



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. 103 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 8 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	Virден	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

Friday, 8 July, 1983.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Bilingualism in Manitoba

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the news reports this morning that the Attorney-General has indicated that the government has conducted polls with respect to the government's proposed amendments to the Constitution with respect to bilingualism, my question to the Attorney-General is, would he table in the Legislature a copy of the poll indicating the number of people surveyed, the location where they live, the questions asked, and all full information relating to the poll?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, there has been some efforts made to ascertain what some of the questions people have are, an analysis is being done on this and when it is available it will be tabled.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney-General indicate when it will be ready? It is important, I think, for the people of Manitoba to have the information that the government has requisitioned. Could he indicate the cost of taking the poll?

HON. R. PENNER: I'll take the second part of the question as notice, and as I said in answer to the question when first asked, the results or analysis will be tabled when available.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, another question to the Attorney-General. In view of the widespread and deeply-felt concerns expressed at the government's informational meetings yesterday in the Town of Dauphin and the City of Brandon, would the Attorney-General indicate where the legislative committee will meet, when it will meet, and in view of these widespread concerns, would he not be agreeable to having the committee meet throughout the province to hear the concerns of all Manitobans?

HON. R. PENNER: With respect to when the committee will meet, I'll take that as notice. I should be in a position to make an announcement in the House on Wednesday.

There is a great deal of House business to be dealt with. I will be making some announcements about other House committee meetings today. We are watching very closely the progress that is being made with respect to the legislative program and whether or not there's a genuine effort to debate bills as they are called so that all business of the House can be accommodated in a balanced way, but certainly we have said that the committee will be called and I expect that it will certainly be called before the end of July.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney-General indicates there is a great deal of legislation still before the House and some very important legislation. In view of that would the Attorney-General and the government not agree to deal first with the legislation before the House and have an intersessional committee of the Legislature meet after the House has finished its business on the Order Paper?

HON. R. PENNER: The First Minister yesterday answered, not once, but I think several times the question with respect to intersessional. I find it unnecessary for me to add anything to that which the First Minister said to this House yesterday.

The length of the Session is at this moment not something that can be easily determined. Who knows at the rate at which things are going, this Session could last until just the beginning of the PC Leadership Convention, lots of time for consideration of everything in a balanced way.

The Loan Act - Jobs Fund

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance advise how much of the \$63 million shown in Schedule A of The Loan Bill, tabled yesterday, has been committed to this point?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary question to the Minister of Finance then, Mr. Speaker. Will any funds committed, any of the \$63 million for the Jobs Fund, be accounted for separately?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I wish the member had asked these questions in Committee. We certainly had the material available at that time. I don't have the material in front of me, but I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance says that I should have raised it in committee. I draw to the Minister of Finance's attention that last night, when he was given leave to table the bill and he introduced it for second reading while the bill was being distributed, the Minister of Finance didn't see fit to make any explanation of the bill. Therefore, I have some questions as to whether or not funds identified in The Loan Act for the Jobs Fund will be accounted for separately. Surely the Minister of Finance would have some knowledge of that, Mr. Speaker.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I've indicated to the member that I'll provide him with full information at a later time.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Finance give some assurance that funds budgeted and provided for in The Loan Act will be spent entirely for self-sustaining programs?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, that portion that is for capital items will be required to be spent on capital items.

Unemployment rate

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. We on this side of the House welcomed the fact that the number of unemployed people in Manitoba during the past month has decreased by some 6,000 persons — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we know however there are still 46,000 people unemployed, some 20,000 more than when this government took office. Could the Minister of Labour indicate whether the increase in the number of employed persons by some 7,000 persons, has occurred in the area of public administration in government or in the area of the private sector and could she give us a breakdown?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: I'm pleased that the member has brought that particular subject forward today because, while we are very happy too, to see the changes in the unemployment figures and we note that our labour force is the highest it has ever been in the history of this province, it is also important to reiterate, as we have, that 46,000 unemployed is still unacceptable and until every Manitoban who wishes to work is able to work and can find a job, we will not be satisfied.

To answer the specific question regarding public administration, it is my information that when these statistics come forward from Labour Canada, the questions that are asked of those who are employed are directed to - "Where did your employment come from?" Many many people have been employed due to the efforts of various governments, including ours,

and including the Government of Canada, and many people are answering this question why the government has funded a program, the government is putting money into a program.

The people who are asking the question, the people working for Labour Canada are looking at a change in the wording of that question to make it more specific, to say, "Who do you work for directly?" I would hope that they would do this because then I think we would have a clarification of actually where these jobs are occurring, as opposed to an idea, that because government money is supporting private business, is supporting farms, is supporting non-profit agencies in providing jobs, that people do think that they are working for the government because government money is involved. I think there is some confusion there in that statistic and we would hope that it would be clarified within the next couple of months.

Construction starts

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct some questions to the Minister of Housing. In view of the past concern about some slowdown in the construction industry, could the Minister of Housing inform us about the present status in development of housing in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you for that question, Mr. Speaker; thank you to the Member for Burrows. Certainly there is always room for good news, Mr. Speaker, and I am happy to report, as was reported in the press today, that housing starts in Manitoba are doing quite well, in fact, we have a record year ahead of us.

I should indicate as well, that the latest report from the Homes in Manitoba Program indicates that fully one-half of the 2,500 starts that are being projected will have Homes in Manitoba Program mortgages behind them. So, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed good news. It's good news because it shows a growing confidence on the part of Manitobans in the economy. It also is good news, Mr. Speaker, because the building of those 2,500 homes means jobs for tradesmen, jobs for construction workers.

MR. C. SANTOS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What is the current situation of the vacancy rate, and what about the nature of apartment construction in the city?

HON. J. STORIE: Very good questions, Mr. Speaker. I'm truly pleased that the member asked those questions. Mr. Speaker, we had a report in the press recently, supposedly from a housing market analyst who was concerned that rent controls - in fact, it was reported that he said that rent controls had resulted in zero starts in apartments in 1982. I would like to indicate that that is incorrect, this researcher should check his facts a little more carefully. We had approximately four times the number of apartment starts in 1982 as we did in 1981. This year the

projections are that approximately 2,000 apartment units will be constructed, and that represents a tremendous increase in the number of apartment units being constructed. And again, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis has to be on the jobs that that's creating in the industry.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I direct this question to the Premier. It was reported in today's Free Press that the province plans to hire bilingual ag reps. I would like to ask the Premier if it's his government's intention now to hire bilingual municipal assessors and bilingual municipal planners?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member may not already have received a copy of the bulletin that's been distributed by the Attorney-General pertaining to services in areas where there is a large French-speaking population. Those areas are outlined in blue, in respect to the map. In most instances, services are already being provided in bilingual format in those areas that are colored blue. It certainly is the intent of the province to ensure that services are provided in bilingual format in all those areas that are colored blue; in most instances, that is already the case that such services are provided. For example, the question of the assessor - having been once the Minister of Municipal Affairs I know that the assessor that performed the assessment duties in the St. Malo and St. Pierre area was bilingual.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. In view of such comments as are seen in the Winnipeg Free Press, "Little support voiced for bilingualism deal," and the Winnipeg Sun, which talks about "Penner strikes out in Brandon and Dauphin," and given that some rural municipalities and towns, villages and cities are planning referendums on the question of nuclear weapons, and are now considering holding referendums on bilingualism, for example, Hamiota is planning one. I ask the First Minister this: would he consider postponing a final decision on this question until the October Municipal Elections and the results of a province-wide referendum?

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: No?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's right, no.

MR. R. DOERN: I would then ask the First Minister if he can provide any — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I then ask the First Minister whether he would provide this House with any evidence that he is willing to listen to the views of the people of Manitoba, which appear to be overwhelmingly opposed to this proposed resolution.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's been my experience from the opportunity that I have had to speak to Manitobans, that when what is being provided by way of French Language Service, is explained in an honest and straightforward fashion, in a way that is clear, that it does indeed gain support. When it is presented to Manitobans in a way that is reflective of what has been done at the federal level by way of bilingual policy, then of course the support is not there; but if it is explained in a straightforward fashion, then the support is there.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my next question to the First Minister is this. Given that his Attorney-General went to Brandon and Dauphin, which are not known to be hostile New Democratic territory, and received what can only be described as a cool or hostile reception - and I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the Winnipeg Sun which wrote as follows: "In voices crackling with suppressed anger, speaker after speaker rose to denounce the bilingual amendment to applause and cheers from the crowd." The proposals were not well received in Brandon, Mr. Speaker.

My question is this, what will the First Minister and the Provincial Government accept as evidence that the public wants no part of the proposals, particularly that refer to the bilingualization of the Civil Service of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, our responsibility is to communicate, to explain and to ensure that the public is fully aware that this is French Language Service, not bilingualism that has been practised at the federal level. That is the process that we are doing and will continue to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

HON. S. LYON: You've capitulated to Trudeau again.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and I would ask him whether he can confirm that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: If questions are to be asked in the House I think it's only reasonable and fair that the Minister have an opportunity to hear the question.

Emergency medical service - North

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable First Minister. I hope all members would take those remarks to heart.
The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I presume the First Minister's directive was aimed at his own backbenchers because that was where the interruptions were coming from.

Mr. Speaker, while I hate to interrupt the interesting debate that was building this morning and perhaps we can get back to it, I do want to ask the Minister of Health a couple of questions on another topic of interest. I would ask him whether he can confirm that under the aegis of his office and the government generally, a task force has been convened to explore the development of a helicopter emergency medical service for Northern and remote Manitoba and whether that is an outgrowth of the criticisms leveled some weeks ago by Indian Band Chiefs in particular having to do with inadequate medical services in Northern Manitoba communities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I wouldn't call it a task force. I think, Mr. Speaker, that was during my Estimates that we were looking at that. We have a committee of the commission joined by staff of other departments such as Northern Affairs that are looking into it. It certainly has nothing to do with the problems up North, which is a concern of ours of course, but the main responsibility of the Federal Government.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have documentation which may be accurate or inaccurate, but appears to me to be accurate, which outlines the convening or the convention of an intergovernmental agency task force to look into the subject with the authority of the office of the Minister of Health and the First Minister, and that assigns and authorizes a company by the name Vega Aviation Limited - otherwise known as Vega Helicopters - to convene that task force. I would have a question or two relative to the assignment that's gone to Vega Helicopters if the Minister can confirm that that documentation is correct and that that task force is at work as of 10 o'clock this morning in this building.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that. I'd have to take it as notice.

Crop damage - frost

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Acting Minister of Agriculture. I wonder could the Minister advise the House and the members on this side the amount of frost damage that was experienced in the province on the night of July 4th or the morning of July 5th. How widespread was it and how much damage has the department indicated?

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

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, we are aware that there has been some frost damage south of Riding Mountain in the parklands regions. The

department I'm sure is reviewing this at the present time and I will pass the concern on to the Minister and I'm sure he will provide the information to the House at the earliest opportunity.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I have a question for the Attorney-General. Regarding the hearings that are being held on the bilingualism and the changes of the proposed Constitution, could the Attorney-General advise me if the committee is going to make the decisions where the hearings will be held, or is the Attorney-General going to make the decision where those hearings will be held?

HON. R. PENNER: In accordance with the usual practice, a meeting of the committee will be called and the committee will, as usually is the case, discuss its own procedures. The meeting that will be called will be called in the first instance for Winnipeg and after that the committee will decide.

Co-op Implements

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of Co-operative Development and would ask him whether he could inform the House whether or not C.I., Co-op Implements, has asked the government for additional assistance with regard to financing since the last package was signed about a year ago.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I'm not aware of any requests from C.I. for additional financing. I can certainly confirm that there has been none since I've assumed the responsibility for that department.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the same Minister and would ask him, since the agreement which was signed approximately a year ago called for a \$5 million share equity which would have to be taken out by C.I. members, in other words, members of Co-op Implements, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House as to how much of that \$5 million has been raised by the members of Co-op Implements up until this point.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how that is within the responsibility of our department. That question should properly be addressed to the Board of Directors of C.I.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister he couldn't confirm that there is in excess of \$8 million that the Province of Manitoba stands to lose upon the failure of a company like this, and that if he doesn't think that the Legislature of Manitoba and the taxpayers of Manitoba should be monitoring this particular situation to make sure that the members who have control of this company are, indeed, living up to their side of the commitment. All I'm asking the Minister is to inform the House whether or not the members

of Co-op Implements, under their agreement that he signed, were asked to raise \$5 million in share equity or in members' equity, whether or not that has happened, or if there is a certain amount that has been raised to date.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, I'll review the terms of the agreement of the loan between the province and C.I., and take that question as notice.

Regional Director of Northern Affairs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Member for Swan River requested information regarding the employment status of the Regional Director of Northern Affairs in the Dauphin area. I can now indicate to him that that regional director took early retirement as of late June of this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I thank the Minister for that answer. The question that I had directed to him was - was the director fired from his position? Now the Minister says that the individual took early retirement. As of what date?

HON. J. COWAN: My understanding is that he took it effective June 21, 1983.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Did the individual have a choice in this matter?

HON. J. COWAN: Oh, yes, the individual, as far as I know, had a series of options available to him and this was one of the options that was available to him. My understanding is, in fact, this is the option that he chose, therefore, he did have a choice in the matter. But one would have to communicate directly with him to get his perception of whether or not he had a choice. Certainly from the perception of the department, he did have a choice.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been in touch with the individual and he would like to continue with his job. I wonder if the Minister would further investigate the situation with respect to the director's position at Dauphin to see whether or not this individual could be considered for re-employment with the Department of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: I will certainly have staff contact the individual to determine exactly what his feelings are as of this time. However, I have to operate under the assumption that he did, in fact, have a choice of early retirement and he exercised that choice. If he has had a change of mind since that time, there are normal channels by which he can express that change of mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: One final question to the same Minister. Did this individual have the option to keep that job that he had been working at for the last 18 years?

HON. J. COWAN: The individual is certainly affected by reorganizations and transfers within the department previous — (Interjection) — previous to the decision on his part to take early retirement. However, those are a normal course of the management of any department, and in fact people are transferred under any administration, and in fact some individuals choose not to continue with their employment as a result of that transfer while others welcome that transfer.

So in this particular instance, I can tell you that he was a part of the departmental plan on reorganization. He chose this option in light of other options which were available to him, and that's the normal course.

Superior Bus

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Economic Development. I'd like to ask that Minister, who is privy to the events surrounding the receivership of Superior Bus at Morris, to give some opinion as to whether this company will be able to survive its present difficulties?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question to ask for facts rather than an opinion, which is contrary to the rules.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would then ask the Minister if she could disclose the sudden change of events that led to the Federal and Provincial Governments withdrawing their loan guarantees to Superior Bus.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it's with sorrow that both levels of government have had to withdraw their loan guarantees to Superior Bus at this point in time. The loan guarantees were offered contingent on there being no new information surfacing through the annual audit. Regrettably, there was some new information. I think it's the prerogative of the company and the credit unions to divulge that if they choose, but it significantly altered the viability as we understood it.

However, the re-evaluation by yet another firm of consultants, that the Receiver under Woods Gordon have put in place — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I do choose to ignore that pessimistic view. We haven't given up on the potential viability of that company, but we're not the prime actors in this situation. It is a private company and the credit unions are the people who have put them into receivership.

We are working with those groups and offering whatever help we can reasonably offer and we certainly haven't given up on the long-term potential, but it would be unfair of me not to say that there aren't major problems.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister could indicate whether the province is contemplating any type of an inquiry into the state of affairs at Superior Bus?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time there really doesn't seem to be any basis for an inquiry, but we are certainly I guess in the informal sense, inquiring into why the problems have occurred with an attempt to understand why such a change in financial status should occur so suddenly.

I guess what surfaces is, that when analyses are made by consultants and by accountants they do a sampling type of process which is not as thorough as a complete study of an industry.

Now we have not been asked to by the company or the credit union to carry out that type of complete study. In fact, the receiver, Woods Gordon, are carrying that out themselves. Our role, I think at this point in time, is to share information, any that we have or any insight, listen to the analyses as they are coming from the receiver and the company, and to keep open to any restructuring or any role that would be appropriate for the province.

Emergency medical service - North

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to try to answer the question that was asked of me a few minutes ago. I have the correspondence that was referred to, and it talks about Vega Aviation Limited as being authorized by the Premier's office and the Minister of Health's office for the Province of Manitoba, to convene an intergovernmental agency task force to identify specific equipment, program dollars and funding source to facilitate an implementation timetable for the Canada-Manitoba EM Program.

I certainly was right in saying that this was hardly a task force as far as we're concerned. I think this makes an effort to make sure they don't say that it was authorized by the Premier's office and the Minister of Health's office.

Now our department feels that we should make recommendations to the committee that I was talking about awhile ago, even during my Estimates, that we would give a different alternative to the government that would have options, and then we would look for hardware. This is a gentleman who is trying to sell his products, that's fine, there's nothing wrong with that. But I don't particularly like this letter that gives it the appearance of a sanction of a government approved or a task force set up by government, because it isn't as far as I'm concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for that response. Just so that we're clear and on the record, am I correct in reading the Minister's response as stating that this particular company, Vega Helicopters, has not been authorized by, or assigned by, or contracted with to do this particular job for the

government, that at this point in time that company is attempting to sell a proposal to the government, is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Certainly as far as any recollection that I have, you probably saw, Mr. Speaker, that I was taken by surprise by the question and I've checked. I certainly didn't authorize anything - I'm not saying this is wrong - but I think it is wrong to give the impression that it is a joint task force between two levels of government.

If it was a task force, I don't think we'd start by going to the supplier of a certain plane to start with. I think that would be wrong. I think we would want to put the different alternatives, and then look at the different planes and different alternatives and we're ready to do that. I'm not saying that this is anything wrong, but I want to give it the right perspective.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Can the Minister confirm that other companies, who would perhaps have the capacity, capability and the charters that would enable them to provide emergency medical service in Manitoba, will be consulted and will be considered in this study, that it's not exclusively being done with this one company?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We would hope so. I don't think it would be proper to start and have the people, who are trying to sell you the supply, in charge of the task force and calling meetings. These people are calling a meeting and we have no authority. They talked to my special assistant and he is looking at that, he's interested in that, and I'm not saying that there was anything wrong being done. If we're invited, then we've had staff there. I'm sure that there's somebody from our department there right now learning and finding out about that but I don't consider it as a task force.

British Columbia budget

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Last night the Governor of British Columbia brought down, what I understand to be from the newsclips I've heard, a very Draconian budget. Unfortunately, the Free Press or the Winnipeg Sun don't have any kind of coverage on that this morning - and I've just heard snippets on the CBC news of what's included in their budget - I wonder if he could inform us of a few of the items that they have. I understand there are across-the-board tax increases and that there's a very Draconian cutback in the public service. — (Interjection) — Could he please give us a bit of a description on what this true Conservative Government has brought in as a budget?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I regret that the budget in another province is not within the administrative competence of this government.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Finance if he has any plans or any ideas whatsoever towards following the path as set by the Government of British Columbia in future budgets for this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, in order to answer that question one must of course know the path that is being followed.

A MEMBER: What is that?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Just for instance, Mr. Curtis, the Finance Minister in B.C. is quoted as saying that drunk drivers may no longer be jailed in B.C. because it costs too much money; the office of the Ombudsman being eliminated; the Human Rights Commission; the Rentalsman being eliminated, those kinds of things, so that is a path I would have some difficulty asking this Legislature to go along.

I believe that it would be an abomination to do that, to hit the weak, the poor, the underprivileged, the defenseless, at a time when they are having difficulty. There is no question that they are having difficulty in B.C. There's no question we're having difficulty here.

They've gone from a deficit of \$968 million, to now a projected one, of \$1.6 billion but within that, and this is why we couldn't follow that path, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'd be pleased if the question asked of the Minister had to do with the plans of his department. It would hardly be according to the Rules to discuss another province's policies or the things that are being done there.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it very clear that we do not wish to follow the path as indicated in British Columbia, and certainly the opposition has occasionally asked questions of us with respect to what is happening in other provinces and whether we will be following those kinds of things that are happening elsewhere.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Order please.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister or to the Attorney-General. Apparently the government has now turned out a document called "Constitutionally Speaking" and on Page 2 of that document, Mr. Speaker, the following statements are made: "To avoid these very real risks" - they're referring to the Bilodeau case - "the Manitoba Government entered into a negotiated settlement. The first part of the settlement requires Bilodeau to end his Supreme Court case. Other cases could have been raised on a continual basis, but the agreement now effectively eliminates such possibility."

Mr. Speaker, I'd like the First Minister or the Attorney-General to identify, either in the constitutional agreement that is before us, or in some private

agreement that they have made with Mr. Bilodeau, or the Franco-Manitobaine Societe, or the Federal Government, the justification for that statement which is at odds with other information on the record.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: That statement is not at odds with information or fact in any way, shape or form. Clearly, the only basis upon which this government, and myself as the Attorney-General, would proceed in this matter would be the basis of resolving the case before the Supreme Court. That obviously was the basis upon which the negotiations proceeded.

As I've indicated time and time again, what we have here as a proposed agreement, is an agreement to resolve a court case, an agreement to avoid a court-imposed resolution of a difficult and complex problem of minority language rights, something which is treasured in our Constitution and treasured in our Charter; and in order to do that the agreement was entered into, that is, to resolve the court case. The linchpin of the agreement is the agreement with the solicitor for the appellant, Bilodeau, and Bilodeau himself, that upon the passage of the amendments, the case itself before the Supreme Court, will be withdrawn from the Supreme Court.

The case presently is adjourned sine die, that is, without a day, without a fixed day, because it is not at all clear at what point between now and December 31st the matter will have reached the Governor General for the seal of the Great Seal of Canada, in order to effect the amendment; but at or about that point, the case itself will be formally ended before the Supreme Court.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I take it then, from what the Attorney-General has said, that there is a document in existence between the Government of Manitoba and Mr. Bilodeau or his counsel, indicating that in the event this constitutional agreement is passed, that the Bilodeau case will be abandoned. Is that the case, and if so, could we have a copy of that agreement? That's No. 1.

But No. 2, the second branch of the question that I asked refers to the quote in this so-called explanatory document. "Other cases could have been raised on a continual basis but the agreement now effectively eliminates such possibility." I can understand, Mr. Speaker, if there is an agreement on Bilodeau, I can understand that. What kind of prohibition is built into the constitutional resolution that will prohibit any other person from bringing an action, based on the agreement, that this government is purporting to enter into?

HON. R. PENNER: Of course, technically anyone can walk over to the court office and file a Statement of Claim . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: Not only does the Leader of the Opposition fail to understand, he misreads again and again and again; now I know why he's wearing his eyeglasses on the end of a string.

The word there is "effectively" and in constitutional terms — (Interjection) — if I could finish the answer which I started. Anyone of course can walk into a court office and file a Statement of Claim. To file a Statement of Claim naming Her Majesty the Queen as a party and claiming alienation of affection, but that is not something that could be effectively dealt with. That's ridiculous.

The Leader of the Opposition well knows, but apparently chooses to ignore the fact that the key element is the validation of all of our statutes which were passed unconstitutionally in one language only, since 1870 in fact, as a result particularly of that piece of legislation in 1890, The Official Language Act. The amendment, if the Leader of the Opposition would have chosen to read it, calls for the validation of our statutes which were passed, as I say, in one language only, and gives until 1993 in order to complete the job of translating them, a job which is now well under way and which is accelerating, finally, at some reasonable pace. That's what that says, and that's what, of course, that means.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: First of all, I would like to announce some committee dates, Mr. Speaker. Tuesday, July 12 at 10:00 a.m. Private Bills; Thursday, July 14, 10:00 a.m. Public Utilities; Thursday, July 14, 8:00 p.m. Law Amendments; Tuesday, July 19, 8:00 p.m. Statutory Orders and Regulations. The purpose there, it is hoped that we will have the last of the family law legislation referred to committee, but as much of it as can be considered will be considered in that committee.

Thursday, July 21 at 8:00 p.m. Statutory Orders and Regulations, there to consider Bill 60; Tuesday, July 26 at 10:00 a.m. the Standing Committee on Agriculture, to continue 8:00 p.m. that evening if required; Thursday, July 28, Law Amendments in the morning and in the evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it has ever been the practice of the House to have Law Amendments meeting at the same time as another standing committee. There are 30 members, I believe, on Law Amendments. We have had two other standing committees, but never Law Amendments and another standing committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm sorry I thought I read this as clearly as possible. There is no calling of the committee

on Law Amendments at the same time as any other committee. I agree with the Opposition House Leader that that should not be done. The Law Amendments Committee for July 14 is in the evening, Public Utilities is in the morning. — (Interjection) — No, they don't conflict either, Tuesday, July 19 for Statutory Orders and Regulations at 8:00 p.m.; Thursday, July 21 at 8:00 p.m. for Statutory Orders and Regulations, again.

Mr. Speaker, would you please first call the Third Reading on Amended Bills. Bills 15, 44, and 45 on Page 3, and then we'll move over to Debate on Second Reading on a number of bills.

THIRD READING - AMENDED BILLS BILL 15 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

HON. L. EVANS presented Bill No. 15, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Emerson, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 44 - THE FISHERIES ACT

MR. B. RANSOM presented Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Fisheries Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 45 - THE FOREST ACT

MR. B. RANSOM presented Bill No. 45, An Act to amend The Forest Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debates on second readings as follows: Bills 66, 92, 96, 85, 49, 97 and 3.

**ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND
READING**

BILL NO. 66 - THE CHILD WELFARE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General Bill No. 66.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources had adjourned that bill for myself.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no other member wishing to speak, the Attorney-General will be closing debate.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity to consider some of the very cogent remarks made by the Member for Fort Garry on June 23 and I will not attempt to address them now. They will be taken into consideration when the bill reaches committee and prepared to ask that the question be put for the bill to go to committee.

QUESTION put; MOTION carried.

BILL 92 - THE CITY OF WINNIPEG ACT

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.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to speak at length at this stage on Bill 92. I adjourned it earlier this week following the contribution of my colleague, the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, because of the concerns which he identified and which he articulated very positively and very clearly in his remarks of that date, Tuesday, July 5, and because those concerns are shared by his colleagues in our caucus.

Mr. Speaker, it's my information that the City of Winnipeg itself, members of city council, have had an opportunity to explore and examine the contents of Bill 92 and pass judgment on it, and their judgment is essentially favourable. One of my reasons for adjourning debate was that I wanted to have an opportunity to acquaint myself with city council's position on the contents of the bill. That being the case, there is no necessity to delay passage of Bill 92 at this juncture.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the overall approval which Winnipeg City Council reportedly has given the contents of Bill No. 92, there still are some strong reservations entertained by members of Winnipeg City Council with respect to certain provisions of this bill and certain sections of it, and I think they require very close evaluation at committee stage.

Further to that, I know that, notwithstanding the general approval that's been forthcoming from the city, many city councillors share the concerns and the worries expressed by my colleague, and shared by me, having to do with the politicization of the Civic Service; so that, while agreeing that Bill 92 proceed through this stage of the legislative process and move to committee, I would not want members opposite, members of the treasury benches or the government ranks to

misinterpret that as clear-cut or sweeping enthusiasm for the principle of Bill 92 where we are concerned. I do not have sweeping enthusiasm for the principle of Bill 92.

I believe that there are implicit dangers in moving to politicize the Civic Service in the way that is provided by this legislation, but I also believe that men and women of good will and good intention can introduce and practice the necessary checks and balances which will prevent damage from resulting from that kind of opportunity. I'm willing to proceed on that basis and try the effects of this legislation where administration of the affairs of the City of Winnipeg are concerned.

The warning, I think, is timely and reasonable. I am pleased that my colleague, the Member for Tuxedo, gave such clear voice to it. I want to note for the record, Mr. Speaker, that I'm aware that various members of City Council share that concern. I've also raised that warning, while giving overall endorsement to the legislation.

So, having had the opportunity to wait to hear what City Council wanted to say about it, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to see this bill proceed to committee study at this stage, and to give it tentative and temporary approval from my position as MLA for Fort Garry, and a member of a caucus that feels the direction proposed, in terms of politicization of the Civic Service here, is one that has to be watched very very carefully, and one that we hope will not lead to power plays and pressure plays that work to the disadvantage of the city and its citizens.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to close debate if no other members wish to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I'll be fairly brief. I'd like to answer some of the concerns or questions that have been raised by members in debate on this bill.

As indicated in my opening remarks on this bill, the majority of the amendments in this bill are of, in fact most of the amendments in this bill, are of administrative and technical nature, and most of them have been requested by the City of Winnipeg. I note in the comments made by the Member for Tuxedo that he said he had no difficulty in most of those amendments, especially since they'd been requested by the City of Winnipeg. I would also point out that, of those amendments, 18 of them have been requested while members opposite were in government, and they failed to act on those amendments as requested by the City of Winnipeg, so I'm pleased to see that they've now had a change of heart and are prepared to agree with them.

The Member for St. Norbert raised questions as to where the requests for the other amendments came from. I can advise that there were requests from the additional zone municipalities that surround the City of Winnipeg for a number of amendments, and most of them have been incorporated into the bill. There were also requests for amendments from two provincial departments, the Department of Natural Resources dealing with some matters with respect to the flood plain and waterways which are incorporated into the bill; there was also a request from the Department of Municipal Affairs for most of the changes with respect to the conflict of interest, in order to make The City

of Winnipeg Act conform and comply with the changes that are coming forward in The Municipal Conflict of Interest Act. All the changes were generated, either by requests from the City of Winnipeg, or self-generated within government.

The Member for St. Norbert raised concern about the change with respect to the prohibition of people running for council if they had bankruptcy or other such situations. The reason for that change, again, was as part of the overall changes on the prohibition, and was really to make it consistent with the position that exists for members in this House. There is no prohibition that exists for people running for members of the Legislative Assembly in that regard, and therein was the reason for the change. There are strong opinions on that one. I'm certainly prepared to reconsider and to look at that change.

The member also made a suggestion that there was no consultation with the City of Winnipeg, with respect to the changes that are the centre of most of the discussion on this bill allowing civic employees the right to run for office; that simply is not true. There was consultation with the official delegation of the City of Winnipeg at meetings, wherein we indicated that we were contemplating such a change to The City of Winnipeg Act, and the official delegation indicated to members of the Urban Affairs Committee Cabinet that they had no objection to that kind of change.

I just want the record to be clear, Mr. Speaker, that there was consultation with the City of Winnipeg with respect to this change. As was indicated by the Member for Fort Garry, that position has been endorsed, subject to some modification by the City Council, at its meeting last Wednesday. It is a position that is well accepted and I think one that is needed to give civic employees a right that was unfortunately denied them, and that the right that I think all citizens of the province should have that, is to run for elected office, be it federal, provincial, or at the civic level. I just wanted to ensure that the record was clear that there was consultation with the City of Winnipeg in that regard.

The city has just recently submitted to us a list of concerns they have with some of the wording, in particular, those sections related to the right and protections for civic employees to run for office. I'm certainly prepared to look at them and consider them at committee stage, and possibly make some amendments to ensure that those sections of the bill are workable. But on the basic principle, I think it's an important one; and it is not, Mr. Speaker, as being suggested by members across the way, that this is an attempt to politicize the civic employees of the City of Winnipeg. That simply is not true, Mr. Speaker.

What it does is give employees who work for the City of Winnipeg the right to run for political office. How someone can twist and manipulate that around to come out with some end product that says that's a politicalization of the civic service of the City of Winnipeg is beyond, I think, the realm of reason and I can't quite understand it, Mr. Speaker. All it does is give people the right, which was denied them, the right to run for office.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I believe I've answered the points that were raised in debate by the three members that spoke on this bill and I look forward to the committee's deliberations on this and,

as I indicated, I look for constructive suggestions with respect to changes on particular sections, to ensure that the proposals that we have made will indeed be workable.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 96 - THE DOMICILE AND HABITUAL RESIDENCE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney General, Bill No. 96. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we've reviewed this bill and the Law Reform Commission Report on which it is based. We're prepared to let it go on to committee and to hear any representations made by it. I hope there has been sufficient time for the appropriate section of the Manitoba Bar Association to review it and to indicate whether or not they have any concerns with respect to this bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 85 - THE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS DISBURSEMENT ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 85. The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to allow this bill to go on to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL 49 - THE PROVINCIAL POLICE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 49, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this bill is a companion bill to Bill No. 2, which we completed our discussion of approximately one week ago and which has been standing in the name of the Attorney-General. In order to conclude debate, we are prepared to see these two bills go to committee.

We do not support Bill No. 2 and therefore we do not support its companion bill, Bill No. 49, for the reasons that have been expressed, I think at length, on Bill No. 2.

I know that the Attorney-General is going to propose some amendments to Bill No. 2 at Law Amendments Committee. We expect that there will be serious representations made by associations and individuals concerned with this bill, involved in the police forces of Manitoba. We are concerned that the Attorney-General has proceeded with a bill on which he has not developed a consensus and which has caused a great deal of concern among police forces in Manitoba.

We will be proposing amendments to Bill No. 2 and to this bill in committee also, Mr. Speaker, so on that basis we're prepared, assuming very shortly the Attorney-General will conclude debate on Bill No. 2 and pass that on to committee, we're prepared to proceed with Bill No. 49 and allow it to go on to committee, to be dealt with at the same time.

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

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, just in response to the remarks of the Member for St. Norbert, I would like to indicate to him that I will be closing debate on Bill No. 2 on Wednesday.

The reason for the delay is that there have been continuing discussions with some of the associations to which he refers, with respect to Bill No. 2, and indeed I think I will be able, when I speak on Wednesday, to indicate some proposed amendments, additional to those already announced, which I think are going a long way to meet some of the concerns that have been expressed; and indeed we were very close to a consensus, as I understand it.

In any event, I just thought I would make that timetable clear, asking that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, to follow the family law batch, as I will be asking with respect to Bill No. 2, so that we will give full opportunity to the delegations that undoubtedly will come from various police associations, and to the opposition, to be able to work on this bill in some unpressured way, rather than just have it as one of a large number of bills in Law Amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? On division?

MR. B. RANSOM: On division.

MR. SPEAKER: On division.

SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

BILL 97 - THE QUEEN'S BENCH ACT

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 97, The Queen's Bench Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Cour du banc de la Reine, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief, although this is a very important bill. It is An Act to amend The Court of Queen's Bench Act, to provide for the establishment of a family division of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Manitoba. This brings into existence what is popularly called the Unified Family Court.

There is other legislation which is in the works that is related to the amalgamation of the County Court and the Court of Queen's Bench. The establishment

of the Unified Family Court under the name of the Family Division of the Court of Queen's Bench will actually precede that amalgamation as things now appear. I expect that it may take place if this bill goes through and I expect it will receive the full support of the House. The establishment of this division would take place approximately February or March of 1984.

The bill provides that the Family Division of the Court of Queen's Bench will have complete substantive jurisdiction to deal with all matters related to family law, and specifically those matters that arise under The Child Welfare Act, Change of Name Act, The Devolution of Estates Act, The Dower Act, The Law of Property Act, The Married Women's Property Act, Family Maintenance Act, The Marital Property Act, The Marriage Act, The Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, the Parents Maintenance Act, The Child Custody Enforcement Act, The Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act and The Divorce Act.

The bill provides for the division to consist of an Associate Chief Justice and five other judges who shall serve full-time in the division. It's expected, Sir, that there will be federal appointments of those particular positions some time before the end of the summer. In addition, the bill provides that the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, in consultation with the to be newly designated Associate Chief Justice of the Family Division, may designate a number of other Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench to serve as additional judges for the division on a rotational basis.

So that, if I may interject here, Sir, there will be a corps of full-time Family Division Judges at the Court of Queen's Bench level; five plus an associate, Chief Justice is six, and given the present anticipated workload in this wide ambit of Family Law, it will likely be the case that some three judges from the regular division will sit, on a rotational basis, perhaps sitting six months at a time, maybe a year at a time; that will be up to the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench and the Associate Chief Justice as to the length of time a judge moves over to the Family Division to sit with the other six.

The bill provides that where a judge, or master of the court, considers that an effort should be made to resolve any issue without a formal trial the matter may be referred to a conciliation officer. It's intended, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that upon the passage of this bill the division will be given exclusive geographic jurisdiction for Winnipeg, Selkirk and St. Boniface. It's anticipated that its geographical jurisdiction will be slowly extended over the next few years. We want to start with the largest population base, consistent with good management, and that will be the, broadly speaking, the greatest part of what is commonly referred as the Eastern Judicial District, and make sure that it is working and working well before we look to the possibility of extending the geographical jurisdiction of the division in other parts of the province.

By relieving the Provincial Judges Court, Family Division, of Winnipeg family law responsibilities within this defined geographic area, it is expected that the resolution of family law disputes outside of Winnipeg will be improved by the availability of more provincial judges. In addition, the juvenile justice system for the City of Winnipeg will benefit by the availability of more provincially-appointed judges. It is expected that this

will be, in fact, an urgent requirement when The Young Offenders Act is proclaimed. It's now anticipated, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Young Offenders Act will be proclaimed, not for October 1st of this year, but for April 1st of 1984. It's been a much delayed, I would say, a much too much delayed bringing into force, but that has to do with the problem of effecting adequate financial arrangements from, particularly, payments from the Federal Government to the provinces, to bear the increased cost that this new system of dealing with young offenders will undoubtedly entail; not so much in Manitoba as in other provinces.

I should just state here, as well, that with the burden of family law, in all of the areas that I've mentioned, being transferred to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Family Division of the Court of Queen's Bench for this defined area, even with the anticipated increase in the juvenile side occasioned by The Young Offenders Act, there will still be less of a workload for the 10 judges presently sitting in the Family Division of the Provincial Court. That does not create a problem; indeed, it creates an opportunity because, as was pointed out earlier in these remarks, we will be able to strengthen the representation in family law matters outside of the defined geographical area and, indeed, some of the judges in the Family Division will be able to sit on the criminal side to help us reduce the time lag that still exists - too much of a time lag - on the criminal side.

There has been very extensive support for the concept of a unified Family Court with complete jurisdiction to deal with all matters related to family law. The support has been received from women's groups, the judiciary, the legal profession, social work profession, and I commend this bill to the House, and in doing so I just would like to add one other observation.

It had been my hope, when looking at the development of this concept of a Family Law Court that would have complete jurisdiction with respect to every aspect of Family Law, would provide conciliation services of a new and enhanced level, thus reducing the amount of time that was spent in the adversarial contest within the courtroom, having more problems resolved outside of the courtroom. It was my hope that this could be established at the Provincial Judges' level, or at least with the involvement of the Provincial Judges to a greater extent than is possible. This required an amendment to Section 96 of The Constitution Act, 1867, because the provincially-appointed judges do not have jurisdiction in vital matters, such as, divorce, a whole number of other family law matters, therefore, that would be necessary, it would be necessary to have that amendment to the constitution for our provincially-appointed judges to be able to deal with all family law matters.

All of the provinces were united in asking the Minister of Justice to concur in such an amendment and, at one time, he seemed favourable disposed. However, the Minister of Justice federally is moving along with amendments to The Divorce Act and feels that he wants to deal with these and leave the question of extended Section 96 jurisdiction for provincially-appointed judges for sometime to come. Therefore, if we were to bring the Unified Family Court into existence it could only be done at the Queen's Bench level and I'm satisfied that that, indeed, will make an excellent court. I'm looking forward to seeing what the appointments will

be to that court; it's my hope that the appointments will reflect a great deal of experience in family law matters by those who will be appointed, but that has to be seen.

The court, initially, will occupy space that will be available by a series of moves in the Woodsworth Building, so that it is located with the other court services. This makes it possible to provide the administration for that court without any substantial increase in costs, without any substantial increase in personnel.

I recommend this bill to the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this is a concept to which members on this side are certainly not opposed and are, indeed, supportive of, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Constitutional authority over the courts, and recent court decisions, have caused some problems with respect to family courts at the provincial judges' level and makes it more important that this type of court be proceeded with than it did a number of years ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Certainly, the volume of work requires some expansion of the services because the current delay in the hearing of family matters, before the courts in Manitoba, is quite significant.

We are, Mr. Speaker, prepared to allow this bill to go on to committee immediately. I raise one question with the Attorney-General. I note that the bill would give the Unified Family Court exclusive geographic jurisdiction for Winnipeg, Selkirk and St. Boniface, and that this court will be located, I believe he indicated, in the Woodsworth Building.

He will be well aware, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it has been traditional particularly with respect to what happens after the amalgamation of the County Court and the Court of Queen's Bench, it has been traditional in Manitoba to retain the County Court of St. Boniface in St. Boniface, and the Provincial Judges Family Court, as well as criminal division, in St. Boniface, and to have French-speaking judges and personnel available in St. Boniface, to hear those matter which they had geographic jurisdiction over. That was done without a constitutional amendment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but it has been traditional and has been right and has recognized the predominance of the use of the French-speaking language in St. Boniface.

It appears at first glance that as a result of amalgamation, and as a result of this Unified Family Court and the assumption of the geographic jurisdiction for St. Boniface, that those courts will be perhaps removed from St. Boniface. Perhaps the Attorney-General could indicate what is proposed to be done to guarantee - it doesn't have to be in legislation either, we're prepared to accept the actions of the government - but to continue to provide for the significant French-speaking people in St. Boniface, their French-speaking judges that they have had for years and years, and French-speaking personnel, and will that program be continued under a Unified Family Court, and particularly with respect to the amalgamation of the Court of Queen's Bench and the County Court.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm glad that the Member for St. Norbert raised a question which I should have dealt with in my introduction to this bill.

Yes, I'm happy to be able to state, that with amalgamation there will be, for administrative purposes, one judicial district, but a number of judicial centres, and St. Boniface will continue as a judicial centre, which means in effect, that although it will be a part of the Court of Queen's Bench, the court has constituted, will continue to sit with the present County Court Judge, the Honourable Armand Dureault, will continue to sit there but he will be a Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench following amalgamation.

It will follow as well that family matters coming to the family division to be actually heard in court, will be dealt with if they arise in that district, and particularly where the parties will want to conduct that matter, that trial of a family law matter in the French language, will continue to be able to do that in the judicial centre of St. Boniface where complete facilities for French language trials will continue as they presently do.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING Cont'd

BILL NO. 3 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 3, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture; and on the proposed motion of the Member for Kirkfield Park, an amendment thereto, standing in the name of the Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise at this time to speak on the proposed motion of my colleague.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, many things have been said and I think almost all things have been said regarding Bill No. 3. Certainly everybody on our side has had an opportunity to say most of the items that crossed their mind, particularly related to sections of the act that we have found offensive, but nevertheless, I must confess after listening to the Minister's address the other day, where he again tries to make us believe that the approach the government is taking is a little bit faulty, quite a degree faulty, I might add.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister attempts to reassure all that are listening that in his view they are taking the right approach. I think those were his specific and exact words when he spoke to the proposed motion. I'd like to review his address to some degree because again for the record, Sir, I would like to take exception to some specific areas.

Throughout it all those of us that were in attendance the other day, and anybody that's had an opportunity to read Hansard, they'll realize that the final ground for launching the debate that is used by the government, is one on pure speculation. I suppose that's acceptable to some degree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speculation in its rawest form is something that one can look at with a jaundiced eye to say the least, particularly those that

don't have a total understanding and a full comprehension as to what it is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to read the definition that I pulled out of the dictionary here just a few minutes ago on "speculation" and I would hope that the Minister, in reading my remarks in Hansard, would feel free to comment upon some of the remarks I'll make.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, speculation, "An act or instance of speculating as an assumption of an unusual business risk in hopes of obtaining commensurate gain." Of course, that comes as no great surprise to any of us, that particular definition because that's indeed the nature of speculation. It's the hopes of obtaining gain. What worries me so much - when I hear members opposite using this word so flagrantly and with such disdain - is the little phrase in there that is always missed, of unusual business risk.

What is risk, Mr. Deputy Speaker? "Risk" says that things don't always go your way, quite often they go the opposite. That's what bothers me to some degree when the Minister of Agriculture the other day rose on possibly one of his final speeches on this particular bill and he used, I would say, fully two-thirds of his time to cite case examples, some 10 or 12 in number, where it had been documented by the Farm Lands Protection Board that individuals had purchased land in the name of either themselves or others, and subsequently, in a short period of time, had disposed of that particular property for commensurate gain. He used that argument throughout his speech and, of course, that's the emotional side of debating this bill, and I dare say, Sir, that it's without doubt one of the concerns that was raised within my area four or five years ago; but it ignores, and I challenge the members opposite to tell us why they allow it to ignore, the other side of the speculation chain, the other side when prices fall. Because right today, if the same Minister wanted to, he could go to this very same board and have documented for him 12 cases where individuals today are losing; but he chooses not to do so and I really question why.

We know why, Mr. Speaker, because of course speculation is deemed as being always in the negative sense, and never working to the benefit of those people who aspire to own farm land. So it's on that particular base that I'd like to review, in further detail, not only Bill 3 as it exists, but our motion to have the bill set aside for six months, and also the whole question around, again, to some small degree, the statistics that have been used.

Mr. Speaker, to begin, after the Minister says he's convinced that Bill 3 is the right approach to take, he says the main reason for bringing in Bill 3 is to preserve and strengthen the family farm; and, of course, that's the motherhood statement that we all use from time to time, and certainly this particular Minister seems to use it in almost every paragraph. What concerns me a little though is the inconsistency on which he attempts to be selling this particular bill, and this legislation, and some of the other decisions he's making in areas that he has total control over; and I'd like to cite an example, Mr. Speaker.

Right today there are members of some of the poultry boards who are lobbying hard the Minister of Agriculture, and also the supervisory council, to have exemptions dropped, particularly in the case of broilers,

from 1,000 to 500, and laying hens from 500 to 200. And, of course, the rationale used by some of the directors of the boards, and those people guaranteed production rights and quota rights, the argument used is that it's necessary to have those exemptions reduced so as to protect the interests of that whole industry. What that does, Mr. Speaker, of course, it says to those people, those of us who may want to, for instance, raise broilers and supplement our income and strengthen that family farm; and to do more than that, Sir, to allow a supplemental income to individuals, young farmers wanting to go into that industry, it's taken away that right from them. And yet, Mr. Speaker, every member opposite who chooses to speak on this bill says the greatest benefit of it will be to allow the young and small farmer to enter the business. I would love to buy that, I would love to accept that argument, but I'm too close to the situation, Sir, I see it and it is not so.

Yet on an area where they can help the small farmer, and the young one, to supplement income, to move into that industry, they've cut him back. They may not have done so far, but I know the decision will be rendered by the council; I know this government will ratify it, and I question - and I'm sincere about this, Mr. Speaker - when I ask the Minister and the government to tell us how they can be so inconsistent in those two areas? How can they say to the young farmer, in one case; no, we won't allow you to raise up to 1,000 broilers uncontrolled, without regulatory rules being imposed on you by the boards, there's no way we'll allow you to do that, but yet on this bill we're going to attempt to fight for your behalf. So where's the consistency, Sir; I ask you that and I particularly ask the Minister of Agriculture, because I think it's only fair to answer that particular concern.

He says, Mr. Speaker, going on, "that is a goal, Sir," and I'm quoting, "which all supporters" - and I think he's talking about the freedom of existing farmers, and future generations of farmers, to acquire, own and operate farm land - and he says, "this is a freedom which I would say all those who say freedom of choice would surely endorse."

Well, Mr. Speaker, isn't that an interesting comment? He's trying to say that those people that support freedom of choice would certainly want to support this bill. He didn't draw the argument out. Mr. Speaker, I would love to see the convoluted logic that could be used in support of that statement because, without doubt, freedom of choice is not being expanded, it's being curtailed, and I'd like to tell you why, in my view. Again it ties in to the so-called support for the young farmer. Mr. Speaker, many young farmers in our area are farming today only because a bank of reserve rented land is available. I think that's proven out by some of the statistics offered by the Member for Turtle Mountain when he made his presentation. He indicated that some considerable share of the land base has always been held by those who rent to young individuals, and I can tell you that within my constituency, where I would have to say some of the larger holdings, even though it only amounts to some 2 or 3 percent, of non-resident owners, that virtually all of this land is being farmed by young farmers today who otherwise would not be farming. Yet I don't see that particular concern addressed by members opposite. They haven't gone

out to see, really, who is farming this so-called non-resident owned land. They have not gone out at all.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if you want to move into the area of statistics, and at times I do and at times I don't, but I will for a second. They haven't gone anywhere to determine statistics, other than what they're prepared to accept from a university study some five years ago, and that's as far as they've been prepared to go to attempt to arrive at global figures. Then, beyond that, all they've done is set before us 12 case studies, all of them ending at the bottom line, in their view, of pure speculation. That's all the support they've given in an analytical and a statistical sense to this whole argument. I really question, and I know most Manitobans do, whether that is the proper way to proceed in any legislation, let alone probably one of the most important issues facing rural Manitoba today. Mr. Speaker, I again would hope the Minister could tell me how the freedom of choice is going to be expanded should this bill receive passage.

Mr. Speaker, I will move into the area of statistics and I agree with anybody that makes the comments. Like many issues discussed in this House particularly, I suppose, seat belts being the main one, that statistic is time because you can put on so many interpretations to them, tend to cloud the basic discussion and at times people lose their arguments. I would like to make a couple of comments about the statistics.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it was incumbent upon the Minister of Agriculture when we drew to his attention the comments - not only the comments, Sir, but the conclusions arrived at in the Kraft Study - and also the comments made specifically by Mr. Kraft as to the methodology within that study and the weaknesses associated with it. I believe it was incumbent upon the Minister of Agriculture to be prepared to argue either for or against the concerns as expressed by us and he chose not to do so, Sir. Again, because he has chosen not to, I feel that some comment again has to be put onto the records.

Dr. Kraft, when he did his study, looked at non-resident owners and they were defined as those who did not live in the municipality, nothing more, those who did not live in the municipality. My father, for instance, who when he retires, if he decides to move out of the municipality even though that may mean a move of 10 miles; even though it may mean he wants to maintain his interest in the land that he's farmed for some 40 years; even then he would lumped into that area of non-resident farming. We pointed that out over and over and over again and yet the members opposite and the Minister choose to ignore that.

Even worse, they chastise us for not segregating those numbered companies, those ones that are used as dummy corporations and we said we did and we did, Sir. We factored that out; to the best of our ability we factored it out. We made an assumption that the land was held in a lawyer's firm in Winnipeg in the name of a lawyer firm in Winnipeg. It was under a numbered company. If it was held by a lawyer's firm outside of Manitoba it was shown to be owned by somebody living outside of the country; it was factored out. It was deemed to be foreign-owned land and we went to great efforts to make sure that was done. That's why we feel so secure in our own statistics and yet the Minister the other day speaking to this bill gave no acknowledgment

whatsoever to that argument. As a matter of fact, he fell right back again to the Kraft Study and chose not, at one time, and I honestly believe this, to understand the methodology used even though I said the last time I spoke on Bill 3, I said that Dr. Kraft himself in attempting to put some figure against an attempt to analyze the figures of foreign-owned land within my riding, came to virtually the same figure we did - virtually the same figure - and yet the Minister chose not to even recognize the argument.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's absolutely deplorable. Really it is when you come to a situation like this and when there's such a difference in statistics that the Minister would choose not to even delve that deeply into the methodology used for the statistics that he's presented to support his argument. I suppose off the side it makes one wonder how many areas of new legislation are brought forward with that type of supporting analysis. I think it begs a question in many other areas, Sir, not only in land ownership.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister attempts to shoot down our arguments with our statistics but he never, ever answered our concerns as related specifically to the figures that he's used. I think if he has one more chance to address this bill, that hopefully he'll take the time and the effort to tell us specifically where we are wrong, like the Member for Springfield attempted to do in his original comment on it, even though he made the erroneous assumption that we had not factored out the numbered companies and all those land owners that were shown — (Interjection) — the member says how did we factor them out? Very easily, Sir, to the Speaker, my colleague. What we did if it wasn't in the name of somebody within the local area known to be the active farmer, if it wasn't in the name of an individual, an aunt or an uncle who had owned land for 30 years and was renting to either a friend, or a nephew, or a relative, if it didn't fall into those two classes they were factored out and assumed to be foreign-owned — (Interjection) — assumed to be foreign-owned, Sir, and that's what was done.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what the member does not realize is that we did call back to the municipalities and we asked for a further breakdown. We don't come up into this House and just throw numbers out as if we just picked them up out of the blue sky. Our backgrounds won't allow that, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please.

MR. C. MANNES: Maybe theirs will but ours won't. Mr. Speaker, the member goes through 12 case studies and uses them as examples of speculation but surprisingly he fails to give one instance of prices falling. Isn't that interesting, Sir? Just think of that for a second. Twelve examples of case studies of the price of land going up because you have a selected view into a period of time when the land prices did go up and you use that as a substantiation for that bill. — (Interjection) — Well, yes, the Member for Radisson says I have lots of examples of that in my own constituency, and he's correct, I said that. I said that 15 minutes ago. But at a point in time when the time comes, Sir, if you read it "speculation", unusual business risk, the risk is, that the time is going to come when they're going to fall

and if the same Minister had wanted to bring case studies to this House over the last six months, he could have shown quite easily where prices have fallen.

I can tell you, Sir, I know first-hand of instances where foreign owners, particularly in some of the marginal lands, have invested \$2 million to \$3 million over a period of five years and today can't achieve \$1 million out of it. Yet, does that Minister bring forward that news? I can tell you, Sir, that the loss represented to those foreigners represents the greatest opportunity for young individuals who want to move into farming in those particular areas. Bargain prices, Sir, and yet the Minister says, no we've got to do something; people have made money in the trading of farm land, and yes they have and they will, but people have lost money in trading farm land and they will continue to do so.

What else does the Minister say, Mr. Speaker? He goes on to say that he's after the Manitoba corporations. The Manitoba corporations which has been used as the front, so-called front, for those who want to own and speculate in Manitoba land. I think if ever that argument was destroyed it was done so by my colleague here a couple of weeks ago when he spoke specifically to that area - that area of the Manitoba Farm Corporation - because I think somebody is going to have to come to grips with that particular problem. What has to give here? Is it the structure, the entity of a corporation and the reasons for why that entity was allowed in the first place in our whole society, which over the last 20 years has found its way now as a tool, as a management tool within farming? Does that have to give or is the Minister going to push it through by forcing some board to define farmers such that if one-third of the beneficial shareholders are not deemed to be farmers that the corporation can no longer exercise its right to go out and purchase land. What's going to give because they're obviously right at cross purposes? One of them has to give, Sir, and yet at no time do we hear the Minister even address the problem. No, he chooses to talk about 12 cases to prove his point and the argument is too weak and it has to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I look at the Minister specifically and I have difficulty when I see him putting so much emphasis on farm land and then not looking where, in some areas, speculation really does exist under his purview. I can move, and I'm not going to spend much time on it, but I'd like to tell him if he wants to look where vast sums of money are being made he may want to look under the supply managed boards into some of the very areas where he's supposed to have supervisory power to prevent these sorts of things from occurring. Why doesn't he address those problems? The very real problems today that have some livestock, worth incredible amounts of money.

Why doesn't he address the problems as to why young farmers can't move, for instance, into the broiler industry, or into some of the other areas? Why doesn't he address those particular concerns? I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because he realizes what happens if he gets into that other area which is under his purview and which is under his responsibility. — (Interjection) — Well, it's the same thing, we have the comment coming forward from the Minister of Natural Resources, it's the same thing.

Well certainly, Sir, it is not the same thing. It certainly is not. That's what upsets me so much about this

particular government when they jump up to their feet and laud their efforts in attempting to help the small and the young farmer to improve his lot within the industry because there's only one area where you have total allowance for freedom of entry and that's within farm land. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm terribly concerned what this bill can do those young people, who today are renting land, who have found that base and that quantity of rented land as their entry into farming.

To move to another area, Mr. Speaker, and that's the retiring farmer, I think comments have been made here a number of times as to why government should have the authority and the power to tell a retiring farmer, as to who, and to how, and for what value he should sell his land. People can say right now, well farm land is worth an awful lot right now. How much does that retiring farmer need? He's probably getting too much.

I can tell you, Sir, it was only 10 years ago that the retiring farmers - I know I bought some land - received \$150 an acre. They'd worked all their lives for a half-section of land to pay for it. We paid those people \$45,000 for a half-section of land 10 years ago. At that time there wasn't any wild speculator; it wasn't any foreign owner that came in to buy that land; it was a nephew; it was me, \$150 an acre; and my aunt and uncle were very happy. They wanted to move on and they put some \$45,000 in the bank for savings. They'd worked on that land for 40 years and they put \$45,000 away in savings and four years later that savings had one-third the value. So don't talk to me about those people who are retiring and how much value should they achieve for that land.

Last night the Premier of the province came over and sat beside and we had a heated five-minute discussion. He was talking about the wild Conservative monetary philosophy - this was just before, Sir, the vote leading into the Jobs Fund - talking about the ravages of people being unemployed, to society. I reminded our Premier of one thing that just yesterday, I believe the City of Winnipeg had put through some special by-law or something, to give to employees who had retired 10 years ago with virtually no pension, but with something 10 years ago that may have been adequate, but some 10 years later was of no value at all and that's what disturbs me about this whole argument. If you want to work it into every aspect of where we are economically, it's what wild inflation does and yet the Minister was running down the policies of those that were trying to stop that rampant inflation and destroying the savings of everybody, destroying the savings of those people who had worked all their life on land and put away \$45,000; because I can tell you, 12 years later, that \$45,000 that I gave to my aunt and uncle for that particular piece of land is gone, completely gone, and they're bitter. They're not bitter with me; they're bitter with inflation, because they're now in their 70s and they expect to live another 15-20 years and there's virtually nothing to live on, except the support of the state. They were people that went through life that wanted to be able to support themselves in their last days.

That's what concerns me about these types of bills that come forward and attempt to say to people who do not have pension funds, who do not have the ability or are not allowed, who do not want to come and sit in this House for eight years and then have a pension fund that's fully indexed or whatever; people who have

said no, my pension fund will come out of the benefits of my ownership of an asset, which I will sell, like three-quarters of the farmers in this country and then you have inflation destroy it.

Yet members opposite will say, no, we don't think it's fair that these individuals have the right to sell to whom they wish. That's speculation and they believe if you stop speculation you can create the orderly transfer to the next generation. That's not the problem, Sir. The land I bought was orderly transferred to myself as a young, starting farmer. I'm the benefactor today because of its rise in value. The people that sold it to me are the losers, because of inflation. But two years from now, unless we pull ourselves out of this economic mess, maybe I'll be the loser too, because I can tell you what the land taxes in our area are doing and I hate to go on a tangent there, but the point being, it's pretty easy for governments today rather than base tax on income, it's a lot easier to put it on a fixed basis on the land. We're seeing it almost in every aspect today of our education. More and more, every day, it's being tied in as a fixed cost against an acre of land.

I think that whole argument deserves some comment by the members opposite, I really do; at least the Minister, because I haven't heard one member yet address that particular point.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have much more to say on this particular area. I think the points I've tried to make are that, if you focus in on a certain period of time on speculation, yes, you'll see some things you don't like, but if you look at it over a period of time, it will even out. The flows will come and you'll never totally remove speculation. You can't do it in any other way.

Mr. Speaker, we saw what you try to do when you try to control the market and we've heard the Minister and we can talk ad infinitum about the way grain prices in this world are determined, and of course it's very surprising that those very organizations that run down the Chicago Board of Trade, the price setter of world grain prices, are the very same people though who when they want a price on something don't realize that's where it's all set. It's all done and a lot of it is done because of speculation; it's a price-setting mechanism and it's not perfect but it's all we have. You can go the other route; you can attempt to fix prices like OPEC did. Tremendously successful. For what period of time? For about six or seven years, but then it breaks down. That's why, when we talk about speculation, and I'm not a great admirer of it, but I realize why it's there; I realize it will always be there and what role it has to play in the price-setting mechanism. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I don't have the time to do that, I would love to get onto that.

Speculation, Mr. Speaker, assumption of unusual business risk in hopes of obtaining commensurate gain, in hopes, unusual business risk. Risk, Sir, means you can win or you can lose. You don't always win; you lose sometimes, just like my aunt and uncle lost 10 years ago, because of inflation. Except they had no control over that, absolutely none; none whatsoever, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to rest my case. I believe that this bill will do irreparable harm to the farm situation in Manitoba and I would hope that other members would see the wisdom of putting the six-month hoist to this bill.

Thank you.

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

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 87, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Bill No. 87, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. (Stand)
The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I had sent a list of bills that the opposition was prepared to deal with; that was not one of them. Perhaps the Honourable Acting Government House Leader would like to call Bill 54 which is standing in his name.

MR. SPEAKER: 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)
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 35. It's on Page 2, Mr. Speaker, Debate on Third Reading, Bill No. 35.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 35, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (Stand)
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 50, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 50, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (stand)
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 57.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 57. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (stand)
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 73, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill No. 73. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (stand)

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 76, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Bill

No. 76. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 18, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 30, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 30, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo. (stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 31, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 31, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Swan River. (stand)

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 47, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 47, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. (stand)
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 48, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 55, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 55, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. (stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 74, Mr. Speaker.

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)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Bill No. 34, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker. It looks like honourable members across the way are reluctant to speak. We'll try them on the Constitutional Amendment Resolution on Page 7, Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable Member for Emerson is present and I know he's anxious to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution by the Honourable First Minister standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson. (stand)

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition the other day indicated that was a secretarial resolution and really didn't require any consideration by implication from this House. I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, whether the Honourable Member for Emerson now would be prepared to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether the Acting Government House Leader was on a point of order or just what he was on, Sir, but I believe that he should be aware that it's a tradition and practice of the House that members can stand items for debate when they're not prepared to speak at the time. It's not for the government to determine — (Interjection) — when members of the opposition should speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members, I believe that the matter was stood by the Honourable Member for Emerson and agreed to.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain.

It's my understanding that the request to allow a matter to stand is done by leave and is not a tradition that is automatically granted which the Member for Turtle Mountain seems to assume. I think it is at the will of the House to require that a member speak when that item is called.

MR. SPEAKER: If no other member wishes to speak to that point of order, the Honourable Member for Springfield is technically correct, but it has become such a practice in this Chamber, I believe that it is almost automatic that if a member wishes a matter to stand that it is done.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, that on the understanding there's no Private Members' Hour, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. Monday.