the Manitoba broadcasters not having access to, I guess, that advertising dollar.

The type of advertising that I think has to be questioned throughout is lifestyle advertising. While there are, to my knowledge, not very many studies dealing with lifestyle advertising of alcoholic beverages that can be directly attributable to increased consumption by our youth who will, of course, be consuming for many years, I would hope that if this Bill should pass that the Government consider at the very least, as part of these amendments, a pilot review on an annual basis to look at consumption patterns

as a result of liquor advertising. I think at the very least we should commit ourselves, if this part of the Bill should pass, that should be part and parcel of any changes as well as—we should say that within, say, two or three years of this clause passing that there be a sunset provision contingent upon the results of that three-year study, if it should be two years or three years, on what changes in consumption have occurred during this period of time if this section passes.

Clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the one hand, we are saying Canada-wide that advertising of tobacco is harmful and we are curtailing all advertising of tobacco and lifestyle smoking ads, but yet on alcohol we are allowing that type of advertising. I think, if we are going to allow this, and I am not certain that it will pass but, if it does, I for one want to say to the Government that along part and parcel of these proposals that there be a mandatory annual review and an update, say, by the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba to do the kind of work that is necessary to make this review. Then we can determine whether or not this should be curtailed. Clearly, this direction is leading counter to everything that we are doing in the area of tobacco. Let us understand that is what we are doing.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please, order. I am having some difficulty in hearing the Honourable Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) in his participation in debate on this Bill.

**Mr. Uruski:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The whole question of advertising is certainly of major concern to myself, as one Member, and I am sure to many other Members as to where are our priorities are lying in this area when in fact on the one hand, when it comes to smoking, we are cutting down on advertising, and here we are going to be creating the impression publicly that somehow it is great to have a beer and be golfing or playing tennis or whatever the sport you want to engage in, and it connotes, gives you the impression that you are great when you have this beer, playing that kind of a sport.

I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is making my point when he says, stop it, it is making me thirsty, and I think that is the effect of the advertising. It does, as one could colloquially put it, wet the whistle. That is what it is designed to do, quite frankly. There are very major concerns in this area.

The other area, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have some major concerns about is the whole question of, and maybe the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) will correct me if I am wrong, but the amendment dealing with International Airport. The allowance of having our International Airport, an open bar 24 hours a day, I am not certain that the travelling public requires a 24-hour-a-day bar at the airport. I really question the need for that kind of an operation.

Clearly the airlines, if anyone has flown either nationally or internationally, the bar is wide open as soon as you take off. If you are landing in whatever place, do you need that bar to open for 24 hours a

day? I raise that question, and I doubt whether that in fact is a necessity by amendment in the Bill.

I see some Members of the Government side frowning on this one. I believe that is the nature of the amendment and if I am wrong somebody will—if my interpretation of the amendment is wrong, I hope that one of the Members on the Government side will correct me. I believe I am right.

\* (2120)

Quite frankly, I question the need for a 24-hour bar at the airport. I do not believe that is of necessity. Clearly, the travelling public will have, if they so desire, their fill as soon as the plane leaves the ground. I am not sure that is necessary to have it at our airport.

The other area that I believe opens the door to what I would call extreme competition is the opening of the allowance of imported beer into the Province of Manitoba, and the allowance of having anyone who handles beer can have a licence or can have a warehouse without being a manufacturer. That amendment clearly opens the door to the North American multinationals who in fact one operation can produce enough beer to serve the needs of Canada.

This amendment really opens the door to having imported beer warehouses to take over a major portion of the market. It is clear that along with advertising, along with lower costs of operation—and we understand that in Canada. The lower costs of operation south of the border do give the breweries an unfair or a fair in terms of competition but an unfair advantage basis the kind of laws that we have put into place in this country where we have provincially allowed each province to make its own decisions dealing with liquor. As a result, hundreds of jobs in every province have been—in fact, it is probably thousands of jobs in every province in the brewing industry have been created. All those jobs, or a portion of those jobs certainly, would be in jeopardy by the allowance of these warehouses to have imported beer come to this province.

Clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while on one the hand, even in the Free Trade Agreement, we have said that we want to protect the industry and, on the other hand, here we are opening the door to offshore beer companies to be able to have warehouses in the Province of Manitoba and—well, offshore, I mean anything across the border, would consider maybe that is the wrong definition but outside our borders. Maybe that is a better way of putting it. Any manufacturer outside the borders and even offshore, it would not matter where they produced the beer, would allow them to set up operations without being a manufacturer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that is really the essence of this amendment.

There are amendments here, Sir, that one can support dealing with proof of age and those areas of The Liquor Act that one can readily support. I would hope that the Government would be prepared to move on the question of pictures on driver's licences, and I hope that the Minister responsible for MPIC (Mr. Cummings) and the Minister responsible for Motor Vehicles (Mr. Albert Driedger), I want to tell them that those

instructions while not formally given by myself back a number of months ago, were given to the Motor Vehicle Branch to start the process going. I believe, my colleague concurred in that whole area to start the process going to develop the infrastructure required for photographs on licences. You need about a three-year lead time to put that process into place.—(Interjection)— Pardon me? Well, they may not have three years but at least that process should be well on their way a year from now that we will be questioning the Minister of Highways who is responsible for the Motor Vehicle Branch and the Attorney-General, who I understand supports the photograph licences in terms of enforcement both on The Highway Traffic Act and The Liquor Control Act that they can be used.

It appears that we do not need advertising for the tobacco users in this Assembly. They are still willing to try and get around the rules of advertising and use it.—(Interjection)— Pardon me?

There are as well allowances to allow some increase or allowing access for parents and their children to allow entry into race tracks and special private clubs and I think those areas where families may attend, those areas of allowing families to make their own decisions are certainly ones that I can support. But the three areas of the airport allowing of a 24-hour licence at the airport, the allowance of imported beer, and the question of opening up the advertising are ones that give me very major concern and should do so to most Members in this Assembly.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Dauphin.

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** I would like to put a few comments on the record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this issue. I hesitated to speak because it was rather a reception-like atmosphere in the House through the time of the last number of speakers and I doubted that anyone was listening particularly to the arguments that were being put forward, but I notice that it has suddenly quieted down tremendously and I am very pleased about that.

I want to say, first of all, that I believe all of us should look very carefully at what is being proposed here, particularly with regard to the change in advertising, a more open and lenient advertising clause that is being proposed in this province as well as with the issue of American beer vendor sales.

The issue that I am particularly concerned about is the issue of increased advertising, lifestyle advertising particularly aimed at our young people. I think that all of us in this House would think very much about this if we had a personal experience where someone we knew, a young person, one of our children or a very close relative was senselessly injured, maimed, or killed by a drunk driver. I think that would probably make us look very closely, very soberly, if I can use that kind of a pun, at such a Bill that would actually give licence to promote the lifestyle of drinking in our province. The fact is that a great deal of this advertising is coming in now at the present time through American channels, but it is also a fact that there are many communities who do not have cablevision in our province.

Winnipegosis, for example, in my present constituency, does not. Therefore, it is not exposed to the degree of advertising that many other communities have with regard to drinking and driving or with regard to drinking. I do not think that it is a good argument to say that we should just because it is coming in at this time through other media that we should now throw in the towel, so to speak, and say, well, if they are all advertising here, we might as well do it too.

\* (2130)

I think we should look at those very sensible voices out there who are leading the fight against increased drinking in this province, among our young people particularly. They are parents who have had children killed in accidents that involved drinking, the Manitoba Highway Traffic Safety Committee that was set up as ministerial committee with a number of Ministers from affected departments—Health, Highways and Transportation, Autopac, Social Services—who had proposed a number of measures to tighten up penalties for misuse of alcohol.

Really, what we all want to say in here is that we are not taking a holier-than-thou attitude when we speak against this kind of a Bill. Many of us consume alcohol to a certain degree, in certain instances. But that does not mean that we should promote drinking in our society through lenient laws, simply because drinking is a fact of life in our life, in our everyday lives. We do not take the position, I do not think, that because there is drinking in our midst that we should be promoting, particularly drinking amongst our young people.

So I ask all Members in this House to consider carefully what they are doing here and I like my Leader's suggestion, which he has thought out very carefully, I am sure, over many months of deliberation on this very serious issue and brought forth very articulately here today, in which he said that we should be going the other way. We should take the leadership role, the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) particularly, with other Ministers across this country, to actually reduce the amount of advertising, liquor advertising, such as is happening with smoking now. I am sure the national Minister of Health, the Honourable Jake Epp, who has been promoting the reduction of cigarette advertising, would be very supportive of any moves in this direction as well. I think we have that opportunity to show that leadership, and that is what we should do rather than jumping on the bandwagon to promoting greater amounts of lifestyle advertising for alcohol aimed at our young people who are often tragic victims of alcohol.

So I ask people in this House to consider this carefully and I put those comments on the record to indicate why I cannot support those measures in this particular Bill.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, we are making better progress than I thought at 8:15 when I announced the order of Bills. Would you be so kind now as to call Bill No. 37, Bill No. 28, Bill No. 29, and the remainder if we get to them

in the order they are listed on the Order Paper? Bill 37 is at the report stage and listed on page 1 of today's Order Paper.

**An Honourable Member:** No. 50.

**Mr. McCrae:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Honourable Members are calling out the Bills they would like to deal with tonight. Let us deal again in this order: Bill No. 37, Bill No. 50, Bill No. 28, and Bill No. 29, and the rest in the order they are listed in the Order Paper. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

## REPORT STAGE

### BILL NO. 37—THE CROWN CORPORATIONS PUBLIC REVIEW AND ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS ACT

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Bill No. 37, The Crown Corporations Public Review and Accountability and Consequential Amendments Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Very briefly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are very pleased that there were amendments to the Bill that I think improved it in terms of the public accountability with the public sessions that were approved in the committee stage. As well, we feel that the amendments being proposed now at report stage by the Minister are appropriate and, therefore, we are prepared to pass this Bill through to third reading.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? (Agreed)

Shall the Bill, as amended, be concurred in? (Agreed)

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### BILL NO. 50—THE BRANDON CHARTER AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings), Bill No. 50, The Brandon Charter Amendment Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock).

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if I may have leave of the House to address this Bill and then pass it? It is my intention—

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** The Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) had adjourned debate so the Honourable Member for St. Norbert will be able to speak on this Bill, so leave is not required. The Honourable Member could go ahead.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** With that understanding, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**Mr. Angus:** So that you can anticipate what it is my intention to do, it is my intention to speak briefly on

this Bill, on the merits of this Bill and then to ask the House to pass it on to the committee stage. I am sure that the House will be able to do that. If it has the will and if the Deputy Speaker can show us how, then we would like to do that.

I would like to say that the Bill gives a certain amount of autonomy and independence to Brandon. It is something that I think should be done. I think it should have been done a long time ago. As a matter of fact, Brandon should be brought into the Department of Urban Affairs. It is for too long the City of Winnipeg has had "Perimeteritis" and looked at itself in the City of Winnipeg and not looked beyond the Perimeter Highway as to the other communities and the things that they have. Brandon is a thriving community that deserves recognition and deserves to be able to do things that this Bill will allow it to do.

I, on behalf of our caucus, urge a speedy passage from this stage to the committee stage where we can have a bit further discussion and perhaps propose some improvements to the Bill that will make it as effective as possible.

I will move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it be passed at this particular stage.

\* (2140)

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do want to make a few comments about this particular Bill and matters relating to it under The Municipal Act.

With regard to the specific provisions of the Bill, we have no particular quarrel with them and would be able to support them. However, I think that the Minister deserves some comment with regard to the way he has organized his affairs with regard to these amendments in The Municipal Act and the Charter.

He could have been able to process and arrive at the goals that he was after, the objectives that he was trying to attain, with the changes to The Municipal Act by simply making a change in the Brandon Charter, as opposed to moving amendments to The Municipal Act, which is Bill 34, which was passed to second reading the other day, which were sweeping changes, fundamental changes, to The Municipal Act. Rather than having designated grants provided for specific purposes, what he did was bring in the sweeping provisions that will allow communities to compete against each other with industrial incentive grants, a fundamental change to the municipal provisions, The Municipal Act provisions. I do not think that kind of provision is something that was necessary and that he should be bringing in without broad consultation with municipalities, with towns and villages across this province, first, to find out if in fact that is something that they want and, if they did, as well to determine whether it is in the public interest to allow that.

We see provinces competing with each other, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to attract major industries and we do not, I think, want to see our small communities competing with each other in that way. I do not know if the Minister intended that when he moved those amendments that he felt he would put in place a

provision for the Brandon University to receive grants from the City of Brandon, while at the same time making it so broad that it would allow for any kind of grant to be made by a municipal corporation to a private industry. If that is what he intended, I would be very surprised, but in fact that is what he was providing for and we intend to move amendments in Bill 34 to remove that provision.

At the same time, I say to the Minister that he should have checked with his staff much more closely on what he was bringing forward. They are experienced people. Surely, they should have known better. The Minister, I hope, has learned a valuable lesson from this experience, that it is quite embarrassing to bring in changes that are not required and not necessarily doing what we intend them to do. He has a responsibility as Minister to look much more carefully at his legislation before bringing it into the Session so those kind of sloppy mistakes do not happen in the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those comments, I want to indicate that we in the New Democratic Party are prepared to pass The Brandon Charter Amendment Act through to committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL NO. 28—THE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS' ORGANIZATION FUNDING ACT**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), Bill No. 28, The Agricultural Producers' Organization Funding Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my colleague, the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski).

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not expect to take too long on this Bill. I want to indicate that this piece of legislation is one that I believe will test the farm community as to their willingness to try to work out an accommodation between the various organizations that are present within the province to get together and to see whether or not a unified voice can occur.

It is one that I guess from my involvement over the last number of years has been an issue that I have done a lot of work and a lot of soul-searching and a lot of, I guess, discussion on this matter with a number of the groups, general farm organizations in the province because, whether we want to admit it or not, there are several viewpoints that come out of the farm community.

You have a number of farm organizations that do work towards a unified voice and are described, as one can, a general farm organization, the history of which in our province has been long standing. We had at one time, Mr. Deputy Speaker, very close in this province the possibility of having a united voice. I guess what was known at the time, I am not sure of the exact

name, but the Farm Bureau evolved from that group. There was an attempt at having a confederation of farm organizations in this province and having a kind of a central lobby voice with representations of various farm groups.

That did not succeed and that organization did not succeed. It fell apart at the last minute, as I understand it. It is before my time in public office and it is unfortunate that it did not at that time succeed.

I think it is the desire of all Members in this Assembly that farmers do have the right to have a farm organization. The real question comes into discussion as to how should it come about? What is the appropriate mechanism? What is the appropriate process that this should evolve? That is, I guess, the dilemma that we will be in over the next couple of days in hearing from the farm groups as to what might be the appropriate mechanism.

There will be some who will say leave it to the farmers alone and let them decide freely, leave it to one organization as is proposed in this Bill. Have an umbrella organization such as was tried several decades ago by having three or four farm organizations in the province but yet having an umbrella organization and having proportional representation in this umbrella group. That was one method that was tried or there is the other method of saying, let us have a vote in the province and let one organization evolve from that vote and have one organization come forward as a result of the vote.

Ultimately this last suggestion that I have made probably may come about that there will likely have to be a vote of sorts, because I believe what will come about in the hearings is that the number of the farm organizations that will come forward, I believe, will be suggesting either an umbrella organization or saying, leave it up to us, give us a free choice as to who we want to join, or have a vote and have one organization evolve. I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) will have to look at the possibility of having that come about.

\* (2150)

It is my view and it is our view on this side—and I have given the Minister a copy of some amendments and suggestions that we have made, and I will put them on the record as to this Bill. I want to indicate, first and foremost, that we believe that farmers should have the right to select an organization of their choice. They should have a right to opt out in a general farm organization. I have no difficulty, and I want to put it on the record that when it comes to a check-off for a commodity group in terms of a marketing board, I have no difficulty with having a mandatory check-off. When the majority of producers elect a marketing structure and if the majority votes in that way, they do have the right.

In fact, that becomes the union in that case, because they do bargain on behalf of farmers for direct economic benefits. That is where I guess the Members on the Government side or some of the Members on the Government side have some difficulty with that notion.

But it does become a union, whether we like it or not, because it is an organization that either through legislation is able to set a price for the commodity if it is part of a national agreement or in fact they bargain as do the hog producers through a marketing board and the majority of producers voted for a check-off, and I believe that right is there. But when it comes to a general policy-making farm group, there is a substantive difference between that scope and that of a marketing board. So the legislation, while the legislation recognizes that in the way it is structured, it still does not recognize the political reality of this province.

I say that not in a negative way, I say that in a positive way, that being the reality. You have in fact the CAM, what I would call the Canadian Agriculture Movement fairly well organized, generally speaking, in eastern Manitoba, and having a—I do not know the numbers of those producers, fairly well organized, but yet I have to say, some of whom are working within the CAP structure. I accept that, but there is a separate entity in that part of the province. As well, you have the National Farmers' Union. The membership, I do not know, it is probably somewhere—I do not think it is 1,000 but somewhere between 700 and 1,000, I would think, is probably not far out in terms of this province. They have a particular philosophy and they do represent a significant number of farmers. You have a number of other small groups of a commodity nature but yet who propose to represent farmers' views on various issues over or beyond the issues that relate directly to the commodity that they produce.

Was it the independent cattle producers, the independent cow-calf producers of the province, some of them hail from the Minister of Agriculture's (Mr. Findlay) constituency or nearby constituency in that area. I do not know how large that group is. They have a particular point of view. Of course, we do have the Keystone Agricultural Producers which has in fact evolved from the Manitoba Farm Bureau, and which has attempted, and which has done a great job in terms of trying to recruit farmers into that organization, just like any other political entity because it is a farmers' political group. It is not a political party, but it is a farmers' political lobbying group, the Keystone Agricultural Producers. They all are, whether it is Farm Union, whether it is CAM, whether it is KAP, they are all serving that function. They have every right to be, and I support each group in having the right to be this.

We believe, and I believe that what should in fact occur is that our preference is to give the farmers the clear choice of joining whichever group they desire. One of those desires, and I accept the Government's prerogative in this whole area, but one of those desires is in fact having the right to opt out. If there is more than one group that comes forward, I believe that this legislation should in two ways, either in a form of a petition of producers—and I am not sure that I accept the Minister's definition of having the \$500 limit as the cutoff. I would let, quite frankly, the farmers' representatives decide what should be the cutoff. I will go so far as to say, let the certifying body decide after consulting with farmers what should be the cutoff. Let them decide. Maybe it should be \$250, maybe it should be \$5,000.00.



I am prepared to allow the certifying agency to have a free rein in that whole area because, if circumstances should change in the future, then we have to come back and amend the legislation. Leaving it open to the certifying agency on petition or definition from farm groups, that could be an ongoing decision without having direct relevance to this Assembly. Let them make their own decisions in terms of who in the farm community should be eligible to vote or be involved in the organization. I am going that far because I believe that, if the petition is not brought forward with the majority of producers who are eligible to vote, then a referendum should be held.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

So I make my earlier comments based on the—Mr. Speaker, I know the time is approaching ten o'clock. I am hoping that I can be granted leave to go beyond before I finish my remarks on this Bill, should I require additional time.

So I continue that I believe that even if there is one organization that a referendum should be held to show clearly how much support there is in the farm community to determine if the majority of qualified producers support this organization. When I say majority, I say the majority who have, in fact, cast the ballot, not the majority of 51 percent. If there is a referendum held in a vote that it be the majority of those eligible to vote that have in fact voted, if there is a referendum held. So that if only 20 percent of the producers should happen to vote, the majority of those who vote, just the way we are here in this Legislature, you had the majority of votes.

The Conservative Party in the April election did not have 51 percent of the vote in the province but they received the majority of votes, enough to elect the most Members in this House and they are in fact the governing Party. We would accept certainly that kind of a vote. I have also said to the Minister that, where there is more than one organization applying for certification, the agency shall allow producers to designate the organization of their choice to which he or she wish to belong.

Mr. Speaker, I say this—and I see the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) shaking his hand at me as if I were a dirty dog.

\* (2200)

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Uruski:** Well, he shook his paw at me, too, to go like this.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for Interlake has the floor and I am having some difficulty in hearing his remarks.

**Mr. Uruski:** That, in effect, would recognize the political reality of farm organizations in this province if the Government is interested in this area.

I will be proposing those amendments. I have given copies of those amendments to my colleagues in the

Liberal Party and I have given them to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). I am not certain that they will pass, but I certainly will be one who will be putting that position and those amendments forward here.

I do recognize, as all Members recognize, that in fact the farmers of this province have a right to have an organization that—(Interjection)—Pardon me? Mr. Speaker, I have heard some chirping from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). If he wishes to speak on this legislation, he will have an opportunity to do so. I know that he chirped during the last provincial election right in my constituency and I had the opportunity of being on the platform with him when his candidate would not appear on the platform.—(Interjection)—The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) says he gave me a whipping. If he did, I should not be here today, quite frankly.

There requires to be some clarity in this legislation about whether or not a commodity group is allowed to be part of this general farm organization. I do not believe it is, but I hope that the Minister in his closing remarks will clarify that point whether this legislation does allow for a producer commodity group to belong to a general farm organization and whether that is even allowed. I am not certain that it does. That question has been raised with me. I have not been able to deal with that question in the legislation and I hope that the Minister will be able to clarify that point.

As well, the November 30 date within the legislation as to how it is interpreted as to its certification, I believe that there needs to be some clarification in that whole area.

I have briefly put some of my reservations and my support to the farmers of this province in an attempt to get them together to organize into a lobbying group. The concept we support but we believe that farmers, given the political reality of Manitoba farmers, have a way to go before they amalgamate. It may be that they may be able to work out, if they decided to work under an umbrella structure, ultimately a single voice. I am not saying it would be always unified, but that there will be a single voice on many important issues and I think in Manitoba we have to recognize that. I know that discussions have pointed to other provinces, like Quebec, that there is a central entity. I did check or inquire in the Province of Quebec with some of my colleagues there. There was not a vote in the Province of Quebec, as I can determine. The organization which generally was brought into being there was not brought in by a vote.

In the Province of Ontario, there is an option. There is an option of two groups in the Province of Ontario. I believe that is the Ontario farmers, part of the CFA—(Interjection)—Yes, the OFA and the Christian Farmers' Associations, the CFA I guess it will be called—Christian farmers, or CFF or CFA, but it is there anyway—the Christian Farmers' Organization, or CFO, and in terms of farmer support, farmers can designate one group or the other in terms of the check-off there. That has been an evolution in terms of farm politics.

Maybe we should be taking that one step in terms of saying, let us move at one step and say, allow the two or three groups that do exist in the Province of

Manitoba to allow that kind of evolution over the next two, three or four years and see how it works out and, maybe three years down the road, that will be my preference and then say, okay, do we amalgamate or we do not amalgamate or do we force the issue. That may be a way of dealing with this question as one step at a time. I do not know whether even that suggestion would be a suggestion that would be accepted by those who appear, but that is certainly some of the questions that I may raise in committee.

The other area deals with—and I will leave the area of Bill No. 28 because as I have said we believe that farmers should have the right to organize. Before I leave that though, I have also given the Minister amendments dealing with the decision-making power of the certifying agency and I believe the Minister has no difficulty with the procedural amendment of having the majority of members of the certifying agency making the decision. The way the Act now is worded, it appears that two of the four people there could ostensibly make the decision. I do not think that is the intent but certainly clarification or amendments in this whole area should be made.

Part IV of the Act deals with the area of funding of commodity groups, completely separate part, dealing with commodity groups. I believe that commodity groups should have the right and I support this portion of the legislation. I question, however, the need for a referendum if there is a petition. Let us say the producer group that comes forward for funding under—because ultimately a producer group coming would want to know from its own membership whether there is support for a check-off, and a producer group may decide to have a petition amongst the producers. As for example, the turkey producers in the late Sixties decided to form a marketing board. Well, as I understand the organizers at the time canvassed all turkey producers in the province and got them to sign a petition. The Government of the Day then was presented with the petition bearing the signatures of the majority of producers.

I question the need for the vote if it can be verified, and that should not be too difficult, that there would be 60 percent and I would even leave it as simple majority but I accept the 60 percent margin, if there is clearly a 60 percent margin of producers who petition the Government for a check-off for their commodity. Why spend the money, allow it. I would want that organization to write the other 40 percent and say we have at least 60 percent of the vote, maybe a confirmation with the other 40 percent in a letter form, may produce a referendum without having to canvass the entire producer body who were not part of that petition. Clearly, I would have no difficulty of allowing, by virtue of a petition, that check-off to be instituted.

\* (2210)

While saying that, I have some further comments on Bill No. 29 because there are major inconsistencies there. I support this Bill to go to committee and, as well, the allowance of having commodity groups come forward and ask for a check-off, for promotion check-off. We agree with that, I have no difficulty with that

part of the Bill. We will await for presentations in committee. Thank you.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being 10 p.m., this House is now—

**Mr. Uruski:** Could I ask leave of the House? I may as well deal with Bill No. 29. If there is agreement, we may as well deal with Bill No. 29 and then we can—

## HOUSE BUSINESS

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** With the Honourable Member's indulgence for one moment, I would just like to announce that the Standing Committee on Law Amendments will sit tomorrow evening at 8 p.m. to consider—that is for Bills referred, Mr. Speaker, and the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders will be sitting on Wednesday and Thursday at 8 p.m.

## DEBATE ON SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 29—THE CATTLE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), Bill No. 29, The Cattle Producers Association Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des éleveurs de bétail, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski).

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** There is a lot of history behind this Bill, and I see the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), the former Minister of Agriculture, whom I believe I succeeded in office in November of '81.

I will not go into the history of this at all, but all I want to put on the record is that there is a substantive contradiction in Bill No. 29 to that as contained in Bill No. 28. I accept the provisions of Bill No. 28. The Government will see that these contradictions, if they go through, will give them some difficulty down the road of whoever is in Government because, on the one hand, we are giving back to a group that had a compulsory check-off with opting out provisions, and they were there before. They maybe were not as clear as they are now. On the other hand, we are giving any other commodity group a different set of rules in terms of check-off.

I say that to the Government that, quite frankly, what is the rush with Bill No. 29? Tell the cattle producers you have got Bill No. 28. Be like everyone else and fulfill the requirements of Bill No. 28 and you are in business like anyone else. Unless there were some commitments made at some given point in time to them and, if there is, let the Minister or Members on their side come clean on that one, but clearly it is a contradiction. I do not believe that if I was a pulse grower, a corn grower, canola grower, and these will be all groups—

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs):** Turkey producer.

**Mr. Uruski:** Pardon me?

**Mr. Downey:** Turkey producer.

**Mr. Uruski:** No, the turkey producers have had a check-off to the Turkey Association and others a long time ago. I am talking about groups that have yet to come forward. Those groups will be coming forward. There are a number of commodity groups that I am certain will come forward when they have the support of producers. What I do not want to see is other producer groups saying, well, you gave it to one, why do you not just lessen the rules for us under Bill 28, somehow making it a little bit easier, because you did it for one.

Quite frankly, I would recommend to the Government, even though I would like to hear what happens in committee—I will allow this Bill to go to committee, I will not oppose the Bill. But, quite frankly, I would urge the Government to rethink their position on Bill 29 and allow all producer commodity groups to fall under Bill 28, and then clearly there will be no question at all and I would have no difficulty with that. With that, Mr. Speaker, we will let this Bill go to committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being 10 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).