



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 102A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 7 JULY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 7 July, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their Sixth Report.

Your Committee met on Thursday, July 7, 1983 and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill No. 72 The Wild Rice Act; Loi sur le riz sauvage.

Mr. Sidney Green, Q.C.

Bill No. 78 An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.

Mr. Randy Moffat, President of Winnipeg Videon.

Bill No. 91 An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.

Mr. A. A. DeLeeuw, President of Winnipeg Real Estate Board.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 80 An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Bill No. 84 An Act to amend The Residential Rent Regulation Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur le controle du loyer des locaux d'habitation.

Bill No. 91 An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered:

Bill No. 26 An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.

And has agreed to report the same with an amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DES JARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the 1982-83 Annual Reports of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and also of the Manitoba Health Research Council.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we are pleased to welcome the Honourable Orlin Hanson who is the State Representative from District 3 of the State House of Representatives in North Dakota.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Government Policy - Business of the House

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier. There is a great deal of business before the House and to put it charitably, Sir, the business of the House has not been proceeding as smoothly as it might be if the business were a little better ordered by the government, and I ask the Deputy Premier what action the government intends to take to attempt to make business flow a little more smoothly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of business before the House because there's a great deal that the government wishes to accomplish. We'll be calling bills as efficiently as we can and we know we can count on the co-operation of the opposition.

Speed-up resolution

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves still dealing with issues that could have been dealt with as early as last December in terms of committee meetings, and we find ourselves in Law Amendments Committee not being able to deal with bills because the government has not ordered the affairs of Ministers appropriately in order to be able to deal with it. So while the opposition

has been facilitating business to this point, can I ask the Acting Deputy Minister if she has any intention of seeing the normal Speed-up motion introduced which, at this time of the year, helps to facilitate the flow of business?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, all those options are open to us and when we deem it appropriate, we will take action.

Government policy - Business of the House

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Acting Government House Leader. In view of the fact that this morning in Law Amendments Committee the committee was only able to deal with four out of 14 bills on the Order Paper and it had to adjourn three-quarters of an hour early, will the Acting Government House Leader consider the possibility of better ordering the affairs of the House so that Ministers responsible for the bills which are before the committee, are there in attendance, able to deal with them, able to answer questions and members don't have to waste time coming out to meetings that can't function properly because the required personnel are not there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do wish to confirm that at the meeting of Law Amendments Committee it was not possible to deal with all the bills that were referred to it because we, as a government, and the opposition is participating as well, is involved in a number of meetings and it is true we are very busy. We are busy as a Legislature and I am not critical of the opposition nor am I critical of my colleagues in government who are trying to do so many things.

A number of the bills that otherwise would have been dealt with at Law Amendments Committee were not proceeded with because opposition critics were not available. We are going to expedite the work of the House but we're going to accommodate members as well.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, that's true, that there was one bill that couldn't be dealt with because a critic wasn't there. Ten out of 14 bills could not be dealt with this morning because of the ordering of business by this government of calling concurrent meetings.

My question is, when is the government and the Acting House Leader going to get its act together so that we can start getting the business of the House done in some reasonable time, for the betterment of the people of Manitoba?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, we are going to proceed with the orderly presentation of bills to the House. There have been quite a number of bills that have been presented; they were presented as early as December of last year, to accommodate the general public and also, particularly to allow the opposition to

have lots of time to prepare arguments and some of those bills have not seen much debate, Mr. Speaker. Some of them have seen far too much debate by the opposition but that's a matter for them to decide; but there's a number of bills that they chose to ignore and they refuse to want to participate in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of bills for example, Bill No. 87, Bill No. 88, that the opposition has not seen fit to be interested in. We have accommodated the opposition, Mr. Speaker, by allowing them to indicate bills on which they have members ready to speak. Well, Mr. Speaker, the accommodation can only go on so long. We want to move the legislation before this House and on some of the bills they've been stalling.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the state of further degenerating chaos into which this government has got the ordering of its business in this Legislative Assembly; in view of the fact that today the government is running two propaganda meetings in support of its amendment proposal to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act thereby necessitating the presence there of government Ministers and of opposition critics and so on; in view of the fact that the committee as we have heard this morning, was not able to carry out its business because of concurrent committees sitting at the same time; we don't know this afternoon whether the House is going to be sitting tonight or whether the committee is going to be sitting - they tell us now the House is going to be sitting - Mr. Speaker, does the First Minister need any further evidence to prove the necessity of having the Constitutional Resolution on Bilingualism referred to an intersessional committee so that neither the people of Manitoba nor indeed this Legislature will be hurried or forced into a situation of disorder such as we are seeing every day with the conduct of government business?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's a question of disorder not to have proceeded into speed-up. I recall in previous sessions being in speed-up, sitting at 1 o'clock, 2 o'clock, 3 o'clock, 4 o'clock in the morning trying to deal with legislation that in some instances I felt was not being dealt with properly because of some frantic hurry to adjourn, to get out of the House and to become a matter of legislation by way of exhaustion.

I know that honourable members are anxious to get out of the House but I think it's important that we take our time; that we review the legislation; that we're prepared to discuss the legislation and analyze it carefully. At the same time, I think it's important that the informational meetings take place; that the Attorney-General is now taking place with members of the public. Mr. Speaker, I know it's nice to talk about haste and rushing and processing, but we're on very very serious matters pertaining to the business of the people of the

Province of Manitoba. I think a little time in so doing isn't going to really frustrate anybody unduly.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the First Minister for agreeing to my case; namely, that the constitutional amendment should not be hurried in any way at all, Mr. Speaker. Unlike the Member for Radisson, I don't have obsessions. He is the zealot and at times the fool who demonstrates that to all and sundry is in this House when the TV camera is on.

Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister then come back to the question that was asked, not to the one that they chose to manufacture? Would it not make sense in the interests of the people of Manitoba, in the interests of this Legislature, proceeding in an unhurried way with respect to the constitutional amendment which, contrary to the opinion of some of the backbenchers, is a very important matter, one that will bind this province for generations to come? Can he not see now the merit of having an intersessional committee to deal with this?

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, as we were just informed at noon, that at the propaganda meetings the Attorney-General is conducting on behalf of this particular resolution, the public were allowed five minutes each, after the Attorney-General had given a one-hour dissertation on the matter. Now that's not democracy; that's not the way to organize anything that is connected with this House. Let's have an unhurried committee hearing on this matter intersessionally. Will the First Minister not agree that would be in the public interest? Will he not make that concession to the people of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if there is indeed any frustration and any temper that unnecessarily creates difficulty in this House it is when one member of this House refers to another member of this House as a zealot or as a fool. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the type of intemperate language that is unduly frustrating the normal course of proceedings of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I'm answering the question but I think it would be remiss for me to not make reference to the remark which was included in the question by the Leader of the Opposition which was intemperate and demonstrates, indeed, the nub of much of the difficulty that we are being confronted with insofar as proper processing of the business of the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that there was any undue hurry pertaining to the Constitutional Resolution. The informational meetings will take place; there will be debate in this Chamber; there will be a legislative committee that will receive briefs from the members of the public and we will proceed in due course with the debate. The legislative committee and I was not aware that we were in any particular undue haste or hurry.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister can attempt all he wishes to deny the existence of reality. The reality of life in this Legislature is that the Legislature is slowly breaking down because of the inability of this government to order the business of the House properly, Mr. Speaker. This morning's example of the committee is only one example and if

we're going to have committees of the House sitting on the Constitution, sitting on bills, does that not suggest to the First Minister that an intersessional . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition has been on his feet, he's asked I believe one question, but he's been on his feet making statements and I think, Mr. Speaker, you owe it to all members of this House, particularly to the Leader of the Opposition, to indicate again to the Leader of the Opposition that this isn't the Parliament of Canada where the members are entitled to a 10-minute statement, this is question period and the honourable members are entitled to ask questions.

They're entitled to introduce their first question by a short introductory preamble to the question, but following their first question the supplementary questions need no preamble. The honourable member has been standing in his place making speeches, Mr. Speaker, and I call upon you to advise him about the Rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe I've quoted this citation before. It's 359(2) which says, "The question must be brief. The preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence. A long preamble on a long question takes an unfair share of time and provokes the same sort of reply. A supplementary question should need no preamble." I hope honourable members will take those words to heart and order their actions accordingly.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the question to the First Minister is this, that in view of the fact that this House is going to be sitting with committees of the House, Law Amendments, on very important pieces of legislation, some of which are penal to the people of Manitoba; in view of the fact that this government is unable apparently to have Ministers, quite understandably, when they've got two or three committees sitting, have Ministers at proper hearings dealing with bills, and then having the same Minister dealing with the Constitutional Resolution, will he not admit the common sense of the suggestion that has been made and reiterated on this side of the House, that if he would stop being so bullheaded and order the Constitutional Amendment Resolution to be heard intersessionally, as he was asked at the beginning, that he would avoid some of the disruptions that are occurring and he would avoid, if I may say so, Sir, some of the concern that is arising among the people of Manitoba, the municipalities of Manitoba, the cities, towns and villages, that they want to be heard on this matter in an unhurried way? Will he not agree that would be the best way to order the business of this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's for that reason that, indeed, informational meetings are proceeding in

Dauphin, in Brandon, in Thompson, in Winnipeg. There will be opportunity for municipalities and villages and towns and for others to make presentations to a legislative committee of this House dealing with this particular resolution when it is referred to that committee. So, Mr. Speaker, there is in fact more opportunity than is the case with most bills, contentious bills, that proceed through this Chamber. We have a very very contentious bill dealing with seat belt and restraint legislation that will be dealt with, with a committee meeting and the presentation of briefs, no informational meetings, so there is every opportunity being given to deal with the resolution by way of informational meetings by legislative Committee, to receive briefs.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I should not have to remind the First Minister, of this or any other province, that the resolution that he has and his government have before this house, is of sublime importance to the future of this province, namely, an amendment to The Constitution Act of Canada. Will he not agree that the amendment should be treated interessionally in an unhurried way so that the people of Manitoba will have every full opportunity to tell the Legislature what they think about that fundamentally important matter; not to have to share their time on seat belts, The Farm Land Protection Act and so on, which committees I expect this government will want to run concurrently? That is not the way, Mr. Speaker, will he not agree that is not the way to run the business of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in fact the business, insofar as this Chamber is concerned, is being run in a way that is less hurried than in previous years . . .

A MEMBER: Contemptible!

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . contemptible because honourable members want to get away on their vacation, Mr. Speaker. We're going to take our time insofar as dealing with these important matters . . .

HON. S. LYON: Now you're the fools.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, I want to just put on the record, again, that the Leader of the Opposition is — (Interjection) —

HON. S. LYON: I'll put it on record any day of the week, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister is acting like a fool in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to repeat the statement by the Leader of the Opposition, otherwise I would be making myself as he has described - come very close sometimes, Mr. Speaker - for being tempted to sink into the same sort of abattoirs the Leader of the Opposition does.

Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to take our time. In fact, there isn't even a provision for a resolution to be referred to a legislative committee. There is no need for this resolution to be dealt with by way of a legislative

committee, to be dealt with by way of informational meetings. Mr. Speaker, let us be clear, this government has gone the extra step insofar as this resolution is concerned, it is taking this resolution to informational meetings throughout the Province of Manitoba; it is referring this resolution to a legislative committee, not required by the Rules of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, just for the information of members across the way, it's my understanding that insofar as the other provinces are concerned with their constitutional resolutions pertaining to aboriginal treaty rights, that they're not being referred in most cases to committees, are being dealt with in the normal process of a resolution.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister who need not, out of the barrenness of his thought processes, reflect or impute motives to this side of the House about wanting holidays. This side of the House has some understanding of the fundamental importance of this Constitutional Amendment which he and his incompetent government have negotiated. We, Mr. Speaker, want to make sure that the people of Manitoba have full opportunity. So lest he try to get away with that kind of imputation, he can keep those shallow thoughts to himself.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is very simply this, and I'm asking for an answer, not a weaseling around such as we've been hearing from him, will he not agree that the people of Manitoba on a fundamental issue of this importance, the first constitutional amendment - and don't talk to me about the Native Rights Amendment, that is a secretarial amendment compared to the one on bilingualism, compared to that - so, Mr. Speaker, will he not agree that it would be in the interests of the people of Manitoba, never mind his personal schedule or that of his incompetent backbenchers, in the interests of the people of Manitoba, once will he do something in the public interest and schedule these meetings interessionally so that the people of Manitoba will have a chance to be heard?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've already responded to three speeches, not three questions, by the Leader of the Opposition. I don't intend to abuse the Rules of the House by entering into a fourth speech in response to a speech by the Leader of the Opposition.

Judge Jewers Report on Lotteries

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister in charge of Lotteries and would ask the Minister, in light of the fact that the report dealing with Lotteries, Judge Jewers Report, which was commissioned by him over a year ago, has not yet been tabled in the Legislature, I wonder if he could inform the House as to when we can expect that report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it'll probably be next week; very soon anyway.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that many of the non-profit groups who have, approximately a year ago, put in applications for Nevada and Bingo licences, does the Minister anticipate that these particular applications will be dealt with once the Jewers Report is brought into the Legislature? In other words, what kind of time frame is he looking at for the implementation of the report?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to make the correction. It's not necessarily the implementation of a report. Policies will be developed and announced to the House taking into consideration some of the recommendations and the Report of Judge Jewers. There could be other policy changes.

I can announce to the House now that there will be some very major changes in policies, and that takes quite awhile to get ready, but we're going as fast as we can, and as soon as we can these policies will be announced to the House and to the public of Manitoba.

MR. R. BANMAN: A further question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister then saying that after the report is tabled that the freeze on the new issuance of licences for Nevadas and for Bingos, to non-profit groups, will continue till the government has decided on their new policy direction? I'd like to ask him, if that indeed is the case, if that is how he intends to approach the situation, could he tell us roughly, how long these groups would have to wait; in other words, till they can have a word whether or not they will be receiving favourable consideration or otherwise?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be wise for me to announce any policy change or even part of the policies at this time. I've answered the honourable member and the members of this House that policies are in the process of being developed now, and will be announced very very soon.

Crow Rate

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm wondering if I could ask the Acting Minister of Highways and Transportation, roughly, if he could give me an estimate as to how many people have called the government seeking information on the Crow rate issue by using the public phone number that was accommodated to them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the specific question as notice, but I believe that it's somewhere neighbouring the 200 mark.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, I then ask a question of the First Minister. I would ask him, because some \$150,000 was allocated to advertising to elicit questions from Manitobans who had concerns on this, how roughly at \$750 a phone call to this point in time, how that figure contradicts the statement made by the Minister

of Natural Resources yesterday when he lauded his government's efforts in cost-conscious decision making.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the implications of the Crow are certainly considerable insofar as Manitoba is concerned. Our expenditure, in regard to Crow information, is probably modest by comparison to the expenditures that have been encountered in the Province of Saskatchewan by the Saskatchewan Government. I think, by comparison, we would be quite modest insofar as our expenditure of sums of monies re the advertising issue so that, in fact, Mr. Speaker, we probably could be criticized, in comparison to the efforts of the Saskatchewan Government, to advertise a position contrary to Pepin.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the advertising is not just to elicit questions, but certainly is more to inform, to advise Manitobans insofar as the consequences of an improper decision on the part of the Federal Government pertaining to Crow. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that we had unanimous support in this House as to the serious consequences that might occur on the part of the people of the Province of Manitoba, and farmers particularly in the Province of Manitoba, if the Pepin proposals were permitted to proceed, so I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, if anything, that there would have been criticism for us not launching more enthusiastic advertising along the lines of Premier Devine's Government in Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister can attempt to justify it in any way he wants but \$750 per phone call is a large amount.

My next question is to the Minister of Transportation, I would like to know whether the government will be making a presentation to the Federal Standing Committee on Agriculture as it passes, I believe, through Winnipeg on August 4th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have indicated to the Government of Canada that we intend to make a presentation on behalf of the Government of Manitoba.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister can indicate how the position to be put forward by the government will be determined?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the Member for Morris has never been in government and doesn't quite know the methodology employed to put together a brief that would presume to represent the province and the government; perhaps some day he will have that opportunity. But that is something for us to determine, it's not something that is debatable here.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I wonder if I might interrupt the proceedings for a moment to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 15 students from the Frederick Wilhelm School in West Germany who are the guests of Fort Richmond High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Yorke.

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

The Honourable Member for Morris.

Crow Rate Cont'd

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I have one more question in this vein. I'm wondering if the Minister would be a little more explicit and tell the House whether, indeed, any of the report that was tabled here by our own Standing Committee on Agriculture will be used to formulate the government proposal, because certainly it should be made well aware to all Manitobans that that standing committee went around and based its questions and elicited responses on the original Pepin proposals and they have changed many times since that.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the appropriate references will be made to that document and I believe it will be done in a way that will not offend members opposite.

Bilingualism in Manitoba Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him if he could clarify something. Is the First Minister considering a free vote on the question of bilingualism in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Elmwood is able to vote as he sees fit.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I did not hear the answer. I wonder if the First Minister could repeat it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, certainly the Honourable Member for Elmwood will be able to vote as he sees fit. Insofar as a free vote, that's a matter that will have to be determined in due course, I'm sure, by the caucus opposite and our own particular caucus. At this particular time, no one on our side except for the Member for Elmwood has expressed any concern about whether the vote be free or not.

MR. R. DOERN: I'd also like to ask the First Minister whether he could explain his comments which were made a week or two ago which appeared to be contradictory, namely, that he was considering a free vote and that it was also a matter of confidence in the government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have never ruled out a free vote, but unlike the honourable member's

priorities, this has not been a priority of concern within our particular caucus in discussion as to whether this be a free vote or not. At some point before the vote, we'll probably discuss that. I don't sense it to be a matter of priority on the part of this caucus.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask as a last question of the First Minister, is this a matter of confidence or a question of confidence in this government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's been made very clear it's a matter of confidence.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the First Minister, I hope, is pondering the question still of an intersessional committee taking the lead from what his colleague, the Minister of Transportation, has been doing with respect to taking phone calls on the Crow rate; considering that the question of the Constitutional Amendment is much more fundamental a problem, would he consider putting in a free phoning area for the people of Manitoba to communicate their information to this government because this government thus far has seen to forestall and to squelch and to hold down people from telling the government what it thinks about the Constitutional Amendment?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe there are facilities now that provide for any citizen of the Province of Manitoba to phone in, I believe, on a toll-free basis if I'm not incorrect, Citizens Inquiry Service, Mr. Speaker, and also of course, to communicate by way of letter and other means.

Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Conservative members across the way that this is a government that certainly has not hesitated to invite public response. In fact, some three weeks ago we gained the pleasant experience of visiting a number of communities in ridings of honourable members across the way to discuss all current issues before the Legislature. We met in Morden, Manitoba; Notre Dame; in Vita; in St. Pierre; in Beausejour; in Whitemouth and we discussed this particular issue. Let me tell honourable members, we discussed the issues pertaining to seat belts. Mr. Speaker, in fact, I do not recall honourable members across the way going out and meeting with community leaders during the Session as we did a few weeks ago, members on this side of the Chamber.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in furtherance of the question that I asked before, will the First Minister and his government give serious consideration to opening up either a special phone line or some other additional means of letting the people of Manitoba communicate with their government on this issue? The best way is an intersessional committee; will he not consider the intersessional committee, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think it's incumbent on members of this House to try and abide by the Rules of the House. The Leader of the Opposition has been in this House for many years and yet he consistently

breaks the rules. He knows that it is improper for him to consistently ask the same question, change a word here or change a word there or make a shorter speech before the question, but to repeat the same question, Mr. Speaker, surely you should advise the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that he should abide by the rules. A long time ago he used to, Mr. Speaker.

I would remind you to reflect on experience in this House and tell him not to repeat his questions.

French Language Services - Advertising

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable First Minister which follows upon the excellent suggestion I think that's been made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that the government may, on the question of the expansion of French Language Services in Manitoba, want to follow the excellent example set by the Minister of Transportation. I'm wondering if the Premier would consider doing at least \$150,000 advertising campaign and public information campaign for the people of Manitoba on this important issue and include in it a telephone number to which members of the public could respond both for, to make comments and to have the questions answered by the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a lot of Manitobans in fact may be wishing at this particular point, with all the misinformation that members of the Conservative opposition have been spreading about the province, that we would engage in more such activity of advertising, communicating information and other means of ensuring that honourable members in this House do not succeed in misinforming the public at large.

Bilingualism in Manitoba - misinformation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would the First Minister care - and I'm sure he'll have to take notice of this question - would he care to identify one piece of misinformation that has been spoken by me or by this opposition party since he introduced the Constitutional Amendment? And if not, will he withdraw that uncalled-for statement about misinformation? We are not the ones, Sir, who have been issuing misinformation. Let him speak to the President of the Union of Municipalities about misinformation, coming from him, with respect to an issue about which this First Minister knows very little.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: It was they, the members across the way, that said this would cost Manitobans more.

It was they that said we were requiring more translation of statutes. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are translating less statutes. Mr. Speaker, we can proceed through the Hansard, page-by-page, and we'll find many different areas of misinformation.

HON. S. LYON: Well then, Mr. Speaker, I repeat my question before. I challenge the First Minister to do it or to shut up.

McKenzie Seeds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Order-in-Council No. 700 appoints Honourable Leonard Salisbury Evans, the Minister of Community Services and Corrections, the Minister responsible for the administration of A.E. McKenzie Company, dated June 29, 1983.

Could I ask the First Minister who has been responsible for McKenzie Seeds prior to that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Brandon East, the Minister responsible for Community Services has been on a continuing basis, on de facto basis, and the Order-in-Council ensures that it is done on an appropriate basis.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, who has had the proper and legitimate authority to exercise responsibility with respect to A.E. McKenzie Limited prior to June 29, 1983?

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Manitoba Development Corporation has been involved. It has been the responsibility of the Minister responsible for Economic Development, as the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation. Insofar as McKenzie Seeds, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility is and will be the Minister responsible for Community Services.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Economic Development then. Has the Minister of Economic Development had any dealings with McKenzie Seeds in her capacity as the Minister responsible for that corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, since last July - it was July or August when I assumed responsibility for MDC and Flyer - the de facto Minister in charge of McKenzie has been the Honourable Mr. Evans, although both of us have been legally involved. I think I have had the basic responsibility, but de facto the relationship with McKenzie has been handled by my colleague.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. What authority did the de facto Minister, the Minister responsible for Community Services have to

appear before the Standing Committee of the Legislature and answer questions concerning the affairs of A.E. McKenzie Limited?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable members had concerns, I don't know why, at that particular point, they did not ask at that time because the Order-in-Council involved has been passed since that particular date.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the opposition, perhaps wrongly had been assuming that the First Minister could at least see that his Ministers were properly appointed and that their responsibilities were properly assigned. Perhaps we will have to begin to question each and every one of the appointments that this First Minister makes.

My question to the First Minister, Sir, under what authority did he appear before the committee to answer questions concerning A.E. McKenzie Limited?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in this particular case it was clearly an oversight that we noted on this side before members of the opposition had noted it, that there had not been an Order-in-Council appointing the Member for Community Services responsible. — (Interjection) — I did.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister who is now no longer de facto but is responsible for A.E. McKenzie Limited. Did the Minister make any decisions with respect to A.E. McKenzie during the period of time for which he had no authority to act as the Minister responsible for that company?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member should very well know, all major decisions involving Crown corporations ultimately are discussed by Cabinet and are dealt with by Cabinet and I think of one primary example, a very important worthwhile example, and that is the refinancing of that company, something that was planned back in the '70s and that has finally come about. Those major decisions, of course, involved the Minister of MDC and involves, ultimately, the Cabinet of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister of Community Services if he signed an Order-in-Council concerning the refinancing of A.E. McKenzie Limited?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe, if my memory serves me right, that would have been signed by the Minister for MDC because the refinancing is done through the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. B. RANSOM: A further question to the Minister responsible for A.E. McKenzie. Did the Minister sign

any documents, any authorizations with respect to A.E. McKenzie Limited during the period of time that he was, in fact, not responsible for that company?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, going back to the original legislation setting up A.E. McKenzie - and this goes back to 1945 - the Minister of Finance under both administrations as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, has had the authority under that legislation to hold the shares on behalf of the Government of Manitoba. I therefore had one occasion to act as the shareholders for the Province of Manitoba at the annual meeting of A.E. McKenzie early in this year and the proxy was given to me by the Minister of Finance which, as we are advised by Legal Counsel, is the proper way to proceed. This happened, also, under your administration; your Minister of Finance had to do the same thing.

MR. B. RANSOM: A further question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Did the Minister sign any order with respect to appointments to the Board of Directors to A.E. McKenzie Company Limited?

HON. L. EVANS: Ultimately the appointment to the Board of Directors of this Crown corporation is agreed to by the Cabinet of the province.

MR. B. RANSOM: Perhaps the Minister could be a little more specific in responding to the question, Mr. Speaker. Did he sign an order respecting appointments to the Board of Directors of A.E. McKenzie Company Limited?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Question having expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, would you call the Bills in this order please: Bill No. 87, Bill No. 88, Bill No. 55, Bill No. 48, Bill No. 60, and then Bill No. 2, 3, 18, 23, 24, 47, 49, 66, 74 and 85. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Bill No. 87. (Stand).

Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The members perhaps aren't aware that there have been meetings called by the government to deal with the Constitutional amendment that is before this House, and our critic is attending those meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Bill No. 88, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand).

**ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND
READING**

**BILL 55 - THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
ACT**

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, this bill which provides for additional services to Members of the Legislative Assembly we believe is an inappropriate bill to bring forward at this time. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I will give an example of the various issues that are involved and the manner in which the bill has been debated and discussed by members opposite in the course of the second reading debate in this House.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of areas of concern with regard to this bill. Firstly, it's evident that the bill has been brought forward by the government in an effort to justify positions, as members of the Legislature of Manitoba, ought to become full-time endeavours by all members. That concept has been referred to on a number of occasions in debate and discussion on the bill this Session. I believe that's a concept and an area that we ought to be concerned about, because I believe that there are a number of good and valid reasons why we shouldn't be moving to make positions, as members of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, full-time, year-round jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it's very important to have additional outside interests and commitments and involvements, other than just those which we are required as members of the Legislature to participate in. I believe that it's in all of our interests to get out of this artificial environment that we have here in the Legislative Assembly, as Members of the Legislature, and into the real world from time-to-time. It's important for us to keep contact with the community. I believe that contact should include perhaps some outside employment and endeavours as much as possible, because I think it's important for us to have that diversity of views that is out there in the public in Manitoba; that diversity of views that we can only get from constant contact, not only contact as a member of the Legislature sitting on the end of a telephone, or responding to initiatives that we create by legislation here, or by bills brought forward; but rather have our work and our legislation be in response to the experiences that we have from our involvement outside of the Legislature. I believe that this diversity of views can serve, without question, to make for better legislation.

I think that it's important, as I've said on a number of occasions, that this Legislature be populated by people of as broad a cross-section of representation in this community as possible; not only the geographic representation that occurs because of the way the boundaries are drawn for the constituencies that members represent in this House, not only for that geographic difference in the regions that are represented by the people present here in the House, but the diversity of ethnic origin, the diversity of people of different vocational backgrounds, different interests and so on. I think that is very important.

The Member for Thompson, for instance, in discussing this bill made a number of different references, references to his feeling that this bill was very important for his ability to keep touch with his community. He very proudly stated, on occasion, that he felt that he worked very hard at keeping touch with his community, and this bill was going to enable him to do a better job as a member of the Legislature. I'll quote him: "Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, I wish members opposite would be a little more courageous in expressing the view. I wish they would get up and say, yes, I feel the position of an MLA should be a part-time job, that I should come here for the sitting of the Legislature then go to some other form of employment, and that's it. I do not believe that there should be constituency services; I do not believe that there should be constituency offices or any travel allowances in-between legislative sessions. I wish they would have the courage to say that."

Mr. Speaker, I am saying I believe that it is important for us not to become full-time members of the Legislature where we have no other contacts, no other commitments and no other involvements out in the community. I'm saying that. I'm sorry that the Member for Thompson isn't here to hear me say it because he's challenged us to say it, but perhaps he'll read it in Hansard.

I take exception to his position in attempting to, as justification of this bill, make the position that he is currently in a full-time job. I understand why and I'll refer to that a little later, but I disagree with it. Mr. Speaker, I think the inference that the Member for Thompson is making is that only if we are full-time members can we do an adequate job of maintaining contact and keeping in touch with our community and fully servicing it to the best possible extent. I believe there are many different ways of keeping in touch with the community and I believe, of course, that there are differences in which we have to keep in touch.

A widespread community such as the Member for Rupertsland represents is much more difficult, and he would have to be much more imaginative and make use of much more different techniques to try and keep in touch because of the manner in which the population is spread out in his constituency than, for instance, someone such as myself or other urban members who are in daily contact with their communities. For us, I realize that it's a lot easier. We can meet and have discussions with and gain feedback and advice from our constituents merely by going shopping at the grocery store in our area from time to time. — (Interjection) — The Member for Elmwood says at the beer parlor. Well, I suppose for some that's an appropriate place for an exchange of information and dialogue and I suppose that they serve tomato juice there as well, so one doesn't even need to indulge in order to sit and participate. — (Interjection) — The Minister of Agriculture says they serve Pepsi and the Member for Elmwood says they even serve milk from time to time. Well, that's true, I suppose that that's the kind of thing.

But I'm saying that in an urban centre, one can keep in touch just by going out to his children's games at the community centres. We can participate when we go to a Home and School meeting; we can participate and we can keep in touch and we can get a good deal

of feedback and information, an indication of just what's on the mind of our constituents as we stand outside at a hockey game adjacent to a hockey rink watching our children play; or gymnastics, watching them perform; at church teas; at so many of those things - so it's a lot different for us perhaps than it is for the Member for Rupertsland.

But I believe that it's just a question of commitment and a question of imagination as to how you go about structuring your time to keep in touch with that community. I don't believe the matters that are brought forward in this bill are in any way, shape or form going to ensure that any member of this House does a better job of keeping in touch.

What it will do, Mr. Speaker, however, is burden the taxpayer, that beleaguered taxpayer who's already served with the weight of a record deficit, a record deficit last year that was at an all-time high of - I believe it's been established now as being around \$340 million - a record deficit this year that's projected at \$578 million. When 52,000 Manitobans are unemployed, searching desperately for jobs, we are facing them and burdening them with the extra cost of now providing us, as members of the Legislature, with additional services, additional benefits.

The members opposite, particularly the Member for Thompson, and I believe the Member for Inkster, or certainly the Member for Springfield in his questioning of my colleague from La Verendrye, made the inference that this was actually somehow going to be a saving to the taxpayer, because now we were replacing a \$1,500 taxable benefit that all of us are currently getting with a \$2,500 potential non-taxable benefit for which receipts were required. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is absolutely no doubt that members are going to be able to justify that. They probably are already expending that \$2,500 today on travel within their constituency, on information that they're sending out to their constituents on a regular basis. I don't know if members opposite do but I certainly know that our members do.

In fact, one of my former colleagues in the last Session of the Legislature used to send out an enormous amount of mail daily from his office. He had a mailing list in which he kept people informed on issues and positions and just did a marvelous job. He did that out of the existing indemnity that we received, out of the existing allowance for constituency and secretarial and research; he did that because that was his way of keeping in touch with his constituents. I don't think that this would have been any more incentive for him to do what he knew was necessary in order to do the best job possible as a member of the Legislature, and it wouldn't have changed it. It would have just meant that he then could turn over all those receipts for postage and stationery and printing and all of those things and get compensated for it, and that's exactly what will happen. Members are currently doing all of these vital things necessary to perform adequately their jobs as members of this Legislature without these provisions.

I don't see the need for us to burden the taxpayer with the additional expense. I certainly don't accept the position that's taken, I believe, falsely by members opposite by saying somehow this is going to be a saving to the taxpayer. There is no way that this will be a saving to the taxpayer and we had better face up to that right now.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we're replacing a \$1,500 taxable benefit annually, of which I suppose many members are paying back almost half in income taxes; so, in essence, \$750 goes back into the tax rolls of the province so, in fact, it's a net benefit of about \$750, we're replacing that with a \$2,500 non-taxable benefit for which we have to supply receipts. Any of us who have been involved in any endeavours, whether that be here as a member of the Legislature or as a member of government or a member of business where you're keeping those receipts, you're accumulating those receipts and you know that you are expending that money and there will be no difficulty in providing the receipts to prove that every year you spend, indeed, even more than \$2,500 on legitimate constituency expenses to do the job that you were elected to do to represent the people of your area.

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand how, in fact, the Member for Inkster in his references said that it was a much better system to require people to provide receipts for their legitimate expenditures that they make. He indicated that as part of his speech, saying that it was a much better system now because we had to provide those receipts for the expenditure.

At the same time, this bill takes away a situation that currently exists on behalf of the Speaker's office, in which the Speaker is entitled to a \$50 per diem for coming into his office and presumably for carrying out the business of the Speaker's office while we are not in Session; so they are now taking that provision away from here, a provision which I presume is an accountable provision - the Speaker doesn't get it automatically - he gets it only for having demonstrated that he has spent time in his office carrying out the duties of the office of Speaker during the course of the intersession, the time between sessions.

That, for instance, last year amounted to \$7,050 and that's now being replaced with an additional indemnity of \$3,500. So the reverse principle is being held out by this government, saying that instead of having an accountable amount in there, we're now going to cut it back to a non-accountable \$3,500 increase in indemnity.

The government is confused in its principles and its logic here as it is, obviously, in so many of the things that it does. As my colleague from Virden says, you can't have it both ways, but this government always seems to choose to try and have it both ways by justifying, on the one hand a situation, and on the other hand, an opposite situation, just reversing their arguments for the two; and that of course I suppose is part of what happens with the arguments that the Member for Inkster puts forward continually.

Mr. Speaker, in referring to this item, of course, the Member for Thompson as well made comment on that matter. I'll just refer to the notes here. The Member for Inkster says that he referred to it; well perhaps I've got it in the notes of Hansard, of his speech; but in any case, they choose their arguments, depending on the position that they want in the bill, and as I say, they just reverse the arguments when they're taking the opposite position. In any case, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things about this bill that I think ought to be open to question, that the public ought to be concerned about.

The former Member for Inkster - and we have said before that the current member has large shoes to fill

- but the former Member for Inkster, when faced with this kind of proposal in the past, that is the proposal to increase benefits and/or indemnities to members, suggested that any new benefits, any increase in indemnities, any new services or cost to the taxpayer on behalf of members of the Legislature, should not come into effect until after the next election, so that we are not voting on a basis of greed or on a basis of increasing our own incomes and proving our own financial situations, but we should put forward the proposal and then let the taxpayer voter, next time around, decide whether or not we have been fair, honest and straightforward in putting forth this kind of suggestion of a change in compensation to members — (Interjection) — I have no problems with that whatsoever, in response to the Minister of Health. — (Interjection) — I'll get to that in a moment, Mr. Speaker.

I say that's a valid proposal because I'll give you an instance of that. The members who are sitting in the government benches today did not campaign on the basis that, if elected to office, they would immediately endeavour to increase the benefits paid to or on behalf of members of the Legislature. I certainly didn't hear it; it certainly wasn't in that manifesto that was put forward, "A Clear Choice to All Manitobans," that was put forward by Howard Pawley on behalf of the ND Party during the campaign of '81; I did not hear the Member for Inkster, I did not hear the Member for River East, I did not hear the Member for Thompson, I have never seen anywhere, in any of their literature or campaign speeches, that any of them advocated that they were going to be elected to government to increase their benefits and compensation as members of this Legislature.

From Day One, they're going into the public trough to increase the cost to taxpayers, to keep members of the Legislature here. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides greater compensation and benefits to members; there's no question about it. It provides it in a different form, but I've illustrated just how it ends up in more dollars out of the taxpayer's pocket and more dollars into the pocket of members of the Legislature.

The members opposite, the government, are taking great pains to justify it. In fact, the Member for Inkster has obviously done a great deal of research on this. If you take a look at his speech, he has researched this matter and he has referred to the compensation and benefits in virtually every province in this country. He's able to quote what are the benefits and what are the compensations paid to members of Legislatures in virtually every province in this country. This is the Member for Inkster. He refers here to Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick; he refers to Saskatchewan, Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia, Quebec and he refers to all of them, indicating that they all provide so much greater compensation and benefits to their members.

I'll tell you this, he's also honest, in that he says, and I quote, "The amount that is being proposed," that is the increase to \$2,500 in allowance and expenses for constituency work, offices, whatever, he says, "The amount that is being proposed is, I think, very miserly. I will freely admit that I argued for quite a substantial amount of funds above that in the development of this legislation, for I do not feel that \$2,500, when you compare it to other jurisdictions, is that adequate a

sum of money to be able to provide for a good constituency liaison." That's the Member for Inkster. I want to know if he said that before he was elected, Mr. Speaker. That's what I want to know.

I want to see it on the record, Mr. Speaker, because I'll tell you, this is going to form a part of the record that we are going to send out to his constituents in the next election and to the constituents of the Member for Springfield, the Member for Thompson, the Member for River East and all of those members opposite, all of those members opposite.

He goes off on a tangent, saying things such as, and I quote from the Member for Inkster, "Quebec even allows up to two constituency offices, up to \$46,000 a year for servicing their constituents and so on and so forth." Well I want to tell you a little bit about Quebec, Mr. Speaker, because when I was in Cabinet I had a number of occasions at Federal-Provincial Ministerial Conferences to meet with members of the Legislature in Quebec and Cabinet Ministers in Quebec and I was frankly appalled. Frankly, I was appalled at the circumstances that they have there.

Cabinet Ministers are paid \$95,000, or somewhere in that range, per year; ordinary members of the Legislature are paid in excess of \$50,000 in Quebec. While the average Quebecer lives below the poverty line, they pay themselves salaries that are absolutely incredible. The Ministers used to travel around when we went to federal-provincial meetings and we might take two or three advisors with us - they would have 10 or 12 - they would travel with an entourage and they would spend lavish amounts of money at these conferences on lunches and dinners while their rural populace suffered, starved below the poverty line.

He refers as well, of course, to the fact that Saskatchewan pays greater indemnities and benefits. Of course, here we're dealing with socialist governments that have set the standard both in Quebec and in Saskatchewan that set the standard for this kind of compensation. That's what he uses to justify their endeavour to increase the expenditures and the compensation to members of the Legislature. Shameful, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I referred, of course, to the economic circumstances in which we find ourselves because I think that has to be the backdrop against which you evaluate this as a priority measure, as a priority piece of legislation of this government, because it's this government's priorities and decisions that have resulted in the record deficits that we're currently undergoing. The fact that in their very first year of office their deficit was greater than the cumulative deficits of four years of our government but they exceeded that in one year of government.

So we're on a wild spending spree and it's burdening the taxpayer and at the same time we're asking the taxpayer to pay. We've raised their taxes, the payroll tax, the sales tax has gone up, property taxes have gone up three times in the first two years - three times what they went up in all four years of our government, cumulative. Park fees and licence fees, Crown land lease fees, everything is going up to pay for the excessive spending of this government and we pile on top of that this bill which we have labeled, members on this side have labeled, a greed bill and that's what it is.

How can they, against the backdrop of that kind of spending, face the taxpayer with additional costs and we haven't even talked about the fact, and I'll have an opportunity to speak more on The Election Finances Act but it's in the same vein, the fact that this government cares nothing for the taxpayer. Surely the government has a responsibility to lead by example from time-to-time but in this case it's not "Do as I do" but it's "Don't do as I do, but do as I say". It's that kind of approach to things.

Is it any wonder that under this government we've reversed a trend that prevailed for four or five years in which Manitoba's and Winnipeg's rate of inflation was much lower than in the rest of the country? Now, since early this year our rate of increase in the cost of living has been leading the rest of the country. Why? This government has to take a fair share of the responsibility, they're the ones who have added to the cost of government massively. I think it's right now, through this kind of bill, the government is demonstrating beyond question it's insensitivity to the real needs of Manitobans. Their real goals and ambitions to live as comfortable a life as they can within the bounds of their economic means. That's what most Manitobans, I believe, want.

What this government faces them with, after me you come first, that's their attitude. It's evident in all of the legislation that they put forward. I'm first and after I've had my fill, well, if there's some left over, that's up for you. You're next but, of course, we want you to pay for it; that's the point, after we have our share, we want you to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that these members opposite were elected for that purpose. I believe that they were given the responsibility to look after the interests of the taxpayer not to say, do as I say but not as I do as they are in this kind of bill.

Mr. Speaker, I already referred to the fact that they didn't campaign on this but it's one of their priority pieces of legislation and I will, the Minister of Health says that they campaigned on this. Nonsense. After this kind of bill how hollow is that move that the Minister of Finance made which said that he's going to freeze MLA's increases to 6 percent this year.

Well, that's very big of him after he gives everybody else additional income through other purposes, additional sources of benefits as members of the Legislature. That's very big of him. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield comes here to interrupt me because he wasn't here when I laid that out earlier how the fact that the \$1,500 of taxable income that is being replaced with \$2,500 of non-taxable income is in effect a net \$750 after tax being replaced with \$2,500, that's exactly what it is for every member of this Legislature. That's where the additional expenses are. Of course, the member doesn't understand that because I assume he hasn't paid taxes very often.

Mr. Speaker, all of the rhetoric, all of the flim flam that has been put forward on this bill by members opposite has been to cover up what is actually being done and to justify their existence here as full-time members and it's obvious from the way they choose to run the affairs of the House that they want to stay here longer and longer throughout the year, that they want to do everything possible to justify being full-time members of this House, and we can understand why.

They're afraid to go out and meet the people in their constituencies, they have nothing to go to out there, they have no responsibilities outside this House, there's no one depending on them or looking for them to make a contribution to any other kind of endeavour.

All we have opposite arguing on behalf of this bill is the unemployed and unemployables before the last election who are now here and trying to justify their continued existence here, that's what we have. The Member for Springfield, the Member for Thompson, the Member for Inkster, it's no wonder that they don't want an occupation listed on the ballot in The Elections Act because either they're a full-time politician or else they don't have a job, so it's one or the other, it's either unemployed or full-time politician, that's all that would appear on the ballot in a number of instances.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite will say that I voted for an increase in the MLA's indemnity in 1980 . . .

A MEMBER: Who said that? Nobody said that.

MR. G. FILMON: They will say that after I've sat down, I'm sure, so I'm going to beat them to it and I'm going to say it, that I did vote for an increase that's true but I want to tell you economic circumstances were different in those days. We did not have the massive deficit; we were not increasing taxes, in fact, we had decreased taxes; we had frozen the hydro rates, we've done all those things. We were looking after the taxpayers' dollars.

A MEMBER: But you turned the corner.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, what happened was we followed Judge Hall's recommendations, and we did put through. The members opposite are saying yeah, yeah. I can remember all of their crocodile tears about that when we brought in that bill. I can remember how they wrung their hands and said how insensitive we were, and how inconsiderate we were, and they all took it. Mr. Speaker, I said at the time that I didn't feel, personally, that I had a need for that increase. I recognized, however, that there were others who were not as fortunate, perhaps, as I as having another outside job, or having another outside business endeavour and source of income that I could productively put my time to during the time when we weren't in Session; and so consequently I said, okay, if members in general feel that it's a good thing, if the judge has recommended it, okay, I'll go along with it. I'll tell you, I would not have taken the position that members opposite did in speaking against it, and crying crocodile tears about it, and then later on taking it. Okay, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what happened.

When I was on city council in 1976, they brought through a resolution to increase the indemnities paid to city councillors. They brought that through in 1976 and at that time I spoke against it, argued against it, and said that we had not campaigned for office on increasing the incomes of city councillors. As a consequence, they had a mechanism at City Hall whereby you didn't have to take the increase, and I did not take the increase for three years. The remaining three years that I was at city council I did not take it. I did not take it because I said at that time that I would

not only take the position but I would put myself on the record.

Members opposite, of course, did not take that position and now they're bringing in this kind of legislation and they're not leaving a choice to the taxpayer. I say this is not good legislation, it's not warranted now; the taxpayer didn't ask you to do it; and you didn't tell the taxpayer that you would do it when you ran for office.

So withdraw the bill; don't go forward with it; it's not necessary; it's not needed; or make it take effect after the next election. If you have the courage of your convictions leave it as a legacy to the next members of the Legislature, but don't fill your pockets today and don't compensate yourselves today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Member for Tuxedo. In view of his comments about those who were disputing the bill in 1980 ended up taking the benefits that accrued to members as a result of the salary changes at that time: is the member telling us that he, for one, or he and his colleagues will refuse to accept the service benefits which accrue because of a bill since they are opposed to it, since he suggested it might be somewhat hypocritical to do otherwise, since that's what the NDP did in 1980?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that it would be hypocritical in this instance. I said it was hypocritical for the NDP to argue against a salary increase for MLAs and then take it. In this case, this is compensation for things that we are already doing out of our own pockets. I am putting in these expenditures; I'm putting in this travel; I am putting out the mailing pieces, and I'm putting out these mailing pieces to my constituents and I will continue to do so; and because members opposite are going to use that for political gains I'm going to make sure that I take every advantage to defeat that government next time around. That's why I will use it, because I'm already doing it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek that debate be adjourned.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 48, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General standing in the name of the Member for Minnedosa. (Stand)

BILL 60 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 60, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation standing in the name of the Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm busily and hastily making notes here. I hope I've got sufficient to be able to start with my few notes I have on the table here.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 60, our safety package, is an incredibly important bill. It's a bill I personally take very seriously; it is a bill which I believe personifies our interests in the human condition, and our interest in trying to get people to lessen injuries and lessen the deaths on our highways. It has been often said that highway deaths and highway injuries, or our highways, in general, are in many ways like a disease. As a matter of fact, the World Health Organization has said, "Road accidents, in comparison with diseases, have an etiologic history. They affect various age groups differently; they occur in well-defined situations with more or less foreseeable frequency; they are not simply unpredictable pieces of bad luck.

When you look at the accident statistics of who are injured in age groups, in motor-related accidents, in rates per 100,000, you see small children - they would include pedestrian accidents as well - of 10 per 100,000 in the age group of 1-4; age groups of 5-14, the statistics - these are based on statistics from the American Academy of Pediatrics in 1980, I might add - just slightly lower, 8.6. Some of that shows the additional survivability in an accident of a larger child, rather than a small child I would imagine. But when you move into the category when young people are getting their licences, when they're starting to drive, learning to drive and using the highways as routes to learn on, in many instances, and also under peer pressure, but the basic tenet is that they are now driving the vehicles and the accident rate jumps up almost six times, to 44.1 deaths per 100,000 live births; so you can see in this short, graphic explanation of the linkage between deaths and age, between highway deaths and propensity of a person to be on the highway, particularly to be driving.

When you look at motor vehicle age specific fatalities, in 1975 and 1978, in Illinois, the passenger to non-passenger ratio of accidents - in other words, this excludes pedestrians - on highway accidents, in your different age groups, jumps once again dramatically. It goes, in the age group of 10-14, from 1.43 to 1 ratio, it jumps in 15-19, when the kinds are getting their licences, up to almost 10-1; 20-24, 11.5 to 1 and then it starts dropping slowly and it doesn't get down below 3 to 1 until the persons are over the age of 65. So there you can see it's like a curve, starting low on one end, reaching a peak in the early years of the 20s, a very dramatic rise actually, from the years from 10-14, a very dramatic rise once they get their licences at 15, a higher rise again in the early 20s and then slowly, I mean slowly dropping off. It starts off 25-35 at almost 8 to 1; 35-45 is 6.5 to 1; 45-54, 4.28 to 1 and 55-65 of 3.35 to 1, so the ratios drop very very slowly. That shows you how like a disease it is age related.

In doing some research for this - and I was glad that the former speaker gave me credit for trying to do

some research and I do. I spend hours of research before I get up to speak in the House, contrary, I think, to a lot of members opposite whose speeches show a distinct lack of research. I contacted a chap who's doing a study in Winnipeg under Dr. Mulligan. The chap's name is Peter Moll and they are doing a survey of accidents in Manitoba, basically, primarily from Portage la Prairie east of the Ontario border and up north of Gimli, a bit north of Gimli. They found, I believe it was last year, only two people died wearing seat belts. One of them was a 77 year old man who died of a heart attack some 10 days later, so being a younger person, there's no question that elderly gentleman would have survived had he been 20-30 years younger.

The high impact rates usually are at intersections and they're rarely exceeding the speed of 40-45 miles per hour. As a matter of fact, most of the accidents that take place - they use a figure of 2 percent of the accidents that happen - have a change in velocity greater than 30 miles per hour. It's a change in velocity; that means vehicles hitting another object, maybe another vehicle and not stopping instantly, but slowing the speed so that once they hit their brakes, usually the collision is after hitting the brakes for 20 or 30 feet they have usually reduced their speed to somewhere in the vicinity of 30 miles per hour by the time the impact takes place.

That shows you that the accidents themselves, most of them are relatively low speed at the point of impact, with the change of velocity, that important instant, that important micro-second that the accident takes place.

Seat belts have certainly proven to be very essential in survivability in accidents of, say, under 45 miles an hour. When you're getting up into the 70-80 which is far beyond the speed limit, even seat belts, in most instances, are not going to help unless of course the car takes a fairly long distance to actually come to a stop and is bouncing along the ditch or some such thing, the seat belt holding the person in, the survivability can be remarkable.

I've seen accidents, in my earlier days, when I attended an awful lot of motor races and Formula One and Cam-Am racing, saw some accidents taking place well in excess of 120 and 140 miles an hour even, and the survivability of drivers there, one has a hard idea to be able to figure out how they can or a hard - not a hard idea, but it's almost unbelievable that they can survive at some of these high speed crashes; and they usually, in far more cases than not, do survive, in many cases without very serious damages to the individual. The reason is because partially, the construction, although needless to say are very flimsy compared to our motor vehicles we drive on the road, but it's the way the driver is buckled in, of shoulder harnesses as well as harness through the crotch and across the waist and keeping the driver low and with the roll bar on the vehicle; but there, the key is keeping the driver in the vehicle.

In looking at some statistics, and these are analyses, they're not statistics - excuse me - analyses of accidents that have happened in Winnipeg just this year, one sees of four or five truck accidents, accidents involving trucks, four of the five were survivable, where there are fatalities. Pick-up trucks and vans, in particular, have the highest accident rate and the highest death rate of any vehicles on our highways and I daresay that

they're probably the vehicles which have the lowest rate of people using seat belts. For some reason, people think they're safer in a pick-up or safer in a van than they are in a car when actually exactly opposite is true.

In one instance, the passenger was killed, ejected out of the window, four quarter roll, head injury. In that one there was an actual indent into the roof of the vehicle where the car rolled over that person, a fully survivable accident had the person been wearing a seat belt. Another, a head-on collision with a station wagon, between a pick-up. The truck here collapsed; the structural making of the truck just - the person didn't have a chance, be he buckled up or not buckled up. In a van - and this just happened a couple of weekends ago or last week, I believe - a woman was ejected out of a side window of the van and the van rolled over her, killed; fully survivable had she been wearing a seat belt.

Another truck-car collision, this time at Fort Alex. The truck driver again was ejected and the vehicle rolled over him; another example of a fully survivable accident. And the last example of the truck accidents so far in our province was where a person was partially ejected, just their head and torso out the window, the truck rolled over them and then they got tossed back in as the vehicle continued to roll. Once again, killed - no reason; a fully survivable accident, no reason for that accident at all - or that death, I should say - had they been buckled up. Four out of five were survivable, Mr. Speaker.

Looking at car statistics, five of the six fatalities were survivable and one person left a quadriplegic would not have had that injury had they been buckled in. There's only one car accident so far that has been involved - it's a collision, a broadside between a Thunderbird and a Honda with, I believe, the Thunderbird coming through an intersection hitting the Honda and I believe the passenger was killed and the driver survived. The passenger served as an air bag for that passenger. It's questionable whether the passenger would have survived anyway, given the damage to the vehicle. So I'm not going to include that one because the survivability would be very questionable; I'll take that as a non-survivable accident.

In Gimli, a station wagon rolled over; a man was ejected, rolled upon by his car; his wife left a quadriplegic; both totally survivable, a total waste of life on the man's part; a woman committed to a wheelchair or a bed for the rest of her life and leaving two children behind. Another one, a small Toyota hit a truck and this, again, was non-survivable; not too much chance with a truck hitting a smaller car broadside. Broadside accidents, I might add, are the ones most likely where there is going to be non-survivability in the accident.

In Stonewall, another four-quarter roll. I believe it was the woman who was ejected; she was killed; the car rolled over again out through the side window; passenger survived. Both of them should have survived. Had they been buckled up both of them would have survived. In Meadows, just last week, a car rolled; person was ejected; the woman was killed - again a survivable accident. An Ontario couple coming into the province - I don't know where the accident happened exactly but they were a couple from Ontario - who should have been wearing belts; were not wearing belts;

the driver was ejected and killed from a rollover. He was not actually rolled over by his vehicle, he was thrown such a distance, the vehicle did not roll him over but he was killed just from the impact of the ground - again, survivable.

So we have - just let me recount here - I have two non-survivable accidents out of six accidents with deaths. Six deaths, two of them survivable and in addition to that one of the accident victims is left a quadriplegic for life.

Looking at motorcycles, five accidents so far; one with a serious injury still in hospital - at this moment there've been more than five accidents - it's five accidents that dealt with fatalities and near fatalities. Two of them were non-survivable, at least felt they were non-survivable. In one, apparently the biker was travelling along about 45 when a car pulled out in front; basically non-survivable and that unfortunately happens far too often. Car drivers just not paying enough attention to the motorcyclist.

On Bishop Grandin Boulevard, a person fell off his bike; went down with his bike; just suffered glancing blows but it was enough to kill him. Had he had a helmet on - and this is what a vast majority of accidents dealing with helmets and motorcyclists, you don't get very many brick-wall accidents or collisions straight into a car. An awful lot of them are hitting gravel going down. When that happens, the likelihood of a full collision of the head instead of a glancing blow is very very low. Most of the accidents are glancing blows; that is where a helmet protects. No one tries to make the idea or give the impression that a helmet protects on a head-on collision. Nothing can protect in a head-on collision.

In Polo Park, a chap was, as the police statement I believe showed, was indulging in erratic driving and I don't know if he was pulling wheelies or whatnot, but he was a very low-speed accident; the person was killed. Had he had his helmet on, fully survivable accident; probably would not even have been hospitalized. On Archibald Road just this past weekend, a young chap lost control of his bike; went down; the bike was not injured but he was killed. He hit a wall. With a helmet, the possibility that he would have survived was no doubt higher, because he died of a head injury but other injuries on the body may well have contributed to his death as well. Again on Bishop Grandin Boulevard, a passenger, this time a female passenger, is still in the hospital with serious head injuries, no other broken bones, I believe. With a helmet on, she would not have had those head injuries.

So there we have five accidents so far. One person is still in serious condition in the hospital with a head injury and two other people who have died. Three out of the five accidents were fully survivable.

So no one is going to make the argument that helmets prevent an accident or that seat belts prevent an accident, although this can be - towards the seat belts in particular to keep a person in front of the controls of the vehicle so that once the - if he's not thrown out of his seat and the vehicle is still moving, he has some chance of regaining control of the vehicle. On the other circumstances in the helmets, they certainly do not cause accidents but they do help reduce injuries once an accident has already taken place.

Mr. Speaker, there are some things that I would like to see in the bill that are not already in the bill and

whether we are able to deal with them when it comes to report stage I'm not sure, it's hopeful that they will. Something that is not in the bill that ABATE asked for, and I listened very seriously when ABATE came in to make their presentations to us, because they were serious and well-meant presentations that they - and they were in twice to our caucus and I listened to them when they came outside the building as well.

One of the things they were asking for is eye protection. They're saying if you're going to legislate something, it makes good sense to legislate eye protection because eye protection, there is a prevention of accidents. For people get bugs in the eye, for people getting dust or one thing or another in your eye when you're driving. And in most helmets if they have a visor on the helmet then naturally you don't need any additional protection but with an open-faced helmet I would suggest that eye protection be included which would include sunglasses, regular glasses or goggles whatever is the driver's preference as long as there as some form of protection to the eye of the driver.

Another thing that has been used very successfully in other countries, particularly in Europe it's standard procedure, I believe it is in New Zealand and Australia as well and several States are bringing it in - I've seen some of the work from the Illinois law which they have a riders' cycle safety training act - part of their acts require that beginners be restricted to motorcycles of a certain size. Right now I can go out with very limited driving experience on a bike or with none at all even in some cases, can go out and buy myself a 1200-cc Harley or 1100-cc Yamaha, bikes that have just incredible power, with speed ratios that no vehicle, on acceleration ratios and power-to-weight ratios that no vehicle manufactured for the streets, in cars at least, can compare with, basically even racing car speeds and yet they are allowed to go on to the highway with these machines that are so quick and as much as I like the fast acceleration and the joy the speed gives me, I think that an awful lot of people are way over their heads, beyond their capacity, in the types of bikes that they are buying.

So I would suggest that it would be wise to look at restrictions. I would suggest that there must be a difference if you're going to do it on displacement between a two cycle and a four cycle bike, because a two cycle has that much more horsepower per cc. This is the design of the engines themselves. I'd suggest that if we looked at people, for the first two, or even three years preferably, be restricted to a bike of 350 cc, or less, if it's a four-cycle bike; then 200 cc, and less, if it's a two-cycle bike. This would, I think, give people a lighter bike to start off with, a bike of much more manageable proportions, a bike that's power is much more manageable by the driver, so that slight misjudgments of both the acceleration of the bike, and also of the weight of the bike in tight circumstances, that the persons become more proficient riders before they move onto the bigger machines. That, again, has been proposed to us by ABATE, and I fully accept their recommendation.

Another thing that they have proposed which I would back up completely is the idea of having cycle rider safety programs like they do in Illinois, where anybody trying out for a licence for the first time has to take a cycle rider safety training program. What these training

programs have proven in other areas is basically given a greater degree of familiarity with the bike by the driver; a familiarity with its mechanical workings; a familiarity with the power and the circumstances that one can get into. How to drop the bike, for instance, at lower speeds or even at higher speeds, and ride the bike down. What to expect in various circumstances, so that the people, if the bike hits some sort of a bump and goes into the air, that they don't panic instantly, because they've already been through a circumstance like that in a trained format previously. Just better handling of the bike, a better adjustment in making the bike more part of the rider, because really a bike and a rider are an integral part. They move as one and the rider must have the necessary balance and the feel of the bike to be able to put it through its paces and, at the same time, maintain control.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words I would like to finish my presentation here today with a plea, basically, in many ways for people not just to look and try to make an issue which I really do not think is that viable an issue of so-called rights that people have to not buckle up, or to not wear a helmet. It's a social responsibility and we all have responsibilities to our fellow citizens and to ourselves. I would hope that the opposition turns around substantially on this, recognizing that this is, contrary to what the Member for Pembina said, there is an awful lot of similarities between this and life jackets in boats. I know I've been stopped several times in my canoe by security people and police people telling me to put on my life jacket.

It can't just be done through education. We've heard several people call for more education programs. Well, the boating safety is a prime example. Ever since I've been a small child, the Red Cross, in particular, and Transport Canada has been on extensive water safety programs, and yet you still see people regularly going out in their boats without the benefit of a life jacket. You even see people, once in awhile, going out water-skiing and things like that where a person can get knocked out without life jackets. Education itself is not going to be a sufficient vehicle to get more people to buckle up and to wear their safety harnesses, and for motorcyclists to wear their helmets.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those words, I would wish that the members opposite, with the general public, the feeling that I get from my own constituents is - I've had almost as many people calling in favour of it as I have speaking against the legislation. It certainly isn't a one-way street of people speaking against the legislation at all. There's an awful lot of people that feel it is eminently sensible when you look at other jurisdictions that have it as well, and they see the results of the legislation, the number of lives that it can save. We see, from the stats. that I've given you today, or just the figures that I've given of the accidents so far today, that we have had 11 people who are dead but, had they been wearing their safety belts, they would still be survivors, 11 wasted lives, Mr. Speaker; two other people with serious injuries, one person a quadriplegic, one person with yet to be determined whether they're going to be able to recover from very serious head injuries in a motorcycle accident; two more people with lives dramatically affected by accidents, not because the accident happened so much as because they did not take the necessary or reasonable precautions.

Mr. Speaker, let us try and reduce this slaughter that happens on our highways, and let us look and when we see figures that only a couple of people in the past year or so have died wearing seat belts, and you look back to the total number of accidents that we've had, and total loss of lives in '82 of 132 fatal accidents in Manitoba. So far this year, up until the end of May this year, we already had 32 fatal victims in 30 fatal accidents. Let's try and reduce our fatalities; let's try and value the human life for it really is and, in that value for human life, require people to bring on and to wear the seat belts, and the helmets.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Riel that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 3, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 18, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson. (Stand)

MR. B. RANSOM: I believe that the Acting Government House Leader had given Bill No. 2 as the sixth bill that he wished called, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: The next one was Bill No. 23.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 23. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 24, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson. (Stand)

BILL 47 - THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 47. The Honourable Member for Burrows has 35 minutes remaining.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was trying to reply to the Member for La Verendrye, one of the points that he raised is that it will discourage high quality people who have the skills and who have some little enterprise from accepting positions as mayor or aldermen or members of the municipal council, and that it will inhibit them under the proposed legislation in acting in dual capacity. Therefore, he suggested that such a listing of assets, if it ever should be made, should be kept by the Clerk of the Municipal Council and

shelved in a secret place and should not be made available to the public.

If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, then it will defeat the very rationale of this legislation, which is the disclosure of assets. It will, in fact, promote secrecy in the possession of such assets, but we know that secrecy in any field of human activity is perhaps the root cause of excesses and abuses and corruption. Secrecy in government had magnified the power of the bureaucratic segment of the government, because if information is marked "confidential and secret," only those in positions of appointed public authority have access to such information. We know for a fact that information gives knowledge and knowledge gives power. Therefore, only those who have access to secret information will be able to exercise power, and since they are not exposed at all to public scrutiny, as I have indicated, it will promote and breed excesses in the exercise of power as well as promote corruption.

It is the openness in our system of government that induces honesty among public officials, whether elected or appointed. It is honesty that leads to the credibility of people who occupy positions of public trust. It is credibility which is the source of strength of our democratic and parliamentary institutions. So the suggestion, instead of promoting the strength of our government and our parliamentary institutions, would in fact, be subverting the strength of our public and parliamentary institutions on account of the secrecy that will breed dishonesty and corruption.

If this will discourage people from their business venture, it will mean then that these people will suffer some personal business loss, in the sense that they are inhibited from engaging in their own private commercial enterprise. Mr. Speaker, if I were in the shoes of some of these people who presumably are motivated by a desire to serve the public interests, I would greatly prefer loss which may vex me for awhile, instead of the dishonest gain that I may be motivated to pursue on account of dealing with myself in two capacities, one in the capacity of a businessman, another in the capacity of a public decision-maker. Because in such a conflict of interest, it may forever lead me to the unending remorse as a public official. I would rather dwell in the light of truth about my assets and my possessions so that the public may know and judge that I am doing what I'm supposed to do to serve them in the public interest.

As public servants, therefore, let us carry the torch of openness that promotes truth and honesty, and like a blazing torch of truth, the more you shake the torch, the more the light of truth becomes brighter that will serve to enlighten us in our path to true public service.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 49, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 66, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: I adjourned that matter for the Attorney-General who intends to close debate there, Mr. Speaker, so I'd like it to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, stand.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 74, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 85, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa. (Stand)

Could the Honourable Acting Government House Leader indicate the next item of business?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, the next one was Bill No. 92, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, Bill No. 92, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. (Stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: I think, Mr. Speaker, we can deal with the two that are at the report stage. They are Bills No. 44 and No. 45. I will ask that my staff bring the amendments. Notice has been given to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and others in their caucus and I think we could proceed with those in just a moment. I will ask that my file be sent in and I think we can deal with those matters.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I will have my material very shortly in respect to Bills No. 44 and No. 45, but perhaps we can call the third reading on Bill No. 12, The Water Rights Act.

THIRD READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 12 - THE WATER RIGHTS ACT

HON. A. MACKLING presented Bill No. 12, The Water Rights Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think honourable members that attended in Law Amendments Committee will recall a number of amendments that were made in Law Amendments Committee, I think, made some significant improvement in the wording of various sections of the legislation.

As it often happens, when Legislative Counsel are preparing statutes, there is some later reconsideration of some of the words, the verbiage that is used. Some minor technical improvements were made and I think

honourable members will recall that, out of a concern and respect to a possible impairment of the rights of an ongoing user, a significant amendment was made and there were some improvements in the wording of the bill made pursuant to the constructive advice and criticism that came from members of the opposition, particularly from the Member for Turtle Mountain.

Those amendments have been embodied in the bill, as it now stands before the House and I commend it to the House for passage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 76 - THE CROWN LANDS ACT

HON. A. MACKLING presented Bill No. 76, An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

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

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, again I indicate that during the course of the review by the Law Amendments Committee, a full explanation was given, particularly to those concerns that were raised by the Member for Lakeside and this bill does provide for an improvement in the administrative capacity of the department in respect to Crown lands. It does facilitate the municipalities and the local government districts in the collection of taxes. It is a significant improvement for the department and for local government districts and municipalities and will facilitate all of those interests.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in passing and commenting on the administration of Crown lands, in introducing the bill in second reading, I indicated that by and large the administration of Crown lands has been one that we have taken some care to consider. We have looked at the sale practices and we have, under this administration, embarked on a policy to permit commercial operators, particularly those who are operating lodges and resorts that have had difficulty in the past in obtaining financing because of the fact that they didn't have security of title, to now obtain security of title.

I therefore believe, Mr. Speaker, that the administration of Crown lands in this province has been advanced during our short tenure of office and I think most people in Manitoba are very happy about the manner of administration of those Crown lands and which belies the argument that has often been put from across the way that somehow, Mr. Speaker, we have a very narrow approach to the use of Crown lands. That has not been the case and this act confirms that and enhances our sound administration of Crown lands, and I commend the passage of this bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Housing

THAT Bill 45, An Act to amend The Forest Act be amended

- a) by striking out the figure "6" in the first line of the proposed subsection 45(1) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe it's necessary to put the motion before the House, shall the report of the Committee on Bill 45 be concurred in.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Housing, that the Report Stage of Bill No. 45 be concurred in.

REPORT STAGE

BILL 45 - THE FOREST ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have an amendment?

HON. B. URUSKI: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Housing

THAT Bill 45, An Act to amend The Forest Act be amended

- (a) by striking out figure "6" in the 1st line of the proposed subsection 45(1) of The Forest Act as set out in section 1 of the bill, and substituting therefor the figure "9";
- (b) by striking out the figure "6" in the 1st line of the proposed clause 45(2)(a) of The Forest Act as set out in section 1 of the bill, and substituting therefor figure "9";
- (c) by striking out the figures "1983" in the 2nd line of the proposed clause 45(2)(a) of The Forest Act as set out in section 1 of the bill, and substituting therefor the figures "1986"; and
- (d) by striking out the figure "6" in the 1st line of the proposed clause 45(2)(b) of The Forest Act as set out in section 1 of the bill, and substituting therefor the figure "9".

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Question before the House is the amendment as read. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Unless someone else wishes to speak, Mr. Speaker, I will speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: They want to pass it, Mr. Speaker, we'll allow it to be passed.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further amendments? The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Housing that Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Fisheries Act be now concurred in.

BILL NO. 44 - THE FISHERIES ACT

MR. B. URUSKI: I move, seconded by the Minister of Housing

THAT Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Fisheries Act, be amended

- (a) by striking out the figure "6" in the 1st line of the proposed subsection 31(1) of The Fisheries Act as set out in section 1 of the bill, and substituting therefor the figure "9";
- (b) by striking out the figure "6" in the 1st line of the proposed clause 31(2)(a) of The Fisheries Act as set out in section 1 of the bill, and substituting therefor the figure "9";
- (c) by striking out the figures "1983" in the 3rd line of the proposed clause 31(2)(a) of The Fisheries Act as set out in section 1 of the bill, and substituting therefor the figures "1984"; and
- (d) by striking out the figure "6" in the 1st line of the proposed clause 31(2)(b) of The Fisheries Act as set out in section 1 of the bill, and substituting therefor the figure "9".

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

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, until the amendment just moved by the Minister of Agriculture was moved, I didn't realize this amendment dealt with The Forest Act rather than with The Fisheries Act - the second amendment that he's now moving. Sir, on a point of order, we should have passed the motion for concurrence in Report Stage of Bill 44 before proceeding to report stage of Bill 45. Otherwise we're going to end up amending Bill 44 with an amendment that was designed for Bill 45.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for Springfield for his remarks. I was in error in not putting the motion to the House on the report, as amended, on the previous Bill 45. Do I have the leave of the House to go back to take care of that? (Agreed)

QUESTION put on motion as amended and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Housing, the amendment as read, Bill 44.

QUESTION put on amendment and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Government House Leader indicate if there are further amendments to this bill?

HON. A. MACKLING: Move the report as amended?

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House then is, shall the report of the committee as amended be concurred in?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: 4:30, Mr. Speaker.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item on the agenda for Thursday's Private Members' Hour is the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 41, the Honourable Member for Concordia. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 58, the Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, Bill No. 94, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. (Stand)

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING - PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Debates on second reading of private bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, Bill No. 52, the Honourable Member for River East. (Stand)

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. NO. 15 - AGRICULTURE IN THE NORTH

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed private members' resolutions, Resolution No. 15. On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for The Pas, the Honourable Minister of Housing has 11 minutes remaining.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just a couple of words by way of conclusion to my remarks last time. The amendment, as I indicated, which was brought in by the Member for The Pas, is a particularly appropriate one and one, I think, which increasingly is attracting attention on the part of residents of Northern Manitoba and residents of other parts of the province as an area where there is a need for a good deal of experimentation and a good deal of innovation and perhaps some additional commitments on the part of northern residents, on the part of the Department of Agriculture, on the part of the Faculty of Agriculture in terms of

providing information, in terms of providing incentive and assistance to those people in Northern Manitoba who would like to pursue the development of agricultural land, those people who would like to pursue the development of agricultural products in Northern Manitoba.

A number of years ago, I believe it was the Norman Regional Development Corporation which sponsored a conference on the whole issue of the agricultural potential of Northern Manitoba and I think the results, without doubt, astounded a number of people, particularly residents of Northern Manitoba who, by and large, are unaware of the fact that there are literally millions of acres of arable land in the northern regions of this country. I'm proud to say that a good deal of that agricultural land lies within and adjacent to my constituency. In fact, one of the communities in my constituency, I think, can credibly claim that it was a leader in the development of knowledge in the area of agriculture and that's the community of Wabowden, where for many years there was an active agricultural presence, where there was research ongoing, and where the community became involved and interested in the potential for the development of agricultural products in a climate which is certainly different from what we come to think of as an agricultural area.

So, I think the fact that that experimenting was going on has led to an increased awareness of the potential in the Wabowden area and, in fact, there are still farmers of sorts in the Wabowden area. As I've indicated, there is farming activity going on in other parts of the Flin Flin constituency. There is an active farming operation in the Snow Lake area as well as in Flin Flon, and although by any standards those operations are small, I think they are proving that the land has the capacity to produce products. It is possible for cattle to be produced in the area. What we need to do is to expand our knowledge about the potential for increasing cattle production and perhaps what we need as well is an expansion of our parameters, our livestock industry parameters. Certainly, there has been little experimentation with other forms of livestock such as goats, beefalo, any number of crosses between cattle and game. So in most respects we have tried some traditional agricultural production in Northern Manitoba. We have not by any stretch of the imagination extended what is possible and attempted to be brave and pioneering in what we tried to do. Certainly, it seems to me that there is bound to be some potential for what we might term more exotic forms of livestock in Northern Manitoba, and whether we're — (Interjection) — the Member for Tuxedo suggests giraffes. It shows his limited knowledge of the climate that I come from.

However, by exotic, we certainly might include goats which do not enjoy wide support by the public as red meat. There are certainly those people who enjoy the eating of goat meat, but I'm thinking that it's possible that Northern Manitoba could expand into such areas of livestock quite adequately. Certainly we would have to acknowledge that we don't have the potential for ranch-style operations which occur in southern Manitoba or other western provinces, but we do have the potential for limited livestock production in its standard form. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, we do have that potential and the Member for Turtle Mountain, in all seriousness I think, suggests game ranching of one form or another.

Obviously any number of things could be discussed as potential, and whether we want it to be game ranching or some other form of endeavour is certainly open to question, but we have to use our imagination.

The other thing that I mentioned previously was the area of small market gardens, utilizing energy that comes from the smelter process in Flin Flon. It was suggested that it might be quite feasible to use the heat that's produced in the smelter process for the development of greenhouses so we could get into a limited form of market gardening. Obviously there is potential for individual private market gardens using, I suppose, principally greenhouses; those kinds of things have to be introduced. There has to be, I suppose, a commitment to experimentation of all kinds and hopefully that can happen.

I think that the resolution is a good one. I recognize it has been supported by members opposite wholeheartedly I believe, and I think that's a positive sign.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Housing reminded me of a topic that deserves some discussion under this question of agriculture in the North. The Minister of Housing was talking about goats, and goats not receiving a high rate of acceptance among the public, Mr. Speaker, and that may be. My experience with goats has been somewhat limited. — (Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, that's the sort of comment that I get from the Member for Radisson, for instance, who says that I'm sitting beside a goat. That's the same member, Sir, that anytime that there is some sort of comment made across the way, he takes great exception to. I take it in the jocular fashion, Mr. Speaker, that I'm sure the Member for Radisson had intended as he put that forward. After all . . .

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words about the project that was a possibility in the northern part of Manitoba, the mid-northern part at least, that was not perhaps the sort of agriculture that would normally be considered as such. In fact, maybe some people wouldn't consider it as agriculture at all, but there is a vast area in the Northern Interlake, the part of our province that lies to the west of No. 6 Highway and north from Gypsumville towards Easterville, the western part of the Northern Interlake, that has a — (Interjection) — well, it's north of Basket Lake and in that area. It is beautiful country that is ridge and swale type of country, Sir, that has vast open sedge meadows with better drain, wooded ridges in between and vast areas of willow and also some fairly substantial lakes as one goes further north.

That area at the moment has some numbers of moose, although they have been greatly reduced over the past years; there are some elk in that area and deer. But there is a possibility existing there, Mr. Speaker, where bison could be introduced into that

area and would be able to thrive in that area on the basis of the best information that we have available from people who are knowledgeable about bison; that there is a very high probability, almost a certainty, that the animals could be introduced into that area. Given the proper type of management where one begins by confining bison within a small area and those bison then rear young of their own and those young bison then become imprinted on the area, much the same way that Canada geese become imprinted on the area where they are raised. You then can release those animals into the wild and they will not move far from the area where they are raised.

One then has the possibility of developing a herd of animals that it is estimated there could be up to 5,000 such animals, Sir. This, of course, would be a slightly different type of agriculture, but in essence these animals would be under some degree of control, certainly under some management. Certainly not the same degree of control that one would expect a herd of cattle to be under, but nevertheless they would be under rather intensive management.

While we were in government, Sir, we entered into discussions with Indian bands who have an interest in that area as to how this project might go ahead with their full co-operation, having some agreement from them in terms of there being restrictions placed on the animals taken, and that we could see, with the passage of a few years, that we could have developed an industry - agriculture if you wish to some extent - where the Native people would have had the opportunity first of all to do whatever management was required with respect to this herd of bison; and secondly, to be responsible for guiding hunters who could come and would pay thousands of dollars for the opportunity to shoot one of these animals.

It could also have been set up, of course, so that the meat was not even given to the hunter who took it - the hunter could have been allowed to take a trophy or some of the meat - and the rest could have been retained and sold by the Indian Band because there is a considerable demand for meat. There's perhaps more acceptance for bison meat than there is for goat meat and that sort of thing was in the works, Mr. Speaker, but it was stopped by this government when they took over. I find that quite amazing that this project was well — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen opposite don't seem to realize that most of the situations where Indian Bands are located in this province do not have a very good resource base.

There is not much opportunity at Shamattawa or Pukatawagan to develop significant kinds of developments. But here was a situation, Sir, a vast area in the Northern Interlake where the band at Easterville and the band at Waterhen, at Skownan, could have combined to work with a resource base. There could be a herd of 5,000 animals of which a few hundred - I can't recall exactly the estimate figure - could have been taken each year, people will pay thousands of dollars for that and why was it stopped? What answer did we get from the Minister of Natural Resources? It was elitist, Sir, to think that someone would come in and pay several thousand dollars for the privilege of shooting one of these bison. But here was an opportunity, a real opportunity for the Native people to deal with something with which they're comfortable;

working with animals of that nature; working in the wild; guiding people; dressing out the animals and then there would be a system for selling the meat. So there could have been some real employment generated from this project.

We're not just talking about trying to develop a clay belt that no doubt exists in the North but where there are all kinds of difficulties associated with that development because of the location of it and the fact that, of course, there are many other areas in the province where agriculture can be carried out more efficiently, here was a situation ideally suited to it, where a resource could be developed without detriment to the other resources in the area and one doesn't find that very often.

The Member for The Pas who introduced this resolution knows, for instance, with the handling of the Saskeram area, that although one can talk about multiple use, when it really comes down to the practice of it it's not that easy to graze cattle in an area and still call it a wilderness area, for instance. Some uses are mutually exclusive. But here is a situation in the Northern Interlake where this herd of bison could be developed without having any detrimental effect on them, the mosse that are there, the elk that are there, the deer, whatever sort of forest resources are there, limited as they may be, it would have been in addition to everything that was there.

By now had the government proceeded with the plans that were being put in place in 1981 we now would be to the point in that program where we would have had adult bison in place - I believe they were to come from Elk Island Park near Edmonton - the Federal Government had bison available that could have been brought down and in place. There would have been young bison born by this time and within a relatively short period of years they would have been at the point where they could have been released into the wild and the herd would have been built up.

But it was stopped because the Minister thought it was elitist to have that kind of thing take place. So here we have the Band now, or two Bands, who are no further ahead than they were before. They have no further real opportunity for development than they had before and the Minister, who has his own ideology about elitism, sits here with some satisfaction - I guess he can turn to his colleagues and say well we sure stopped that elitist project from going ahead - well that's fine for him to say but there are Native people who right now could have been employed as a consequence of this project going ahead.

Here's a government that says they've got a \$200 million Jobs Fund, they want to create assets - they keep stressing that even though we believe that a lot of the jobs under this Fund are really not jobs that are long-lasting - here was the opportunity to do it. This was an ideal circumstance, creating assets in the truest sense. This was a renewable asset the government could have put in place that could have year after year after year provided employment and income to those Native people that have an interest in that area.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that those Native people had a sincere interest in this project and they wanted to see it go ahead; and I'm sure that if the Minister of Natural Resources was to go to Skownan and meet with the Indian people there and tell them that I stopped

this project because it's elitist and I want your support for it, Mr. Speaker, he wouldn't get it. They would not support the Minister's action. They would say, we don't think there's anything elitist about it at all if it means income, and that's what it would have meant, Mr. Speaker.

So I would urge the Minister or the Member for The Pas to make himself aware of the details of that project and for the Minister of Agriculture to make himself aware of the details of that project because it was a good project. It is still a good project; presumably, it could still go ahead. The animals are not available now; I'm sure they will be available within a year or two from Elk Island again.

One doesn't need to talk about things that might work, might not work. This is something that would work; a very high probability that this would work. So I'm happy that the Member for The Pas brought in this resolution which does provide an opportunity to talk about the possibility of traditional development of agriculture in the North. I think that's a very valid topic for discussion and offers some real possibilities, but this related project offers even more possibilities, Sir, than are covered by this resolution in the short term at least.

I would urge the government to set aside any consideration of elitism and proceed with that project, reinstate it, get the few funds. It's not going to take much to get it going, and they'll have the co-operation of the bands, I'm sure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: I wonder if the honourable member would answer a question.

MR. B. RANSOM: Of course.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has indicated that I have indicated some criticism of the former wood bison project as indicating that it involved an elitest hunt. How many Manitobans would he consider would take up the challenge and the offering of being able to hunt a wood bison for \$5,000 per bison?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, there might not be any. I wouldn't do it. But I don't care, if there's 500 people from the United States, and France, and Switzerland, and Germany who want to come and pay \$5,000 to hunt a bison - great - if it's going to provide some employment for our Native people to give them a resource base that can be utilized. I find it incredible that the Minister would be hung up ideologically about that type of thing. It's a perfectly legitimate undertaking, perfectly legitimate. There is no resource there now. If the government doesn't go ahead, nobody will have it. We'll all be reduced to the lowest common denominator and nobody will have the opportunity to hunt bison.

If the Minister went ahead with his project, some people would have that opportunity. If they don't care to spend their money on that, fine. We weren't planning that Manitobans would be spending that money. It's better to bring the money in from the outside. I'll tell

the Minister, we would be further ahead if it was people from France or Germany or the United States who came in here and brought the money into Manitoba, and perhaps the markets for the meat might be outside of Manitoba and we'd bring outside dollars in. Great, great, Mr. Speaker. I'd love to see that happen, to give those people an opportunity to have some real economic development that's based on a renewable resource and on the kind of a resource, the kind of a project that I'm absolutely sure in my own mind that the Native people would feel comfortable with and would be able to manage to the point where they could regain some of that dignity and self-respect that the members opposite are wont to talk about frequently, but apparently are not prepared really to work toward when they're faced with a concrete example of how it might go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know of another case, I don't know of another example where there is a better opportunity for the development of the resources associated with an area close to an Indian band than this project. I don't know of another case in the whole of Manitoba where one could identify a resource and say, here's an opportunity for this band to develop something that will be viable. It's not there as far as far as forestry resources are concerned; it's not there as far as fishing is concerned; it's not there as far as fur is concerned, but it is there in the Northern Interlake as far as bison are concerned. Even if the Minister of Natural Resources has a hangup about it, surely the Minister of Agriculture must have an interest in what goes on there, and the Member for The Pas would have an interest in what goes on there. I seriously recommend, Mr. Speaker, that they familiarize themselves with that project and urge upon their colleagues in government that it go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, for someone who's been up in the North for too few times - I think I've only made three trips up now - one of them being a not terribly successful canoe trip with one of my colleagues here. There wasn't an awful lot of agricultural land on the island we were stranded on for a few days. A couple of miles away from there was some fantastic land. It's along the shores of Wekusko Lake, at a little place called Herb Lake Landing.

There's a woman there who is living as close to the land as she can I guess, one might say. She is also involved in pottery and teaching art, for one of her passions as well is developing a few acres of her land into agricultural land. She's cleared it. The Member for River East was up there last year as well I believe at another point in time. She's got probably close to eight or ten acres cleared by now, I would think. The soil is good dark soil. It's certainly not a clay soil. It might be clay a couple of feet down, but the topsoil is really good quality soil.

She had growing corn, a couple of rows of rye, and some wheat, sunflowers, as well as your potatoes and other root crops which are not near as susceptible to the frost. The season, albeit short, is certainly the most productive one. We were there I think in the second, third week of August, around that time, and everything

was out and pretty well ready to be harvested. Everything had matured by that point and with their days of having such long long days of 18 hour days, or even longer than that of light. Their degree days certainly aren't as intense as ours are in the south, but they're light, and the light counts an awful lot, ask any agrologist. When you've got 18 and 20 hours of sunlight in the month of June and the month of July with similar light ranges, you find your crop coming along pretty quickly.

I don't know how much that far north and I don't know really how extensive the land is around there that could be cultivated, but even in smaller plots, you don't need a tremendous amount of land to be a very productive vegetable garden. I suspect that on her little plot of land there, she could add or at least contribute a good chunk to the vegetables consumed just 20 miles away in Snow Lake. She, in her little garden could be the main produce for the people of that community and some other communities along the way as well. The example of Wabowden has come up and the good land that's around Wabowden. If you look back in the Hudson Bay records in mid-part of the last century, in the early part of the last century, agriculture every one, Oxford House, York Landing, all these places had their little vegetable gardens.

In the summer of '80 when I was in York Landing, they had just brought in a tractor, and were using that tractor to till more land to try and get some local vegetable garden going in the community. Split Lake didn't have as good a land I don't believe, but maybe there are some others close by on the eastern end of Split Lake as well as on the western end near the York Landing site. So there is some very good agricultural quality land there. It can grow the crops that we are used to in the south and with time, as well, when our forefathers came to this land and started breaking the soil, an awful lot of the crops they grew at that stage could not survive in our climate. So with time and the developing of additional varieties, we now have become the breadbasket of the world. There's no reason at all that without more work and continuing work, which would be a benefit to the south as well the North, we could develop new varieties that are quicker growing varieties and that are more tolerant to small degrees of frost.

So we have to recognize as well that the potential of the land in the North for agriculture is quite substantial and I suspect if you go into the Scandinavian countries, which are at similar latitudes, they have boreal forests the same as we, in the North, but they also, I think, we will find in doing a little bit of investigation, have quite a considerable amount of land broken and are feeding themselves. The north is feeding the north over there, I believe, to quite a bit further extent than we are here.

We have talked about turning vegetative matter into meat, it's a very inefficient process and I really don't know how efficient one could expect to have of a cattle operation in the North, because even in the south, in many instances, it's not terribly viable where you have to feed them seven, eight months a year off of cut hay.

So, the best opportunities may well not be in traditional cattle. Maybe we have to go to animals that are more efficient in processing the food, instead of going after cattle, going after other bovines such as

bison or maybe the beefalo that is being developed to some degree, as well, to see what possibilities there is of ranging those animals in the North.

One thing I would like for us to be very cautious of when we are going into agricultural development in the North, and that is, we don't repeat the mistakes we have in the south; that we try to develop our agricultural potential on a more ecological basis, that we try to develop our ecological cohabitation, agriculture and the natural environment. Unfortunately, in many instances, the land that is most productive and best used for agriculture is also the most productive and the most valuable land for sustaining the wildlife resources that we have in those areas.

If we go ahead and repeat the problems that we've had in the south with some of the drainage projects that have been less than wise, of wiping out any vegetation along the rivers and streams, so that we wipe out the wildlife corridors that can be left; of cultivating land that is not productive and is not worthwhile to have cultivated in the first place; of draining potholes; of draining swamps. I'm afraid if we went with the same amount of blindness, one could say, in developing some of the areas in the south, and the Member for Turtle Mountain is well aware of that, for his own father is one of the champions of people trying to farm their lands and live more in parallel, I guess one could say, with the environment around him, of seeing the value of seeing the odd elk come out on their land or deer and, I understand, when I was out there last year I saw a couple of moose tracks as well. So, the value of being able to see that from the farmhouse instead of having all the wildlife in the area pretty well wiped out, or the majority of it, I think, takes away from the richness of the quality of life that one has when he's in the area.

So, I would hope that as we go North and as we're developing food sources in the North, I would like first to concentrate on a vegetative matter and then other things we can look aren't necessarily large animals. We can look at smaller animals as well. Looking at rabbits and there's a nurse, I can't think of her last name, her first name, she goes by Joe. I met her in several communities. She's a nurse that's had an incredible reputation of serving Northern Canada, not just here in Manitoba, but in the missions in Labrador, the Grenville Missions and in other areas in the Northwest Territories. She started, on her own, experimenting with the raising of rabbits as a red meat source in the North and she was, just in her garage at the back of her house, in Thompson, raising rabbits and some members may laugh - it's much more majestic to see a buffalo or to see a Hereford outside, but as far as efficiency of turning the vegetative matter into meat, I think probably the rabbits are far far more efficient, plus they can live on much less, they don't need the same high quality of food.

So, if when we're looking at it, we look at some alternatives and not just try and repeat what we're doing in the south and take it further North. In the plants we have to develop stronger and hardier varieties; in the animals we probably have to take a complete shift from the animals that we're cultivating through our animal husbandry in the south and transport it up to the North. I'm fully aware that Tom Lamb had a very sizeable herd in what is now the forebay in the

Summerberry area and now the area around there in general is called the Tom Lamb Wildlife Management Area and I'm not fully aware of the success that he had. I understand there were some trouble. I understand there were some successes as well but I would suspect that Tom Lamb, if he would have been able to keep the herd going, would still have a sustainable herd in the area.

But how viable it would be, you must also consider with the cost of shipping the meat north to those communities and trying to buy the meat. Maybe it's going to cost you more to produce it locally but the differential between the locally produced beef or, in my opinion, probably wiser to go to other animals - maybe goats, maybe rabbits, small animals as well. The viability of raising those and the cost per pound of the meat on the table, is probably substantially less than the cost of trying to import it in. Well, it so happens that rabbits, at least hares, snowshoe hares do live and have lived in the North far longer than man has. They're adjusted to that and we have to find, when we're moving into a new area, to move in with animals that are compatible to that area and have a history of survival, rather than trying to introduce some foreign species.

To say the very least, I'm not overly impressed with the proposition that the Member for Turtle Mountain brought up of so-called game farming of bison. — (Interjection) — Yes, I am, I have great reservations about that sort of a thing. I know the examples that they've had in the southern states and in some of Europe and, sure, some entrepreneur can make a few bucks off it, whether it be the band - I don't know - it's not something that's exactly parallel to Native traditions to bring in foreign hunters and to have them take them out and show them their animals and shoot the animal and then give them the trophy. I don't know that trophy hunting in my books, as an environmentalist, as someone that's a friend of the environment, I don't subscribe to this trophy hunting and I look at the causes of what happened in the south with the trophy hunting, where the buffalo used to roam here and they came through with the trains and shooting the buffalo along the train tracks, massacring them by the tens of thousands, by the hundreds of thousands and by the millions.

I know in the southern States, and I know that some astronaut, some very high profile people in the States have gone to some of these farms, and some of the larger ones are in Texas. I remember reading about them in a book a couple of years ago called "Mankind?" with a question mark. They were talking about these great trophy hunters, of going in, and they have little vans that they drive these people through the roads in this game farm, and they'd picked out the animal and then they'd dicker over the price of how much this animal is going to be worth, and then they'll give the person the gun and have him shoot at it. They usually stand by to make sure they finish the thing off, or if he misses it, then they'll shoot it for him. Then they'd package up this big trophy head of this antelope or whatever it may be, pick up the thousand or the two-thousand that the guy leaves behind, ship him home and send the trophy home after him. It's something that I do not think is that terribly compatible to the Native heritage and the Native peoples of this land with their love of the environment, their wish to live in some harmony with their environment.

Beyond that, one has another problem, and that is a problem that bison tend to roam. I don't know if the former government was planning on fencing in the whole of the Northern Interlake, but that's what you have to do. The animals rove for thousands of miles. They don't like to stay tethered up or stay within a home quarter, to say the least, their home quarter million, they're a roaming animal. To be able to talk of moving in thousands of bison into the area, as much as I would love to see it happen, for them to be able to be near, I don't know, and don't have great confidence that they're going to stick around, because they do tend to roam. What's the song, "Where the deer and the antelope roam," well the buffalo roam far far longer than the deer and the antelope ever dreamt of roaming. — (Interjection) —

So, in finishing it up - I'm not going to do an "Old MacDonald" routine here or continue with the few phrases alongside my good colleague, the Member for Springfield, who obviously is showing his talent in singing. Unfortunately, the Member for Lakeside isn't here or we could have a really good chant of "Where the buffalo roam and the antelope roam."

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing here, I want to leave some time for my colleagues. I think that we do have to look, as the resolution calls us to look, for greater potential and greater possibilities of agriculture in the North; that when we look at the agricultural potential in the North we must also look at the consequences of that agriculture and try to develop it in concert with ecologically sound agricultural methods, to do it in parallel and in concert with the wild life resources so that they are not so depleted, so that they disappear as they have in the south.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank them all for the time to make a few comments to this very important resolution and I would hope that it has the support of all members of this House.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

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

As I listened . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

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

As I listened to the presentations being made by members opposite, I felt that probably I knew no less than they about this particular topic and I'm therefore — (Interjection) — when we got into the talk about the deer and the antelope playing and buffalo roaming, it certainly appeared to me that there was a contribution that I could make to this debate on the resolution.

However, as the Minister of Housing talked about the resolution from his experience as a resident of the North, it brought to mind the conference that was held when we were in government in the fall of 1980; it was called The North feeding the North. A number of members of the Legislature attended. The Member for The Pas indicates that he saw me there and, of course, the Member for Churchill, now the Minister of the

Environment in Northern Affairs, was in attendance as were others.

I went up to that conference on behalf of the government with various colleagues of mine, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, who was at that time as well a Minister of the Crown, the Member for Arthur, the Member for Thompson at that time, then the Minister of Labour and, in fact, the member for Swan River, who at that time was the Minister of Northern Affairs. All of us were in attendance.

In fact, I had the privilege of chairing one of the afternoon sessions. We listened to many excellent speakers and gained a good deal of information about the topic and the opportunities that exist for the North growing its own food and raising its own food for the purpose of feeding people who choose to live in the North.

There was a good deal of information that was brought forward at that meeting and I thought it was a very worthwhile one, and I was pleased to be a member of the government that participated in the funding of that conference and certainly arranged for a number of the speakers to be brought in. The organization was well done and I was, as I say, delighted to have been a part of that. So, this is not a new topic that the Member for The Pas has brought forward. In fact, even at that conference in the fall of 1980, it was evident that there was a good deal of information available from many many sources about the opportunities that have existed in the past and have been pursued in the past to develop agriculture for the purposes of self-development and fulfilling the needs of those who live in the North.

In fact, I recall a number of the presentations that were made, one was made - and the Minister of Housing can perhaps inform me as to the name of the gentleman, he was the Director of Workplace Safety and Health for Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting - Wayne Fraser, yes. He brought a slide presentation on the vegetable garden that he had on his own property in Flin Flon on land that would not ordinarily be considered to be very fertile or arable, but with the use of fertilizer, with the use of polyethylene to ensure that during the early portion of the growing stages that they were protected from frost and many other special measures that had to be taken in order to ensure that there was enough degree days of heat during the growing season and a great enough length of time, he was able to raise a substantial amount of vegetables for the feeding of his own family and, in fact, friends and others that he shared for a very very modest garden patch in his yard in Flin Flon.

Then there was the possibility of using green houses in the North. In fact, there was a very impressive presentation to indicate just what kind of barren property could be used, they were developing old mines for the growing of crops, vegetables crops primarily, and all they had to do was regulate the humidity and the moisture and ensure that there was fertilization. They were growing it on what people would normally consider barren abandoned mining properties. A very very impressive demonstration at that period of time. As well, I think that was being done in Sudbury by, not Inco but the other one - Falconbridge. I think it was Falconbridge.

A MEMBER: No, it was Inco.

MR. G. FILMON: It was Inco. Okay, it was Inco. In any case, there were a good many very impressive presentations that were made at that time, and I was impressed by the amount of information that was available that was not being utilized, that was not being pursued and developed for the use of the people who live in the North.

As well, of course, I have seen, during the time when I was in the consulting engineering field, and this goes many many years back — (Interjection) — well, with a little Grecian Formula, we can all look young. I don't require the Grecian Formula, but others perhaps would appreciate it. — (Interjection) — My colleague from Niakwa says that there are other signs of age that Grecian Formula won't help, including the absence of hair.

However, the other impressive application that I saw, and this was being done in areas that had been strip mined in Pennsylvania, where they were indeed a barren-looking wasteland and one would not have thought that there was any opportunity to grow agricultural crops on them, but they used, interestingly enough, spray-irrigated effluent from tertiary treated domestic sewage to fertilize the land, and they turned what was a problem; that is the disposal of domestic sewage into an asset, in turning barren wasteland from strip-mined areas into agricultural land. And this, obviously, along with whatever other measures would be needed in order to ensure that the temperature and the length of growing season and everything else were accounted for, there would be any numbers of opportunities for us to pursue the development of agriculture in the North.

So it's well that the Member for The Pas brought this resolution to debate in this House; but I'm curious to know why he didn't feel that he could have worked with the Minister of Agriculture and the members of the Cabinet of this government to pursue it without having to make sort of a public issue of it by bringing it forward as a private member's resolution. Why he could he just not have urged - and encouraged his government to pursue this, what appears to be a viable opportunity, on behalf of his constituents and all of those residents of the North.

Would the government not listen to him? Would his colleagues in Cabinet not consider this to be a priority; that he needed to have the encouragement of support of the whole House to demonstrate to his own party that this was indeed a good idea. I don't understand why it's before us, Mr. Speaker. It just seems to me as though he has a good deal of opportunity to pursue this kind of thing. Is he not getting the attention that he deserves from the members of Cabinet, from the senior members of his government? Are they not listening to him when he has serious concerns and valid — (Interjection) — If the only purpose in bringing it here was so that he could go back to his constituency and say, I brought a resolution to the House and it was passed unanimously, well, it seems to me that the Member for The Pas ought to have other methods of demonstrating his value to his own constituents.

Surely, just the fact that he has come here with a private member's resolution isn't the only way that he can work on their behalf and demonstrate his value as a representative. I believe that there are any numbers of opportunities. I believe that if he really thought that

this was an important issue, he would pursue it in the most direct manner, and that is to persuade and convince his caucus and his government that this is a priority, that this is a viable opportunity for them to invest in the future of this province, in the future of the people of the North of this province who they represent, largely, in fact totally at this present time in government. Why are they ignoring the opportunity and instead just talking about it in a private member's resolution?

Why wouldn't they take some of the money that they are currently spending in the Jobs Fund on such exotic kinds of investments as brush clearing and tree cutting and grass cutting and other things on this kind of make-work job project that they have in their Jobs Fund; why would they not take the funds from that and invest them in a long-term viable project such as the research and the development of opportunities for agriculture in the North? To me, that would make a good deal of sense.

I know that members on our side of the House felt, after funding and participating in The North Feeding the North Conference, that there was indeed a good deal of opportunity to be pursued and, of course, I am sure that at this point in time we would have been furthering that endeavour, had we been in government. I'm sure that we would have been pursuing those opportunities that are evident and that have been developed by others, and all of the information is there. But on the other hand, of course, the members opposite came into government, and they have just dropped the whole issue in terms of a real viable project, in terms of an initiative that they could take on behalf of the many many thousands of people who they represent in the North, they could do something for them.

There's the old saying, give a man a fish and you feed him a day, teach a man to fish and he can feed himself a lifetime. Well, I'm paraphrasing it, but it's that same concept that could and should be pursued in this

kind of initiative, but instead of positive action, instead of some real viable opportunity on behalf of the people of the North of Manitoba, we have this resolution, just a resolution, to talk about it in Private Members' Hour. No government business; no government development; no real initiative in terms of future creation and future development of agriculture in the North; instead we have nothing but talk, nothing but a resolution by a backbench member of this government who obviously isn't getting his share of the limelight, needs a little more attention, and needs to be able to justify to his constituents back home in The Pas that he's here, to demonstrate to them that he's here. — (Interjection) — Well, I don't think they know he's here. In fact, I think they know that he's here too much; he's never back home. So he's got to be able to have this resolution passed in order to prove it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a valid and valuable resolution, but I believe that we need more than a resolution. We need action!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have a point of order?

The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Tuxedo said that I am never home; I am always in Winnipeg. I would like to point out to the Speaker that I have been in The Pas practically every week-end since I've been elected to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the Honourable Member for The Pas for that explanation. It was not a point of order.

The time being 5:30, when this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have seven minutes remaining.

I am leaving the Chair to return this evening at 8:00 p.m.