



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. 153 - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 18 August, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 18 August, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

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

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Committee met on April 28, May 3, May 31, June 7 and August 18, 1983 to consider the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member of any Committee from Mr. S. Cherniak, Chairman of the Board, Mr. J. Arnason, President and Chief Executive Officer, and Mr. A.K. McKean, Assistant Vice-President, Finance, with respect to all material pertaining to the Annual Report and the business of Manitoba Hydro. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

Your Committee examined the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1982, and adopted the same as presented.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, Standing Committee Report, I'd like to present the Second Report on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Committee met on Thursday, August 18, 1983 and heard representations with respect to the Constitutional Amendment on Aboriginal Rights as follows:

Mr. Eric Robinson & Chief Raymond Swan,  
Brotherhood of Indian Nations  
Mr. Jack Fleming, Manitoba Metis Federation  
Mr. Don Glays, Manitoba Wildlife Federation

Chief Joe Guy Wood, Chief Jim Bear, Chief Walter Monias and Mr. Colin Gillespie, Constitutional Committee of Chiefs, Standing Committee of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs.

Your Committee recommends the proposed constitutional amendment respecting Aboriginal Rights to the Legislative Assembly.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Committee met on August 15, 16, and 17, 1983 and heard representations with respect to the Bills before the Committee as follows:

Bill 3 The Farm Lands Ownership Act; Loi sur la propriété agricole,

Mr. Yude Henteleff, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties.

Mr. Kent Magarrell, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce,

Mr. Walter Kroeker, Kroeker Farms Ltd.,

Mr. Garland Laliberté, Manitoba Institute of Agrologists,

Mr. Lorne Parker, Manitoba Farm Bureau,

Mr. Rod Fowler, Ducks Unlimited Canada,

Mr. Don Glays, Manitoba Wildlife Federation,

Mr. Robert Tyler, Manitoba Real Estate Board,

Mr. A. Goddard, Manitoba Chamber of Commerce.

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 3 The Farm Lands Ownership Act; Loi sur la propriété agricole,

Bill No. 23 An Act to amend The Real Property Act (2),

Bill No. 24 An Act to amend The Registry Act (2),

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, on division.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Radisson that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Fifth Report of the Committee on Industrial Relations.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your Committee met on Wednesday, August 17, 1983 and heard representations with respect to Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, as follows:

Mr. Frank Speed, Vice-President and Actuary, Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association Inc.

Messrs. Alasdair McKeachan and Ross Rigney, Retail Council of Canada

Messrs. Jim Wright and Mark Fenny, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce

Mr. Dennis Sutton, Canadian Manufacturers' Association

Messrs. Dick Martin and John Walsh, Manitoba Federation of Labour

Mr. Donald Logan, Private Citizen

Dr. Linda Asper, Mr. David Lerner and Mr. Strang, Manitoba Teachers' Society

Mr. John Green, Great West Life

Mr. Andrew, J. Dawson, Director of Employee Benefits Manitoba Health Organizations, Inc.

Mr. Ted Paterson, Chairman, United Way Agencies Employees Benefits Plan

Mr. Norman Bergman, Executive Director, Manitoba Chamber of Commerce

Mr. John Turnbull, Turnbull & Turnbull, Consulting Actuaries

Mr. W. Templin, MacLeods Stedman.

Written Submissions: Y.W.C.A.  
The Mining Association of Manitoba, Inc.

Your Committee has considered Bill No. 95, An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, on division.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Burrows.

**MR. C. SANTOS:** I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a report from the Public Trustee of Manitoba for the year ended March 31, 1983 and a Return under Section 30.2 of The Law Society Act to table.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 1983, for the Public Trustee of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motions . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Staff house at Jenpeg

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. This morning, in the Public Utilities Committee, Manitoba Hydro confirmed that it's presently constructing a \$3.8 million staff house at Jenpeg to accommodate the workers who must go to Jenpeg to keep this small generating station operating.

Can I ask the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, if this expenditure for rather an elaborate staff house for Hydro employees at Jenpeg received Cabinet scrutiny and, if so, did the Cabinet of Manitoba or the Government of Manitoba approve of this expenditure?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for Hydro will deal with that question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, the Capital request and the Capital spending plans of the Manitoba Hydro came before the Cabinet for scrutiny. This was an item that had been pared down from earlier estimates and, as indicated in the committee today, the Hydro staff had concluded that this was a less costly way of proceeding than to continue to maintain indefinitely the temporary camp where the workers were situated right now, so in dollar terms, it was projected by Hydro to be a saving over the long run.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Jenpeg station which is rated at somewhere around 136 megawatts per year is one of the smallest Hydro generating stations in the system except for the Winnipeg River stations; given the fact that the hydro that is generated from it is the most expensive hydro power produced in Manitoba at some 30 mills, I believe the statement was given to us this morning, as opposed to 12 mills from Long Spruce; given the fact that the people of Manitoba have had to pay over an exorbitant amount of some 3.5 millions of dollars for an arena at Cross Lake and are now into a situation where a bridge of a few million dollars is being proposed over Cross Lake because the variance of water levels due to the control structure and Jenpeg installation, would the government, along with Hydro, not now give serious

consideration to reviewing the viability of this whole sink-hole operation at Jenpeg and the control station to see whether these massive amounts of public money that are being expended to keep this white elephant in motion are indeed justified?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, the Chief Executive Officer of Hydro has indicated that, in his opinion, the control operation in fact provides a stable flow for the dams further down the Nelson River; that the Jenpeg Station itself is meeting carrying costs and into the future, as the costs of other power sources increase, Jenpeg over the long run, and it was always seen as a long-run investment, will in fact be of benefit to Manitoba. I would believe there are many jurisdictions in North America and in the world that would want to have assets like the Manitoba Hydro assets as an asset listing on its assets book, Mr. Speaker, including Jenpeg compared to the costs that so many other jurisdictions have to incur with respect to the development of hydro.

Jenpeg is an operation, Mr. Speaker, that can last for 100 to 200 years, and it requires some vision to understand that, something that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition doesn't have.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I was trying to direct the First Minister's attention to Jenpeg, not to the whole Hydro system. It's when Jenpeg is compared to the whole Hydro system that the futility of its being built in the first place becomes apparent to all reasonable people. Jenpeg with its Russian turbines that my honourable friends are so proud of, being the most inefficient station in Manitoba, my question to the First Minister again is, will he and his government not review the current economic viability of shutting that station down from time to time, because it costs an absolute fortune to keep it in operation all the time, not blow it up, just shut it down? That perhaps would save money for the taxpayers of Manitoba. Would he consider that option as a means of more efficiently running the Jenpeg Station, instead of building \$3.8 million so-called staff houses to keep an inefficient operation going?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I'll check the figures again, but the Chief Executive Officer of Hydro indicated that Jenpeg generates something in the order of \$23 million or \$24 million a year in revenue and I find now that the Leader of the Conservative Party is asking that that be shut down, so that Manitoba Hydro would lose \$24 million a year. I will check the figure to confirm what the Chief Executive Officer of Hydro said, that he said it generates \$23 million to \$24 million a year. Mr. Speaker, we will look at that. We certainly come back and determine whether, in fact, there's any logic whatsoever to what the Leader of the Opposition is trying to say, mainly that we close down a \$24 million generation facility.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, while the Minister is getting those figures, would he get the total capital cost of Jenpeg and of the control works, neither or which was recommended by anyone, other than Mr. Cass-Beggs, and we know of his reputation, what it is. Would he get the full cost of the control works and Jenpeg, the carrying costs, the operating costs and put all of those

into a composite, so that the people of Manitoba can see what a boondoggle this is and then come back and tell us that it is worth building another \$3.8 million staff house there to operate this socialist boondoggle?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, again the Leader of the Conservative Party is caught up with some rather untrue history.

**HON. S. LYON:** Read Tritschler.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, if one talks about a boondoggle, it's the boondoggle by the Conservative Government who set up a \$3 million or \$4 million witch hunt. That was the boondoggle by the Conservative Government, Mr. Speaker. Even the Tritschler enquiry indicated that . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** . . . the Nelson River Development was originally envisaged, both Lake Winnipeg regulation and the Churchill River Diversion were envisaged, Mr. Speaker, so to have the Leader of the Conservative Party, probably in his swan song, grasping at some remaking of history, try and call this whole development and the whole Hydro development in Northern Manitoba a boondoggle, is a complete distortion of the facts.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister, if he's able to answer any questions. The question to the First Minister, is not the whole Hydro system - after all the Conservatives built most of the good parts of it - the question, Mr. Speaker, is about Jenpeg, the Cass-Beggs boondoggle.

Will the First Minister not seriously cause a review to be made into the continued operation of the whole scheme at Jenpeg including the control works, given the massive amounts of money that the public of Manitoba are now having to pay, \$3.5 million for an arena at Cross Lake; a few million now for a bridge at Cross Lake; 1.7 million for trapping losses at Cross Lake; \$750,000 for other losses at Cross Lake; a staff house of 3.8 million, which I mentioned before; all of these accumulating losses, will the First Minister not have his government take a look at the continued viability of operation of the Jenpeg water control mess that was built there under the guidance of Mr. Cass-Beggs - wrongfully built, as the Tritschler Report proved, Mr. Speaker, wrongfully built - will he not have that matter revised now so that the people of Manitoba will not continue to pay further millions of dollars into this sinkhole of socialist depravity?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** In response to that question which in fact shows the wear and tear that the Leader of the Opposition has been exposed to over the last three months, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives were in office for four years, if they wanted to close down Jenpeg, they certainly had the opportunity at that time to do so. They didn't do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about are long-term development investments, and the Chief Executive

Officer of Hydro today indicated that, in his estimation, over the long run that facility, in fact, has a lot of implications in terms of run-of-the-river generation for the plants downstream. We also indicated there is a long-term study under way. We also indicated that we're prepared to pool together that information, Mr. Speaker, and that in no way gives any type of credence to the type of debate and the type of personal attacks that the Leader of the Conservative Party is so wont to undertake and has been doing so for the last five or six years.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when we return to the next Session of the Legislature, when it resumes, that we won't have that type of name-calling constantly taking place in this House with respect to people who, I think, made considered judgments in the past for the well-being of Manitobans, not only for the next 10 years or 30 years, Mr. Speaker, but for future generations and for the generations to follow them.

### Financial problems of horsemen

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Economic Development. In view of the fact that in 1982 Assiniboia Downs went into receivership and in 1983 there have been two purse reductions already, both events of which caused severe hardship on the horse industry in Manitoba, and the horsemen, as I understand it, are facing severe financial problems which may jeopardize the balance of this racing season, what action is the Minister or her department taking currently on the matter?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the track has been experiencing lower levels of attendance and betting, common to the experience to tracks right across the country. The horsemen, in working out their arrangements for purses and for their share of the monies raised, negotiate with the track owner. The role of the government in this industry is to regulate it and see that it is well-run and that everything is carried out in an upright way.

Our prime responsibility is not to interevene in the negotiating between the horsemen and the track. I think one of the difficulties for any group in negotiating is that people always live with hope of growth and improvement, and one thing we've learned from the recessionary times is that people must learn to plan for either a leveling-off or a decline as well as for an improvement, and we've been working with the horsemen to see if that kind of realism can be injected into the negotiating. But we also are keeping under regular review, our tax level and our relationship with the track to see if there is any change that's appropriate.

At the present time, though, we have no new arrangement to announce.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the horse-breeding and horse-raising industry in

Manitoba has an investment in terms of millions and millions of dollars and, in fact, annually results in millions of dollars of benefits to the economy of Manitoba and the track itself is probably Manitoba's largest tourist attraction, can the Minister assure us that her department is involved in this and is going to see to it that the track does not close down for the balance of the season and that, in fact, the horsemen have a viable operation not only for this year but for the future years?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, there are elements of the track operation that we have direct influence over, but there are other elements that are really the responsibility of the organizations of horsemen and the track owners. It would inappropriate for us to intervene or to tell them how to conduct those negotiations. The best we can do is to be sure to the extent that we are responsible for seeing that they have accurate information as to our policy and that they are also reporting regularly to the commission so that their responsibility can be carried out. It really is not appropriate for us to place ourselves between those two groups who are, in a way, negotiating what an appropriate level of take for each party is. To the extent that our good offices can be used to assist them, we are able to assist, but it is not our direct responsibility to determine that negotiation.

### Jobs Fund

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister.

Two days ago, the First Minister tabled some information pertaining to the Jobs Fund and the amount of money that has been committed. That indicates that \$82 million has been committed on the budgetary side of the Jobs Fund. Can the First Minister indicate to the House how much of that \$82 million has actually been spent, to this point?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice, as to the actual amount of dollar cash flow up to this point, of the \$82 million. As I indicated to the honourable member, there is in excess of \$82 million that has been approved, in view of the cash flow, much of it which will probably spill into the next fiscal year, '83-84.

As to what has flowed up to this point, I would have to take that question as one of notice and communicate that to the member, hopefully tonight or, if not, by private correspondence subsequent to same.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A supplementary to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister indicate, to this date, approximately how many jobs have been created through the expenditure of money flowing from the Jobs Fund?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the number of jobs that have been created up to this point is in the neighbourhood of 8,000 jobs.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. Can he indicate whether that is based upon a projected cash flow for the entire approval for those projects or is that based upon actual cash flowed and actual jobs created, to this point in time?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in the month of July, there were some 7,000 that were actually employed as a result of Jobs Fund projects that had been announced - 7,000. It is my understanding that the number has since risen now to in excess of 8,000 at this time in August. Of course, that number will increase very very significantly when the various construction projects that are now in process of design, pre-tender and tender are launched. Many of those will be, of course, launched and initiated during the fall and the main construction work to take place during the winter months, when we will see substantial increase again in the numbers that are working and receiving funds directly as a result of announcements made under the Jobs Fund Program.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A further question to the First Minister. Can he indicate to the House what constitutes a job? When the First Minister says there are 8,000 people working, 8,000 jobs, what does that mean then, in terms of the number of weeks that a person works; or does it mean that someone might be employed for a period of three weeks and then laid off, or is there some kind of average figure that he could give us?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it means a restoration of some human dignity, no longer having to receive a welfare cheque or an unemployment cheque, that's No. 1. No. 2, it means a contribution on the part of an individual in contributing towards construction, towards the development of projects of lasting value, lasting return, insofar as the Province of Manitoba and certainly, Mr. Speaker, insofar as those that are involved and are collecting pay cheques, it means a great deal. In fact, I'm surprised that there should be any wonderment as to what it means to have a job.

There are, I must say, some 1.4 million Canadians that wish this very day that they could have a job and could return and could meet with their families, knowing that they were contributing in a meaningful way towards the construction of lasting value in the country of which they are residents.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the First Minister knows that, of 1.4 million, 46,000 of the unemployed are in Manitoba. I don't understand the First Minister's sensitivity. The question was simply, what definition is he using for a job? Does it mean that person has an average of 26 weeks employment or 15 weeks employment? We're simply trying to determine what the impact has been, and surely that's the sort of information that the First Minister would have at hand. If he's going to continue with hundreds of thousands of dollars of advertising on radio and television to tell people about the benefits of the Jobs Fund, perhaps he could tell us what that definition is.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, first let me indicate to the honourable member that if we did not have a Jobs Fund in the Province of Manitoba, rather than

looking at 46,000-47,000 unemployed, as is the present case in the Province of Manitoba, we'd be looking at somewhere in the neighbourhood of 54,000 unemployed in the Province of Manitoba. That's fact 1. Fact 2, Mr. Speaker, the jobs, of course, vary. If an electrician is hired to do work, for example, on the Earth Sciences Building, if a carpenter is hired to do work insofar as the Western Aviation Museum is concerned, the job will last to the extent that the project itself continues.

I want to just for a moment, because it is essential that we underline, Mr. Speaker, this very important fact, because it appears too many are not sensitive to this. The more jobs that are created, that is paid by wages for goods and services in our society, the more that is spent in our society, the more manufacturers are required to produce, the more investment that takes place within our economy, the greater is the opportunity towards us moving towards full employment.

Mr. Speaker, the message is clear; the message is decisive. What this country needs, in fact, what each and every province requires in this country is emphasis upon jobs and that being the fundamental direction that we ought to be undertaking as governments in this country.

**HON. S. LYON:** Why don't you do your job then?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Can the First Minister just give an indication of what the average length of employment would be for one of these 7,000 people who has a job? What would the average length be? Surely that is not an unreasonable question to ask of the First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the average length is. It varies from position to position, whether it be the carpenter that I mentioned, whether it be the welder, whether it be the electrician. In some instances, they are shorter in term; in other situations, Mr. Speaker, they are long-term jobs that are created within the given situation. Mr. Speaker, what is - and I want to make this again clear to the honourable member because apparently he missed the contents of my earlier remarks - important is the creation of jobs during this difficult time and, through the creation of jobs, you ensure that cash flows through the economy, purchases are undertaken, manufacturers increase their production, investment takes place and jobs become permanent within society.

Jobs are not going to become permanent if governments continue to sit on their butts and do nothing, Mr. Speaker.

### Manitoba Beef Commission

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. The other day I asked the Minister of Agriculture some questions dealing with the selling operations of livestock in the operations of the Manitoba Beef Commission. The Minister replied that the livestock the Beef Commission

had to sell were offered on a bid basis to the packinghouse industry. If only one packer bids on a lot of cattle, Mr. Speaker, are those cattle sold?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice, if there is only one bidder. I am assuming - and the member may want to elaborate a bit further - he is speaking about the situation in Brandon?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** No, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about the total operation of the Beef Commission and I can elaborate a little bit more. Can the Minister confirm, when he's checking into it, Mr. Speaker, that the cattle are assembled in such lots, in such mixed amounts of A and B and C Grade livestock, that in fact, only one packing plant is able to bid on those cattle in the province and they are, in fact, being sold on a one-bid basis? Will he check that out, as well, Mr. Speaker?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know all the details of the workings of the marketing section of the Beef Commission, but I can say to the member this, that it is not my understanding that the cattle are being assembled in such a way as to favour one bidder. In fact, if one looks at the records of the Commission being involved in the market, over the last few months since they've started up, their bids or quotes on lots sold by the Commission have been, I believe, in percentage terms, and in cent per pound terms, higher on an average than has been the case if animals were sold in a different way.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to provide for the House, for the Opposition, and for the people of the province, all of the bids that have been presented to the Commission on cattle, whether it's on a one-bid basis, whether they're sold on a one-bid basis or not. The information, as well, provided to us the other day, Mr. Speaker, was that the Canada Packers had purchased well over 50 percent of the livestock from the Beef Commission, and Canada Packers, as well - and I'll ask the Minister if this correct - Canada Packers as well is the only packinghouse that can, in fact, bid on some of the lots of cattle that are offered and have purchased over 50 percent?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that Canada Packers, historically, in the cattle industry has purchased, I believe, in the neighbourhood of 50 percent or more of the cattle produced. In fact, in speaking with the packers, dealing with their plant, they could, as I'm advised, double and triple their capacity of killing if the numbers of animals were available to them and they could put through that many more animals. Unfortunately, as the member knows, over the last number of years our cow herd and, of course, subsequently our supply of calves and finished animals has declined proportionately and the numbers of animals aren't there. But the historical relationship of Canada Packers per se, as the member

questions, they have always purchased in that range of cattle in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to check out precisely, if that is the case, as I presented it, that Canada Packers are buying the cattle from the Beef Commission on a one-bid basis, thereby eliminating all other packers because of the way in which the cattle are assembled, and Canada Packers are the only ones able to use it.

As well, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that the General Manager of the Beef Commission is the former head cattle buyer for Canada Packers?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say clearly that the Commission, in its marketing practices, calls all the available buyers, both within, and who are known to purchase cattle, within the province and might be buying from outside the province, in terms of cattle, all the buyers are contacted.

Mr. Speaker, the General Manager of the Beef Commission was not the head buyer of Canada Packers, but Mr. Kruzenga was the head buyer of Canada Packers and he does head up our marketing branch in the Commission, but he is not the General Manager of the Commission.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, how many other former employees or employees from Canada Packers, are now working with the Manitoba Beef Commission?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that kind of question would have been asked of everyone in the administrative end of anyone who was being hired, and I can't answer that question, nor will I be able to readily get that information, but I can confirm that Mr. Kruzenga has had an outstanding career in the marketing of cattle and the purchasing of cattle in this province and is highly respected in the cattle industry for his knowledge of beef cattle on the marketing and the finishing end.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, no personal reflection on Mr. Kruzenga, but as the Minister has indicated, he was the head buyer for Canada Packers. Is it not the main job of the Manitoba Beef Commission to be the head seller? There is somewhat of a difference between buying and selling and I would think, Mr. Speaker, the Minister should take a look at the overall operation of the marketing of the Beef Commission, so that the taxpayers don't have to subsidize the system which he now has in place.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, on one hand, the member argues that somehow there may be some relationship and I reject that categorically. I want to tell the honourable member that while he is arguing now that there may be some relationship, if we did not get qualified people who knew the beef industry, from the marketing side and from the raising side and the finishing side, he would then be accusing us of hiring a whole bunch of incompetents to run a Beef Commission. We have gone out and hired who we consider some of the best people in the industry and, Sir, we stand behind them and I think they're doing an



excellent job in getting the best price for our farmers in Manitoba.

### Order for Return re Jobs Fund

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the First Minister. Could he advise if he will be providing to the House today the information requested in the Order for Return, which I filed with respect to the details of the hundreds of thousands of dollars being spent on advertising of the Jobs Fund by this government and, if not, how long does he intend to hide that information from public review?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** First, Mr. Speaker, I reject any suggestion in the member's question - and I think he is doing it in lightness rather than otherwise - that there's any attempt to hide. The information will be provided just as soon as it reaches my desk and I will ensure that it is then forwarded on to the member.

### Hiring of communications officer

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the First Minister. How can the First Minister and his government justify, in the light of the fact that they have burdened Manitobans with the highest deficit in the history of this province this year, in hiring another communications officers, this one in the Department of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources which is being advertised for up to \$42,000 per year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** That is the upper range and the honourable member need not leave any impression that that will be the actual sum that will be involved. Mr. Speaker, I, again, refer the honourable member to statements that we made earlier that this government is not expending more funds, in respect to those that are involved in communications, than the previous government. We have a responsibility, as did the previous government, to communicate with the people of the Province of Manitoba to ensure that Manitobans are conscious and are aware of the programs that are available to them, and that is a need that was recognized by the previous administration, the administration prior to that. This government is not increasing the number of actual people that are involved in respect to communications, we are simply carrying on with that responsibility which we have, and that is to ensure that Manitobans receive information in respect to the many many programs that are provided by this government.

I know honourable members across the way would be delighted if the government ceased to communicate, and all that the public received was from their communicators distorting the different programs that the government is providing to Manitobans; that would delight honourable members across the way, Mr. Speaker. We intend to ensure that government

programs are communicated to Manitobans as has been done under the Schreyer administration; it's been done under the Lyon Administration, and will be done under this administration.

### Bus industry - difficult times

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

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable First Minister regarding the subject matter we were just talking about right, the creation of jobs in this province.

One industry in this province that has been facing difficult times is the bus industry. Can I ask the First Minister why he refused to ride in a bus in Toronto when he was down there at a recent Premier's Conference, instead saw fit to ride in a limousine and cast a slur, not only on the industry but the employees, the people that manufacture buses in this province. Why would he not ride in a bus?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Let me advise the honourable members, like each of the 10 Premiers, at times we walked, at times we bicycled, at times we rode in the bus, at times we rode — (Interjection) — oh, the honourable member says limousines. I want to say in fairness to the Bill Davis Conservative Government, that they don't provide their Ministers, their Conservative Ministers in Ontario, with limousines; they provide them with cars of a similar description as the car that was available to the former First Minister in this province and . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . those vehicles were made available to each of the Premiers, and I would like to table a telegram, Mr. Speaker, from the Premier's Office in Ontario pointing out that that which was provided to the Premier of the Province of Manitoba was also provided to the Premier, by courtesy of the Ontario Government, to each of the other nine Premiers in Canada.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard the eulogy of the First Minister on this subject matter and of his job creation fund. I'm only referring to the article in today's Winnipeg paper. Could I ask the First Minister, would he not have been better advised to go and ride in a bus and say, look, we need jobs in Manitoba, we want to create jobs, we want to sell buses; wouldn't he have been better advised to take

his staff on the Toronto Transit System and say, look, could we sell you guys some buses like this one, or even better than this. Wouldn't he have been better advised to ride the bus?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Let me tell the Honourable Member for Russell I'd prefer to walk and I do walk when I have the opportunity and the time to do it. I'd sooner walk than ride a pony, than to ride a bus, or to ride in a car and, given the appropriate opportunity, Mr. Speaker, let me assure the honourable member I'd prefer to walk it's better for one's health.

### Children's Aid Society

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, would the First Minister say that when he was out walking on the streets with his colleagues, the other First Ministers, that it was a case of the bland leading the bland? Although that actually was not my question. Actually, Mr. Speaker, the thought just came to me, but I want to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Consumer Services and ask him that now that he is rushing headlong towards the end of what has been a very difficult session for him, and a very difficult session for the child welfare system in this province, can he advise the House when he intends to dismantle the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg and replace it with six smaller independent agencies?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this subject on other occasions, during the discussions bill, during our Estimates, and we have had various discussions, I guess, in the public media, but what we intend to do, Mr. Speaker, is to proceed methodically with the co-operation of people who are concerned and interested in improving qualities of services for children and their families in the City of Winnipeg. We are going to do this with the co-operation of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg and Eastern; we're going to do this with the co-operation of professional workers; we're going to do it with the co-operation of people who are interested and concerned, as we are, and as this government is in improving the quality of services and care for children in need in this province.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I understand all that and I've heard it all before, so has everybody else on this side of the House. That was not my question, Sir, my question, which is related to the fact that the Minister is not interested in announcing it in this House, and will do so outside the House when the Legislature is not in Session, my question to him is what is the target date, when is he going to dismantle CAS Winnipeg and replace it with those other agencies?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Member for Fort Garry is wrong in his earlier question when he alludes to the fact that the passage of Bill 107

dismantles the CAS Winnipeg because that doesn't happen, that doesn't occur with that bill. That bill simply relates to the makeup of the Board of Directors of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, whether the Board of Directors changes or not does not affect a reorganization or a dismantling of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, not at all. So the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is wrong on that particular issue.

I indicate to him, as I've indicated public in the past, that we are working on a major revision to the Child Welfare Act of Manitoba which will be brought in next year; that we have a lot of homework to do, a lot of research to do and then that work is being done in co-operation with the broad community out there who is as concerned as we are, and I hope the Member for Fort Garry shares our concerns, as concerned as we are to have a better system than we've had to date. Far better so that we can minimize litigation in courts; so that we can reduce the costs per child spent by this very large Children's Aid Society we have in Winnipeg; so that we can have a system that is more community based, a system that is more culturally relevant and a system that is going to be more sensitive to the needs of children in this province. We care about the children, we care about these families in need, the members across the way can be flippant about it but we're going to do something about it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired. Are members prepared to proceed?

### COMMITTEE CHANGES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a committee change under Privileges and Elections: Brown for Gourlay.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Riel.

**MRS. D. DODICK:** Mr. Speaker, I have a committee change under Privileges and Elections: The Member for The Pas for the the Member for St. James.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, by agreement with the Opposition House Leader, the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections will meet immediately in one of the committee rooms to consider some of its organizational work. The business of the House will continue and the Deputy House Leader will be calling business, the first item of which will be the Aboriginal Resolution.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: ABORIGINAL RIGHTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister, proposed Resolution

regarding Aboriginal Rights, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to see the resolution go.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to participate in this debate primarily due to a number of questions which were addressed to the House and to members on this side by the Member for Turtle Mountain during his contribution to the debate on the resolution. I will be brief in my comments in that much that has been said before me has been done so much more eloquently and in much more detail than I could do on this occasion. However, I do want to specifically answer the questions as much as is possible that were put forward by the Member for Turtle Mountain.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the resolution was passed unanimously in the House of Commons on June 29, 1983. The Senate, on the same day, adjourned debate on the resolution, referring it to a Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs for the purposes of further study and report back. The Senate is holding hearings on the resolution on September 7th to the 9th of this year, and I am informed that it will most likely resume sitting on September 22, 1983. The Legislatures of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Alberta have also adopted the resolution by way of similar motions in their respective Houses. It has been tabled in Ontario, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and, of course, in Manitoba.

Without going into the detail on the resolution, I do want to specifically address some of the specific questions that the Member for Turtle Mountain put to us.

The first question was one concerning the effect of Section 25(b) in regard to the Northern Flood Agreement and perhaps the Forebay Agreements in Manitoba. That section, of course, read previously that "... any rights or freedoms that now exist by way of land claims or agreements or may be so acquired..." in the previous amendment to the Constitution; the amendment as it reads now talks about "... existing treaty rights that may now exist by way of land claims settlements or may be so acquired..."

The Member for Turtle Mountain asked the question as to what effect that retroactive provision of the new wording would have in respect to the Northern Flood Agt. We both had opportunity this morning, during the committee hearings on this matter, to seek advice and to hear comments mostly by way of opinions as to any suggested impact. I learned by way of those conversations and dialogues that others are of the opinion, firstly, that if indeed it were to constitutionalize the Northern Flood Agreement and the Forebay Agreements, the impact, in actuality, would not be significant. We heard from a learned lawyer to that effect. At the same time, we heard that same individual say that he could not give an opinion as to whether or not this particular provision would bring under the Constitution those two agreements. Not being a lawyer and not having studied the matter in fullness enough

to be able to suggest differently, I would have to accept - and I heard no other differences expressed in the committee - that in fact that would be the case.

I also have to indicate that it was not the intention of those individuals who are reviewing the drafting of the amendment at the time it was being put forward for approval by those at the Constitutional Conference that such would be the case. The First Minister, in his comments on debate on this item in this House, suggested that that provision was designed to apply more or less to settlements such as the James Bay Agreement and similar settlements.

I am not of the opinion, nor have I heard others express the opinion, that the Northern Flood Agreement is similar in enough respects to be placed in the same category as the James Bay Agreement. As a matter of fact, we requested one of the persons making representation to the committee today to comment upon that. The question that was put to him directly was in the context of the dialogue which was ongoing about the constitutional amendment. Was he of the opinion that the Northern Flood Agreement was similar to the James Bay Agreement? He indicated - and I believe I understood him properly - that there were certain similarities in that they were agreements, but that there were a larger number of dissimilarities when put in the context of the Northern Flood Agreement. That is certainly the opinion of this government.

We had not intended that the Northern Flood Agreement be constitutionalized by way of this amendment. I heard of no remarks by others who were involved in the discussions at the time that that was an intention, and it certainly is our opinion that, in fact, that is not the effect. In other words, to state very clearly for the record, we do not believe that the constitutional amendment as put forward would improve the Northern Flood Agreement and/or the Grand Rapids Forebay Agreements.

Now that is an opinion, and I very carefully have crafted my words today to indicate that it is our opinion. It is a very strong opinion and one which we firmly hold. It is opinion based on our reading of it; it is an opinion based on our understanding of the discussions that went on in the preparation of that actual wording.

There may be those who disagree with that opinion and certainly the question which the Member for Turtle Mountain put forward is one that bears further consideration, but at this time we have not been advised of anything that would dissuade us from our original opinion that, in fact, we were not including those two agreements or any other agreement of that nature existing across the country, by way of adoption of this resolution.

We very specifically felt that it dealt with agreements such as the James Bay Agreement where there was extinguishment of treaty obligations. In the Northern Flood Agreement, that was not the case. There was a settlement proposed as a result of land that had been used for extinguishment purposes being reacquired by the province and compensation being paid for that.

So we believe that the significant difference between those agreements, in fact, differentiate enough to allow us to have the opinion that the Northern Flood Agreement and the Grand Rapids Forebay Agreements were not a part of the discussions and will not be affected by the passage of the resolution.

It might be important to note that the particular amendments which we're talking about now were adopted fairly much at the insistence of the ICNI and the AFN delegations at the March conference to safeguard the rights of their constituent organizations, who either had never formally entered into treaties or agreements with the Federal Government but are in the process of doing so as is the case with the ICNI, or who have already done so and wanted to see some protection afforded to those agreements, which is the case with the AFN and the James Bay situation.

These agreements are expressly referred to as modern treaties, and I put the word "modern" treaties in quote. They were referred to in that way at the March conference and the James Bay Agreement was cited as an example. The Federal Government refers to these as comprehensive settlements by the Federal Department of Indian Affairs Claims Policies Group. They are intended to extinguish aboriginal right where it continues to exist in non-treaty areas. They are quite different from the Northern Flood Agreement and Grand Rapids Forebay Agreement, which are basically compensation agreements concluded in areas long extinguished of aboriginal title through the signing of specific treaties.

I hope that has answered the questions of the Member for Turtle Mountain. I have attempted to provide him with what I believe was the intent of the drafters of the particular amendment. I've done that because he, himself - and I agree - indicated that if that amendment were taken to court, it might be helpful to have on the record, very explicitly so, some reference as to the intentions behind the wording. I hope that I have been able to allay some of his concerns by providing my perception of what transpired as part of that drafting, and the opinion of the government as to the effect of the amendment as it now stands. I'd be pleased to elaborate upon it by way of questions after my contribution if he feels that might be required.

The other question which he had was in respect to the proposed Section 35(4) which provides, quote: "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the aboriginal and treaty rights referred to subsection (1) are guaranteed equally to male and female persons."

This amendment was brought about by the insistence of the Provincial Government and other organizations contained within the umbrella Indian organizations. As the Member for Turtle Mountain clearly suggested, and he is right in his opinion, there was some concern about the impact of that agreement by delegations representing Indian organizations. They suggested that the matter of who was a member of a Band was a matter that would be reserved to that Band to decide. Of course, The Indian Act says differently and there is an ongoing debate that is not new and is not settled, around that particular issue. What we attempted to accomplish in the drafting of this particular section was to indicate that there were equality provisions in respect to the aboriginal rights referred to in subsection (1). It does not extend rights, but it just says, where those rights exist they shall exist equally and shall be guaranteed equally to male and female persons.

The clause specifically addresses the problem within The Indian Act legislation which denies Indian status and attendant rights of Indian women who marry non-Indian persons and also confers Indian status to non-Indians who marry status Indian males.

I do not want to speak on behalf of the Indian organizations at this time but I do want to indicate to members of House who were not present at the committee meetings, what they had to say when questioned directly on this item by the Member for Turtle Mountain.

The question - and I believe it is one that bears some consideration and certainly was appropriate to address at that time - was, would this mean that if a non-Indian male married a status Indian woman, would the non-Indian, non-status male obtain status by act of that marriage. Or does it mean, conversely, that if a status Indian male marries a non-status Indian woman, as is the case now, the non-status Indian woman attains status?

They indicated a couple of things: 1. They believe that the matter of Band membership is a matter that the Bands should decide internally and, 2. I think two representatives or two Chiefs of two Bands stated very clearly that, no, they did not believe that this would require a Band to give status to a male who was non-status who married a status Indian woman. I concur with their interpretation of the particular amendment, although there are some differences of opinion that exist in that regard as well. But again, it was to make certain that rights were guaranteed equally and not to extend or derogate from rights that existed already.

I don't believe that I can add more to that answer, other than to reference individuals to the particular debate which went on in the committee hearings.

I hope that we have been able to answer the two main questions which the Member for Turtle Mountain requested us to review. Of course, as I indicated earlier, if he wishes to ask further questions, I will attempt to answer them at this time, if possible, or to return with the answer at a later date, if that is not possible.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to the committee which commended this resolution to the House. It provides an opportunity for an ongoing process to deal with some very complex issues in what I believe to be the appropriate fashion, through political representatives of respective organizations who will be affected by any such changes and in an atmosphere of mutual trust and co-operation.

For that reason I commend it to you and look forward to the ongoing constitutional conferences which are mandated by this particular amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that he would entertain a question and I have at least two questions that I'd like to put to the Minister.

He indicated this morning that we had listened to submissions and opinions expressed by chiefs and by a lawyer who was in fact representing the Indian Bands. But did the government seek advice from any constitutional lawyers with respect to the possible meaning and ramifications that might flow from this amendment?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** I'm aware, generally, that we have sought advice in that regard. I would have to refer you

specifically to the Attorney-General to provide details as to the occasions on which we sought that advice and the direct advice that was forthcoming. I had asked staff of my own department who had been involved with this matter to review it and to seek advice, as well. The comments which I have provided to you today are in part their response and, of course, in part an analysis of my personal reflections on the process as a participant.

But, yes, we have sought such advice to perhaps try to anticipate the second question, or another question. The advice is such that one can, at the end of all that review and analysis, say there still is a question that remains unanswered. However, the opinion and the consensus, as much as is possible to develop around this issue, seems to indicate that, in fact, the Northern Flood Agreement and the Grand Rapids Forebay Agreement would not be constitutionalized by this particular amendment, but there is a difference of opinion among experts, as oftentimes there are on matters such as this.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, then the Minister would undertake to provide us with some copies of the opinion if the opinion is a written opinion.

One further question, I want to have this phrased in such a way that it isn't ruled out of order by seeking a legal opinion, I'm interested in whether or not the Minister can give an indication, if he knows of situations where an Indian woman marrying a non-Indian man has been deprived of aboriginal rights through application of The Indian Act.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Again, that's a question that I would have to take as notice and, in response to the other suggestion, I indicated the Attorney-General had undertaken some of that activity, my staff had undertaken some of that activity. If there are written opinions I'll certainly be prepared to forward them to the member opposite.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Can the Minister tell me whether or not an Indian woman then who has married a non-Indian man loses any rights, at the moment? Does that woman lose any rights that she otherwise would have by way of being a band member or having treaty status?

**HON. J. COWAN:** My general perception is that she does; perhaps, the Member for Rupertsland, who is far better versed in this particular subject, might want to elaborate upon the specifics if you have questions as to how that would apply specifically. If I understand your question correctly, yes, they would lose certain rights which accrue to them by way of status.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question before the House is the proposed resolution by the Honourable First Minister referring to Aboriginal Rights. Do you wish the resolution read?

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Acting Government House Leader.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we go to Report Stage on Bill 87 and Bill 60.

## REPORT STAGE

### BILL 87 - THE WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill 87 be concurred in?

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources

THAT subsection 40(1) of Bill 87, An Act to amend The Workplace Safety and Health Act be amended by striking out the words "or any addition to" in the 2nd line of Clause (c) thereof.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill 87, as amended, be concurred in?

The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, excuse me, Mr. Speaker, there is another amendment.

THAT Bill 87, An Act to amend The Workplace Safety and Health Act be amended by striking out the proposed subsection 40(1.1) of the Workplace Safety and Health Act set out in Section 6 thereof and substituting therefor the following subsections:

Exception of limitation to clause (1)(a).

40(1.1) Notwithstanding clause (1)(a), the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may designate an individual business office or retail store or classes of business offices or retail stores or similar workplaces where safety and health committee is not required to be established until the number of workers exceeds 50.

Determination of number of workers.

40(1.2) For the purposes of clauses (1)(a) and 41(1)(a) and the subsection (1.1) the number of workers employed at a workplace shall be determined by averaging over the previous 12 months the number of full and part-time workers present each working day.

I move that, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill 87, as amended, be concurred in?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, with leave, call third reading of Bill No. 87.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We have the vote on the concurrence before it is at third reading.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Very well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question before the House is shall the Report of the Committee on Bill 87, as amended, be concurred in?

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

### THIRD READING AMENDED BILLS

Bill No. 87, by leave, was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the Acting Government House Leader to proceed with Bill 60?

HON. A. MACKLING: I indicated Bill No. 60. I thought it was at the report stage but, no, it's at third reading stage and I believe it stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

### ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THIRD READING AMENDED BILLS

#### BILL 60 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT (2)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 60, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I have no more to say on the subject matter, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On division? Agreed on division. The Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Bills 14, 18, 36 and 47 on third readings.

### THIRD READING - AMENDED BILLS

#### BILL 14 - THE ELECTIONS ACT

HON. A. MACKLING presented Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Elections Act for third reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. S. LYON: On division.

MR. SPEAKER: On division. Agreed and so ordered.

#### BILL 18 - THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

HON. A. MACKLING presented Bill No. 18, The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Conflict of Interest Act for third reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

HON. S. LYON: On division.

MR. SPEAKER: On division? Agreed and so ordered.

Bill No. 36 was read a third time and passed.

#### BILL 47 - THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

HON. A. MACKLING presented Bill No. 47, The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. B. RANSOM: On division.

MR. SPEAKER: On division? Agreed and so ordered. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

### REPORT STAGE

#### BILL 48 - THE ELECTIONS FINANCES ACT

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 48, there is an amendment that has been circulated for report stage. By leave, we could deal with that or I think the rules may require that it cannot be dealt with until tonight but, by leave, I think we can deal with it now. By leave then, Mr. Speaker, I will move the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is leave to, we'll refer that bill to the report stage.

The question before the House then is shall the Report of the Committee on Bill No. 48 be concurred in?

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the motion that I present before you has been circulated and I will read it.

THAT Bill 48, The Elections Finances Act, be amended (a) — by striking out Section 37 thereof and substituting therefor the following section:

Contributions made at meeting.

37 Where any person in attendance at a meeting held by or on behalf of a candidate, constituency association or registered political party makes a contribution of \$25 or more to the candidate, constituency association or registered political party, the name and address of the contributor, and the value of the contribution, shall be recorded

(a) — in the case of a candidate or registered political party, by the chief financial officer; and

(b) — in the case of a constituency association, by the person responsible for the finances of the constituency association.

and

(b) — by striking out the words "naming or otherwise identifying" in the 1st line of clause 49(b) thereof and substituting therefor the words "supporting or opposing".

I so move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MOTION presented and carried.

QUESTION put on Bill 48 as amended, MOTION carried.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** On division on the amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division. Bill be reported, on division on the amendment.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

### THIRD READING - AMENDED BILLS

#### BILL 48 - THE ELECTIONS FINANCES ACT

**HON. A. MACKLING,** by leave, presented Bill No. 48, The Elections Finances Act for third reading.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. B. RANSOM:** On division?

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division.

**Bills Nos. 52 and 58 were each read a third time and passed.**

#### BILL 77 - THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented Bill No. 77, The Public Schools Act, for third reading.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** On division.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division, agreed and so ordered.

**Bills Nos. 82, 94, and 106 were each read a third time and passed.**

#### BILL 112 - THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1983)

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented Bill No. 17, The Statute Law Amendment Act for third reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, when this bill was in Law Amendments Committee, I proposed to the Attorney-General and the Government House Leader at that time that Section 9 of the Act and subsequent sections containing the same definition of a babysitter be amended. He said he would undertake to discuss the matter with the Minister of Labour.

I proposed, Mr. Speaker, that the exception, which has been attempted to be included in The Employment Standards Act and other related acts, is a problem because it confines the definition of babysitter to a person who attends to the needs of a child in that child's home. We know, Mr. Speaker, from practical experience that parents take children in many many instances to the homes of babysitters and leave them

in the babysitter's home for the purpose of babysitting while they are at work.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat concerned although I did have an opportunity to enquire from the Minister of Labour earlier today. She indicated the Attorney-General had not spoken to her. She did not at that time express or seem to believe that my concern was a realistic one.

But the problem is, Mr. Speaker, in The Employment Standards Act with respect to the definitions that are now included in that act, I think there is a real problem in the definition or in the exemption that has been attempted to be provided here to babysitters because I don't think that the government is exempting the situation where people take children to a babysitter's home to be looked after. They, as a result, may very well come within the confines of The Employment Standards Act. I don't think that is really what is intended and I would have hoped that the Attorney-General and the Minister of Labour would have, as the Attorney-General indicated in committee, taken my proposal seriously and would propose an amendment at report stage, Mr. Speaker. But the government now, having taken no action, I want to be clear and be on the record that this situation which I have described is quite likely to happen, and we certainly are not supportive of this amendment as it stands, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Mr. Speaker, in regard to the comments made by the Member for St. Norbert, I do want to assure him that, after the committee meeting I did discuss it with the Minister of Labour. She did assure me, and clarified for my satisfaction, that the amendment, as laid out, is adequate to meet his concerns, that it does exclude babysitters where their sole job is babysitting and not any other domestic tasks. I feel that the amendment, in this particular piece of legislation, meets his needs and meets the needs of people who are babysitting in other people's homes, and taking care of people who are infirmed in other people homes, and not doing any other kinds of domestic duties. If they are, of course, then they would be required to be paid the minimum wage as under the legislation we passed last Session, but with this amendment, if their sole duty was to babysit or to care for someone who is infirmed, they would be excluded.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the member a question, if she would accept it, and I would ask her if, as I did, did she speak to Legislative Counsel, or did she rely on the legal opinion of the Minister of Labour?

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** No, I did not speak personally to Legislative Counsel, who was at the committee meeting. I spoke to my Minister who, I assumed, had clarified it to her own satisfaction and I think that we will try the matter as it will now proceed under this amendment.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The question before the House is the proposed Third Reading of Bill No. 112.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** On division.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division, agreed and so ordered.

### THIRD READING

**Bills Nos. 38, 74, 79, 103 and 114 were each read a third time and passed.**

#### BILL 107 - THE CHILD WELFARE ACT

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented Bill No. 107, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act (2) for third reading.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** On division.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division.

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

**Bill 114 was read a third time and passed.**

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, there were a number of bills that were dealt with by committee earlier on today, or yesterday, I'm sorry, that are not on the Order Paper but, by leave, we can deal with them.

They are Bills No. 3, 23, 24 and 95.

#### BILL 3 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented, by leave, Bill No. 3, The Farm Lands Ownership Act, for third reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill No. 3 as put forward by this government, is very much similar to Bill 54 which the Minister of Agriculture was wise enough to withdraw from the earlier Session of this Legislature, and the principles which we objected to then are still embodied in Bill No. 3 and we'll continue to oppose them.

We may be doing the Minister of Agriculture, what he thinks is a favour by allowing him to pass or to have leave to have Bill 3 passed in this third reading but we may be doing him a better favour politically if we were to disallow him to have the bill read and for it not to be put in place in the Province of Manitoba because, as was said in committee, Mr. Speaker, that will be one

of the campaign pledges that I'm sure the majority of the people of Manitoba will want us to put forward, that is, that it will be repealed. It's an imposition of discrimination against other Canadians. We continued to try to point out to the Minister of Agriculture that it is not in the best interests of the agriculture community; it is not in the best interests of all Manitobans or it's not in the best interests of Canadian unity to introduce such legislation.

He, to this date, has not put forward a sound debate saying that that is incorrect. All he uses is an example that Saskatchewan have similar legislation. Well, Saskatchewan legislation was passed by the same kind of government as we have in place in Manitoba, a new Democratic Government. Mr. Speaker, I believe that, given a little more time in Saskatchewan, one will see the changes made to that particular law that will allow other Canadians to buy in Saskatchewan. I would hope that the philosophy of that government would, after a few years of seeing what is happening, would come about. The case made as far as the Minister is concerned of PEI is a very poor example because of the very small land base which they are starting from, to start with, and the fact that the majority of that land in PEI was not being bought by corporations to farm, but was purchased by people wanting to holiday and recreational-type people from out of the province wanting to come in and absorb their agricultural land for other than agricultural use.

So the cases that he made are not very strong and, I think, going back again to the information that we have provided - not that he has provided but we have provided - that the majority of Manitobans feel strongly that other Canadians should not be restricted.

The Farm Bureau made it very clear. They put on the record that they believe that all Canadians should have the right to own property in Manitoba and that there was a mechanism available, if the Minister wanted to implement it, using the present legislation that's in place and The Canadian Citizenship Act and complimentary legislation that would, in fact, accomplish the kind of results that they felt was in the best interests of the people they represent.

Mr. Speaker, I will again go back and say that it's unfortunate for the people of Manitoba that we're seeing this kind of an imposition, this kind of law imposed upon the people when, in fact, it isn't going to accomplish what the Minister hopes to set out to accomplish to start with. He indicates that it's to try and stop speculative land buying and selling. The law does not stop an individual in Manitoba from buying and selling land as a Manitoban; the speculation as far as he or she are concerned is still there, they can still go out and buy land for a price today and sell it for more or less - remember, I'm sure in land speculation it always isn't profit making, that there are also downsides to it - that as an individual that can still be carried out, but if you want to do it through a corporate instrument, Mr. Deputy Speaker, then you can't do it.

For some reason as again was pointed out in committee by my colleague from Morris, it's the corporation that he has a hangup with. He has a hangup, if you're going to do it as far as a corporation is concerned you can't operate a farm or produce agriculture goods if you don't be a family farm. You have to be a family farm not just a straight corporate owner.



The other very valid points have been made by the opposition and by the people that presented briefs the other night and that is that the Minister of Agriculture and the New Democratic Government do not have statistics that back up the law that he's trying to pass; the need hasn't been demonstrated. The Minister again goes into a tirade about the kind of documentation that was coming forward to me from my department - unsigned documentation, mind you. Well, I don't have any problem, Mr. Speaker, standing here and saying there were a lot of things presented to me as Minister that I didn't pass on because I didn't believe that there was the urgent need in certain cases, on certain policies, not necessarily this one in some areas, in certain cases, but one does not want to be pushed or bullied by the bureaucracy.

Now, I think, it's the other way around in this case, that the Minister has gone out and made a commitment to the Manitoba or the National Farmers Union. Jackie Skelton is probably one of the people he has committed himself to to say, yes, we will pass this law. Coming from the background of the present Minister of Agriculture that he comes from, we know that the Farmers Union - and I've been told this by membership of the Farmers Union - not only do they believe that the government should control or tell the people of the province who should own land but as well there should be a price catalogue brought out on it and the government dictate what price should be paid for each parcel, and that it should be only farm people living on the land that can buy and sell land. That's basically what his philosophy is and if it isn't I would hope he would deny it.

Again, getting back to the statistical information, it isn't there. The Manitoba Institute of Agrologists again brought this point forward in their submission. They said, before you pass this kind of legislation do a review or a study of land ownership in the Province of Manitoba. How serious a problem is it? Give us a current, up-to-date, factual informational package which justifies what you're doing. The Minister doesn't respond to it; he said it was an election promise. I don't believe that there were too many people voted for the New Democratic Party because it was The Farm Land Ownership Bill that they said they were going to pass. I believe a lot of people voted for the NDP, which is the same as the Farmers Union, when they said that they would prevent them from losing their homes and their farms from high interest rates, that no one would lose their job and if they were going to lose their job they'd have to give them a years notice prior to the layoff.

Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of election promise that got these people elected. They promised the people of Manitoba that they wouldn't unfreeze the hydro rates. What have they done? Hydro rates, April 1st, went up 9.5 percent. That people's rents wouldn't go up that they'd have rent control and everything would be lovely in the housing field.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is how and why the New Democratic Party got elected. It wasn't on a platform of imposing some of the most discriminatory laws that we have ever seen passed in this Manitoba Legislature. In fact, it's so discriminatory that, again was pointed out, we have people sitting in this Assembly that because they want to own land through a corporate

structure and a non-farming corporate structure, they are disallowed to continue to do business in a manner in which they've traditionally done through freedom of buying and selling and leasing of property that may be advantageous to their business. Yet if someone owns it through their family farm corporation or as an individual, that is quite all right. I don't think that it is our job as legislative people to pass discriminatory laws. I believe that fairness has to apply.

The point again was made in committee and by presentations made by the Real Estate Association when the attachment of one letter and presentation from a young woman, Dawn Harris, and she and her husband want to establish a farming operation in Manitoba. They've been in the agricultural business in other provinces of Canada and decided to come back to Manitoba to start farming. They were using non-agricultural people's capital through a corporate structure to support them or to help finance their farming operation. But because of this restrictive legislation and this discriminatory legislation, they are prohibited from starting farming in Manitoba, contrary to what the Minister of Agriculture has kept saying are his objectives, that we have to encourage and preserve the family farm in Manitoba.

Well the way you encourage and help people in the family farm units today isn't by bringing in legislation which speaks for itself and they say very straightforward that it doesn't help them, it restricts them. How can he stand in his place and continue to say that he supports family farm operations when, in fact, the opposite is happening? Yes, he goes and uses some examples of a corporation coming in, buying land one month and selling it two or three months later for a substantial amount of money more. Well, if that individual wanted to do it as a private individual and not a corporation, they could still do it. So to let on that he's trying to correct that problem is not coming clean with the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we, as an opposition, have continued to oppose this legislation, Bill 54, now Bill 3; Bills 23 and 24 which are, of course, companion pieces of legislation to provide information to the board. We don't feel very comfortable in seeing this being forced through the Legislative Assembly and that's really what's happening. The Premier, because of his authoritarian type of approach, not within his own caucus or with his own Cabinet but with the people of Manitoba, he said in a press release or a press conference some two months ago now - approximately two months ago - that if necessary he would force closure on Bill 3, that he thought we had a fair enough opportunity to debate it.

Well, bad legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should never be passed. It should be debated, and the points we have made should be accepted by the government. The Minister of Agriculture should do the responsible thing and withdraw the bill. But that would be doing him a political favour because then he may have a little bit of hope of getting some agricultural votes and some votes in the next election. If he continues to persist on the path that he is persisting on and forcing it through, then we will immediately have to start campaigning to remove it after the next election.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seeing this bill go through the process that we've seen it go through, I would have

thought with the opposition that we have given it as opposition; the opposition the Farm Bureau have given it; the opposition that the Manitoba Institute of Agrologists have given it; the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce have given it; all the people that made presentations, the individuals in opposition to it, and remember, to my knowledge there wasn't one in support of it. Who is supporting it? The Farmers Union didn't even come out and support it.

Surely to goodness, when a piece of legislation of such a major or massive amount of power is passed to take away the rights and privileges of people in this country, if there is anybody supporting him at all, why didn't they come forward and speak? I haven't heard one person in the agriculture community come forward and speak in support of Bill 3. I haven't heard one and the Minister hasn't given an example of one. He can't stand in his place and claim support from any corner of the agriculture or from any other community. The Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties, I would say, virtually clobbered the Minister with their presentation on the vagueness of the powers, the interpretations of the bill and how they are going to be able to use the powers of The Farm Lands Ownership Act to get information and to carry out the act - the vagueness of it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when he's had the warnings from the kinds of areas that he had, I would have thought he would have reconsidered. When we didn't see Bill No. 3 on the Order Paper this afternoon, I would have thought he finally listened. I would have thought that he'd seen the light and just said, look, I'm going to reconsider.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** He could have allowed it to sort of accidentally happen.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** That's right. The Member for Turtle Mountain said, it could have just accidentally happened. He could have blamed it on the Member for Ste. Rose or somebody else for not doing his job properly.

**A MEMBER:** St. James.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** St. James, that's right, the Deputy House Leader. He could have blamed him for not having it looked after, or maybe he could have come clean with the people of Manitoba and said, "Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm doing the wrong thing and I'm going to withhold this legislation." He knows he's doing the wrong thing. He knows it. Why won't he be man enough to admit it?

Mr. Speaker, I've made all the points that I can make again today. I'm sure my colleagues will want to put some more points forward because we haven't given up. And when it comes to the administration of this act and the control of the people who are going to continue to have corporations, let me tell you, I don't think the Minister is going to win in the long run. I'm sure he'll be challenged in court. If we have to go through major changes to have language changes in this province because of parking tickets and speeding tickets, then legislation of the magnitude that this is, I'm sure, as well, will end up in the Supreme Court of Canada being challenged many times.

But, let's look at it this way. The bite of the legislation that's being imposed isn't going to come until after he writes all his regulations and gets it proclaimed; the bite starts to come on some of these people and they're starting to pay extra charges for land transfers; go before boards on bended knee; plead to a New Democratic appointed board who are going to say, yes, you can or you can't lease your neighbour's half section of pasture or quarter section of pasture, and if it's a verbal lease we still have to tell them.

It's that kind of administrative nightmare, and once this starts to hit the people of the province, they're going to say, who would ever do that? In about two years time, they're going to start looking even harder at the Minister of Agriculture who is now sitting in his place, sorry that he ever brought this bill forward.

I said to him earlier in committee yesterday that I would hope he would take a couple of years before he decided to proclaim it. He may never get to proclaim this bill as Minister of Agriculture because the Premier may decide the kind of mistake his Minister of Agriculture has made, change Ministers of Agriculture and then he would have an excuse for not having it proclaimed. I think, right at this point, that the Minister of Agriculture is the only member on the other side who is really bound and bent he's going to put this legislation through.

I've talked privately with some of the other members over there and they don't like it either. But to save his job and whatever credibility he may have, they're going to stand behind him and push it through.

So, he may not get to proclaim it; the Minister may see the light of day — (Interjection) — oh, the Premier will never see the light of day, I'm sorry. He may just make a move, take a shot in the dark and change the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I will close with those comments and I would hope that enough members of the backbench of the government would come to their senses and vote against this legislation in third reading, and make the Minister of Agriculture do the statistical background work that should be done, talk to the farm people, and at least get one group of people supporting it before you ramrod it down the people's throat of Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this will be the third time I've risen from my seat to express my personal concerns on this bill, a bill that I honestly do believe to be very bad legislation, legislation that will set back the agricultural economy of Manitoba, set back the strength of agriculture in the Province of Manitoba for many many years to come. I doubt, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether agriculture will recover from such bad legislation that is being forced through this Session.

With this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but think that the farmers and not only the farmers, but the people of Manitoba are going to lose the bit of faith they did have in politicians. They're going to lose it very quickly if this bill should be made law. I'm hoping,

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Minister will come to his senses, will realize that he has not got the support of the people of Manitoba on this legislation. It was proven to the committee this past day or two that he had no support whatsoever that came forward. That has been brought out just a moment ago by the chief critic for Agriculture that even his strong point that he did have, Mr. Speaker, that of the Manitoba Farmers Union, they didn't come out in support of this Minister. So I suggest that he would be well to, for himself, for the party he is part of, for the people of Manitoba, withdraw this bill and save face to the people of the farming community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak a few more moments on a personal basis, if I may. My wife and I, six years ago, incorporated our farming enterprise. We did that so that we could involve, Mr. Speaker, the members of our family who wished to become part of our enterprise. We were advised that was our best step. We took that advice and I believe, if I understand it today, that it is all down the drain and will be down the drain if this is enacted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what is bothering not only me but I am one of many who — (Interjection) — I'm not alone there are lots of us that are in the same position that my family and I are in today. I don't know just where we're faced with this; I don't know what we're going to be able to do with it. We are going to have to take a strong look at this.

**A MEMBER:** You're going to work for the state.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I have two sons presently who are shareholders in our company. The third son, who has finished his education and upon that, wants to become a part of our farming enterprise. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, if that will ever come to be the way things are heading in this province under this government that we have today. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if this is ever going to happen in our family.

Mr. Speaker, my father worked hard all through the Depression years to retain 10 quarters of land. He worked hard in order that he could keep that farm unit together. Upon his retirement years, he wished that his sons could carry on. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I happen to be one of those sons. I've served my country; I've served my community very well; and today, representing them in this House, I'm in a position where I want to see in the near future my own boys carry on that farming business that my father, Joe Hyde, in the community of Burnside, started many years ago. I doubt very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the way things are going that my wishes are going to come true. I doubt very much, if we continue to have governments such as we have, especially Agricultural Ministers, such as we have today, who have no respect for those who built this country from Day One - no respect. I say that to you, Mr. Minister, you will be sorry that you ever had any part of this legislation that's going through this House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister doesn't understand. He just does not understand the way farmers act. Mr. Speaker, many a favourable deal has been made over a line fence with the shake of a hand that proved to be very very favourable to both parties. Not only, Mr. Speaker, has this happened over the line fence between

two farmers' property, it has happened on a Saturday night over a glass of beer in the beer parlours of our farming communities. Many a favourable enterprise or deal has been made just with a handshake. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that day is gone; it has all been destroyed by this Minister.

Mr. Speaker, this government has, during this Session, tried to and have been successful - I have to say that, only because of the numbers they have - have pushed through this House some very bad legislation, legislation that Manitobans will be years ever recovering from. I believe in that, a bill, such as we have passed here this afternoon, No. 60, the seat belt legislation. Well, we all know there are arguments on both sides of that, but I maintain that this government is destroying the freedom of the individual. There have been other bills, Bill 47, The Municipal Conflict of Interest; Bill 48, The Elections Act. Now, we have Bill 3, this is the final reading, the third reading, and it is our last opportunity to express some of our concerns.

Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Agriculture knows very well that the majority of the citizens of Manitoba do not want this kind of legislation forced on them, so how can he honestly proceed with this bill knowing very well that the people don't want it? The people don't want their rights tampered with.

This bill certainly infringes upon the freedom of Manitoba farmers, upon the freedom of the citizens of Manitoba, upon the freedom of all Canadians and comes dangerously close, if not indeed very much contrary, to the Canadian Charter of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will discriminate against the citizens of Canada and the corporations not only of Manitoba, but across this Canada of ours. This legislation will not serve its purpose, Mr. Speaker, it will not help the young people to obtain farm land. Statistics show farm prices and interest rates are down. The ownership of Manitoba farm land by non-residents has fluctuated up and down for the last 100 years and it will continue to do so.

Today, Sir, our economic times are rectifying any problems that may exist upon us today. This legislation lends itself to the purpose of more controls over ownership. This bill will not solve these problems; it was intended to do so, Mr. Speaker. At a time when farm land prices are on a downswing, at a time when land prices are down anywhere from 25 to 30 percent across Manitoba, I see no need of proceeding with this bill and ask that the Minister withdraw Bill No. 3, The Farm Lands Ownership, from this Order Paper today.

Clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this bill is bad legislation. It does not seem to answer any of the problems it claims to solve. This government we have now claim they are out to protect the family farm. Sir, I say to him, the Minister of Agriculture, and to the government, how can anyone support this bill and support the concept of family farm? At the same time, Sir, how can anyone support the family farms and support legislation that restricts Canadians from returning home to Manitoba to farm?

At the same time, Sir — (Interjection) — it does, you read it, the whole act and it does. How can anybody support the family farms and support a bill that will drastically reduce land equity at an extremely vulnerable time? How can anyone support the rights of farmers to own land and at the same time support a bill that

says that one must farm for 10 years before he or she can pass his or her land onto a family member? How can anyone interested in agriculture's viability support restrictions to the rights of ambitious Canadian farmers to invest in Manitoba farms?

Mr. Speaker, I have been farming my land for 37 years. My father farmed this land from the turn of the century. With my farm background, I feel I can assess the feelings of my neighbours, of my family, members of my community and farmers from across this province. I feel that I can assess their feelings and the needs of the farm residents of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, our early settlers came to Canada with the knowledge that in Canada there existed the right to own land. This government wants to limit this right to own land. It would appear that they will be successful for the time being.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to relate a few words and thoughts from the Honourable Tommy Douglas: "Freedom, like peace, is indivisible. I must protect my neighbour's rights in order to safeguard my own." Those are the words of the Honourable Tommy Douglas.

Thank you.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise once again to address Bill 3, I suppose, in the vain, futile hope that the government might reconsider yet before pushing this bill through and, if not, that at least some of the members on the other side might see fit to vote with their conscience and not with the Whip of the Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm sorry that there aren't more members here because I intend to deal once again with a situation which involves me personally, and I do that because it covers a situation in which many other people will find themselves, but perhaps because it affects one of the members of this Legislature personally that perhaps the others will have a little more understanding for it. It's easy to sit in this Legislature and to pass laws, having been told in an abstract way or told about abstract impacts that they might have, but when they bear directly on individuals that one is acquainted with, one is involved with personally, then perhaps it has a greater effect. So I want to explain to the members once again, one last time, how this bill is going to affect Ransom Farms Limited and my involvement in it, and then we're going to watch and see how many of those members opposite are going to stand and vote in favour of doing what this bill will do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the first two times that I spoke on this bill in the Legislature I had the distinct impression that most of the members across the way didn't believe what I was saying. There were calls came across the way like read the bill, read the bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were in committee and I had the opportunity to ask the Minister about the impact of this bill. It happens that Ransom Farms Limited is slightly over 40 percent owned by myself, slightly over 40 percent by one of my brothers, 15 percent by my father, and 5 percent by a third brother.

I asked the Minister if my brother and I would qualify as farmers, given that we weren't taking money out of

this corporation and that we didn't spend very much time at it, and the Minister said, no, we would not qualify as farmers. That means, Mr. Speaker, under this bill that Ransom Farms Limited is not a family farm corporation, even though it has been farming, it has been the vehicle to conduct business for over 15 years. It's now in its 16th year of operation.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, since it doesn't qualify as a family farm corporation, it has no right to lease or buy any more land in this province. Despite the fact that the Minister confirmed that I, or my brother, my brothers as individuals, could own as much land as we wanted, we could lease it, we could have someone work it, we could do it on a custom basis, whatever, but we could not lease that land to a corporation which we had structured to conduct business. That is the ridiculous situation that we are now placed in by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take some time of the House to review a little history of the family involvement and I hope I have the indulgence of the House in doing this. I want to tell the members opposite that my grandfather came to the area where we now are shortly after the turn of the century. He acquired a quarter section of land and then went to work. He had to go and work for someone else in order to be able to make enough money to get a start to finally begin to farm that land.

He did that and he married in 1909, and he and my grandmother lived in a shack for two or three years before they were able to build a log house in 1911. They lived there for another seven years until my grandfather died in the flu epidemic following the war of 1918, and he left his wife, my grandmother and six children, the oldest of which was my father, and he was nine years old at the time.

Mr. Speaker, that family went on to survive the fact that a mortgage company had a mortgage on the land; the fact that my father had to quit school after Grade 9 in order to help look after the family and run the farm. They went on into the Dirty Thirties. My father and mother were married in 1934 at the height of the Depression. During the Depression years, they took over another quarter section of land that was in such condition at that time that the threshing gang came after dinner, left before lunch and had all the grain in one wagon box. It wasn't much of a farm that they took over at the depth of the Depression in 1934, but they got started farming at that time. Mr. Speaker, they went on to raise three children on that farm and my father became an elite seed grower and turned that farm into a productive unit. My father went on into farm organization, was even a strong supporter of the CCF for a period of time in the late '30s and 1940s.

Mr. Speaker, he's still active at age 73. He's still involved in Ransom Farms Limited. He was still able to survive all of the adjustments that took place in the agricultural community after the Second War when mechanization forced a great many people out of farming in the late '40s, the '50s and the '60s. We were still able to continue on, and then some 15 years ago we formed a company, because it was a convenient way to structure the business. That company has survived for 15 or 16 years. It still rents the original piece of land that my grandfather acquired in the early 1900s.

Mr. Speaker, what the rigours of starting a homestead from scratch could not put an end to; what the death

of my grandfather, when the family was all at a very early age, could not put an end to; what the mortgage companies could not put an end to; what the Depression of the 1930s, and the grasshoppers and the droughts of the 1930s could not put an end to; what the adjustments of the 1940s, the 1950s and the 1960s could not put an end to; this government is now going to put an end to. All of those natural disasters that my family has faced, as thousands of other families in this province had faced, all of those natural disasters, and all of the capitalistic system, all of the worst of the capitalistic system that the members opposite don't like, couldn't put an end to it, even though my family did deal with mortgage companies and were threatened with foreclosure at times, Mr. Speaker, but now, after all those years, we have finally come to the point where this Minister of Agriculture and this government across the way are going to destroy what we have put together.

They are going to destroy the opportunity for myself, my father, my brothers, to still maintain that operation so that our children could have some place to start farming. And this government is doing this, Mr. Speaker, to help farmers, to help people get into the farming operation? Mr. Speaker, this is an absolutely outrageous bill, an absolutely outrageous bill that no one could have dreamed that a government in its right mind, acting in a rational way, would implement.

The only consolation that I have and my colleagues have is the absolute firm belief that this government is going to be defeated in two to three years time and that this kind of abhorrent legislation is going to be repealed. This kind of abhorrent legislation is going to help defeat this government and, Mr. Speaker, we're going to vote on this bill and we're going to see how many members opposite are prepared to stand and vote with us against this kind of bill, or whether they're all going to stand and vote for the kind of thing that I have just outlined in one specific case, and that I know applies in many other cases in this province as well.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Are you ready for the question? The question before the House is the proposed third reading of Bill No. 3.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The question before the House is the proposed third reading of Bill No. 3.

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

#### YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Corrin, Cowan, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyler, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill,

Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

#### NAYS

Blake, Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Ransom, Sherman.

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** The motion is accordingly carried.  
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

#### BILL 23 - THE REAL PROPERTY ACT (2)

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented Bill No. 23, an Act to amend The Real Property Act (2), for third reading.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** On division.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division.  
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

#### BILL 24 - THE REGISTRY ACT (2)

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented Bill No. 24, an Act to amend The Registry Act (2), for third reading.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** On division.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division.  
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

#### BILL 95 - THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT

**HON. A. MACKLING** presented Bill No. 95, An Act to amend the Pension Benefits Act, for third reading.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** On division.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On division.  
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

#### ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, by leave, I suggest the House deal with the Address for Papers, moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. It's found at the bottom of Page 7 on the Order Paper. I believe the Honourable Minister of Energy will speak to it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** By leave, Address for Papers, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that an humble address be voted to Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, praying for a copy of the Chase Econometrics Report on prospects for an aluminum smelter and implications for electric energy pricing policy prepared for the Department of Energy and Mines in July, 1982.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, the government's prepared to table the final report of Chase Econometrics which contains the material in that Interim report. It's being used at present for discussions and negotiations with aluminum companies. When it is not of use any more, and it is not a confidential document in terms of those discussions, it will be tabled.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call Bills 30 and 31, standing on Page 4 of the Order Paper.

### ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING BILL 30 - THE LOAN ACT, 1983 (2)

**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.  
The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, despite temptations to the contrary we're prepared to allow that bill to pass.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### BILL 31 - THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983

**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.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill on behalf of my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to make a few comments about the Jobs Fund now that we have had an opportunity to see this

Jobs Fund conceived and supposedly carried through to the point where it's supposed to be producing something.

We have had the very strong suspicion from the very start that what the Jobs Fund was largely designed to do was to try and improve the image of the government rather than to make any major thrust in the area of dealing with the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, we said that because it became evident right away that what the government was doing with the Jobs Fund was taking money from a number of different areas in government, putting it into the Jobs Fund, so-called, and saying they were going to have a major thrust and we had determined, Mr. Speaker, that what the government really was doing was putting only an additional \$18 million of new budgetary funds into job creation and taking over \$50 million of money from elsewhere and putting it into the Jobs Fund.

Mr. Speaker, that was evident to anyone who looked carefully at the Estimates of the Government at the time, even though the government argued, rather strenuously, that this was a new thrust. With the passage of time, it now becomes even clearer. One need only to look to the example of the Minister of Highways, whose Capital Supply amount was reduced this year by some \$9 million, I believe it was, and now within the last two weeks, we see an example of where the Jobs Fund has provided \$4 million of money to the Department of Highways to undertake highway construction.

Mr. Speaker, how stupid does this government think the people of Manitoba are? How stupid do they think the people of Manitoba are not to recognize what that was all about? They took money from the Department of Labour, Mr. Speaker, where last year there was a Career Internship Program, and in previous years there had been the Private Sector Youth Employment Program. This year they took the money from the Department of Labour, changed the name to Careerstart, turned around then and made a big announcement that the Jobs Fund is providing millions of dollars to the Department of Labour to start this new employment program. What a farce, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. S. LYON:** Fraud, fraud.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** It's fraudulent, it is fraudulent. This is nothing more than a cynical, cruel, fraudulent attempt by the government to shore up their image and to leave the impression with people that something significant is being done for the unemployed, that would not otherwise have been done by the government. Mr. Speaker, I think that is the most base cruel type of action that any government could take, to appeal what today is 46,000 and was over 50,000 unemployed in Manitoba, to say we are undertaking this great initiative, this \$200 million initiative. They turned to the taxpayers and said we are asking you to pay more taxes. We're asking you to accept another one percentage point on the sales tax, because we're going to use it to help the unemployed. We're going to use it in the Jobs Fund.

Well, Mr. Speaker, two days ago, the First Minister tabled a document in this House, which should show, at last, what we have expected was the case, what we have suspected was the case all along. Mr. Speaker,

for any member who wishes to make reference to that document, which is a summary of Jobs Fund projects, 1983-84, dated August 12, 1983, it readily becomes apparent, by even the most cursory analysis of that page, that of the 378,000 work weeks of employment that the government says will be created, well over 80 percent of those work weeks which they say will be created, would have been created without anything being done by the Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker.

You can start out with the Manitoba Employment Action Program, the Careerstart, and NEED. Mr. Speaker, those were programs that were under way before the Jobs Fund was even thought about. Fifty-eight percent of the jobs on the budgetary side that are claimed are in those three areas alone. One goes on down the list, road construction, Mr. Speaker, 3,340 weeks of work under road construction with the \$4 million they gave back to the Minister of Highways. After taking away \$9 million, they've now restored \$4 million and claim it as some kind of success for the Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker. How fraudulent. How misleading. Five thousand-and-some jobs for Urban Development. That's the Core Area Development Program, Mr. Speaker. What's it doing in the Jobs Fund? The City of Winnipeg street resurfacing. Well, two or three years ago I remember when we voted an extra couple of million dollars in 1980, I believe it was, it was a dry summer, it was a good year for construction. We didn't make a big deal of it. We voted a couple of extra million for city street work and we voted a couple of a million dollars extra for road work in the country. It didn't take a Jobs Fund to do that, Mr. Speaker. Nineteen percent of the jobs are under a heading which is called "To be Announced." To be announced, Mr. Speaker, 19 percent of the jobs claimed on the budgetary side.

On the non-budgetary side which is the Capital Loan Program, 76 percent of the jobs claimed, Mr. Speaker, are in the Homes in Manitoba Program, which no one denies is not a credible program, but it was announced long before the Jobs Fund; \$50 million was committed over a year ago, Mr. Speaker, \$50 million was committed. It's now only 57.8 million. All the government did was put a few extra million dollars into this. They didn't need the Jobs Fund for that, Mr. Speaker and even under that one, 36,570 weeks of work, that's under a heading "To be Announced," Mr. Speaker, that's 23 percent of the jobs under the non-budgetary side. All of the jobs that are claimed here, all of the work weeks that are listed, are listed under "Employment Impact Work Weeks" and there's a little footnote which says, "Estimated work weeks based on 1983-84 approved allotment." That doesn't mean that all those jobs have been created, Mr. Speaker, that only means that if all that money were spent which has been committed to those projects, then there might be those jobs.

That's why I asked the First Minister earlier today, just to give an indication - when he says there are 7,000 jobs, how long do they last? Are we talking about a job for three months, are we talking about a job for five months, are we talking about a job for 12 months? Because it makes quite a difference, Mr. Speaker. It makes quite a difference if those 7,000 people are going to be laid off after they've worked for 26 weeks. The government must know because they're able to list on the basis of a project, how many work weeks there are. They have to know. Why don't they tell us?

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, as time passes it becomes clearer with every passing day that the Jobs Fund is exactly what we said it was, it is a crass and cynical attempt by the government to shore up its own image without giving proper regard for the real kinds of economic development projects that might bring about real lasting and meaningful employment for people who are now unemployed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think it's necessary to respond to some of the misinformation that we have heard during the past few moments from the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. Mr. Speaker, it is rather peculiar and rather interesting that honourable members across the way like to refer to the Jobs Fund as being a "fraud" fund" or as having been a farce, when honourable members, one by one across the way, rose in their places during a vote in this House to vote in support. Are they now advising Manitobans throughout this province that they voted in support of a fund which was fraudulent, in favour of a fund that was a farce? Mr. Speaker, I don't know how gullible they think Manitobans are, but I know Manitobans are not gullible and they see through that sort of ploy on the part of honourable members across the way.

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in a way in the Province of Manitoba that we're not following the pattern of the philosophic approach that is being pursued by other political governments in this country that represent the shade of thinking of honourable members across the way, restraint in pulling back on any public expenditures, unemployment being of secondary concern to the principal concerns that are facing the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the concern that we have spelled out and we have dealt with clearly is one dealing with the necessity of creating jobs. We've announced \$133 million of announced activities to date, generating some 390,000 work weeks; this translates into 7,552 weeks. So, Mr. Speaker, in fact, earlier this afternoon during question period, I was understating to honourable members the impact of the Jobs Fund in the Province of Manitoba. It is larger than that which I had indicated earlier this afternoon.

In addition, if we had applied the criteria that the Federal Government utilizes, and this may indeed be where the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain has been misled, then we have, in identifying the Jobs Fund to date, a job being 20 weeks and not 52 weeks, then we would have generated 19,500 jobs and I'd be rising in my place and saying, we've created 19,500 jobs, according to Federal Government criteria. So let us be clear then, Mr. Speaker, because I am pleased to have the opportunity to remind honourable members that what has happened in Manitoba through the direct operations of the Jobs Fund, through a positive approach of government, to an aggressive approach on the part of government, rather than an approach which is regressive, an approach which is restraint-conscious, a do-nothing approach that, unfortunately, is too plentiful in some parts of this country. This government has been activist. It has proceeded with programs.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to debate each and every one of these projects listed on this document that was tabled in this House, with honourable members across the way. If they're complaining about one of these projects, let them pinpoint that project, let us debate that project in this House, but let us not have the sort of mutterings that we've heard from honourable members across the way in describing legislation that they voted for, as being fraudulent and a farce, when they voted for that program in this House, when they voted for the legislation, when they voted for the bill and when we have the tabled evidence before us in this Chamber.

The number of Manitobans that are working today, directly as a result of the Jobs Fund, is 8,300 people - 8,300 people working as a direct consequence of the operations of the Jobs Fund in the Province of Manitoba. Honourable members can shake their heads all they wish, but they cannot shake away the truth of the effectiveness of the Jobs Fund in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see -- and I wish I had this editorial with me, but I will send it to honourable members across the way - an editorial that appeared in the Toronto Daily Star last Sunday, the lead editorial in the Toronto Daily Star, arising from the Premiers' Conference, headlined, "Where there is a will to create jobs," and the editorial went on to say that, unfortunately, only in the Province of Manitoba has there been a determined will on the part of the Government of the Province of Manitoba to combat unemployment in this country.

In case honourable members suggest the Toronto Star is some organ of the New Democratic Party, let me advise the honourable members, that has not been the case. I'd be delighted indeed if that was the case but, unfortunately, it's not. But it is a newspaper of national repute that has evaluated the programs of different Provincial Governments and has highlighted the initiative on the part of the Government of the Province of Manitoba and expressed regret, Mr. Speaker, that that same sort of focus, that same sort of effort is not also being demonstrated at the federal level and at the level of nine other provinces in this country.

I don't intend to speak further because I am looking forward, when we return later this fall and also next year, to be able to discuss with honourable members the different programs that have been announced, whether it be the programs pertaining to the North Portage Development, the urban development, the Western Canadian Aviation, the Northern Sewer and Water Programs, the Nursery Programs, the Red River Community College diesel auto shop expansion, the Crane River School addition. All of the programs are listed, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to having the opportunity to discuss those projects with honourable members in this Chamber. I look forward to hearing from honourable members, when they talk about fraud and farce, which of these programs they would have omitted, which jobs they would not have created in the Province of Manitoba. I look forward to that kind of debate when we are next given an opportunity in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**A MEMBER:** Now we'll hear the truth.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to speak at length on this Supply Motion, nor am I rising in response to anything that the First Minister might have said. I intended to speak all along and I want to dissuade him from any thought that anything he said needs any response, except to say this to him, Sir, that 80 percent of the jobs that he claims were created under the Jobs Fund would have been created if the money hadn't been moved out of the departments into the Jobs Fund to create the slight-of-hand that he says is an honest way of treating the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, there's no need for the First Minister to become so rattled and irrational, just because he's been found out. It's been demonstrated time and time again that this government is incapable of telling the truth about either this matter or many other matters that come under his jurisdiction. So I merely say, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Jobs Fund - and I'll probably come back to it in a few minutes - 80 percent of the so-called work weeks and all of these other euphemisms that socialists use for people getting back to work, would have been created in any event and the best evidence, as my colleague cited, was the evidence of the money that was robbed by the Jobs Fund from the Department of Transportation and Highways and then was put back, from the Jobs Fund, on a road program that we had to help the Minister get authorized by his recalcitrant government because they probably had some mariachi bands or some grass-cutters that they wanted to give the money to, or some political hacks that they wanted to send around the province doing hand-holding or something of that nature - and we'll get to that a little bit later - but that is the best example of how big a fraud the Jobs Fund has become, because my honourable friends vote money, took \$9 million or so out of Highways, put it into the Jobs Fund to create the illusion that this was new money and then had to give \$4 million or \$5 million back to the Minister of Transportation when the contractors were beating on the door saying, if you want to create some real meaningful jobs in Manitoba other than mariachi bands and looking after your socialists friends, then let some contracts on highways that should have been in the budget this year. And that's exactly what was done, Mr. Speaker, after considerable stimulation by this side of the House, after considerable stimulation and pounding of the table by the Manitoba Heavy Contractors Association, and may I say, after the poor, beleaguered Minister of Transportation, who I think feels more like an alien day by day in this government, had to bring to the common sense of his caucus members that that money should be spent to create jobs, that the money had been taken from him in the first place. While he had to go through this kind of a mating dance in order to get back his own money, the jobs that were being created would have been created - 80 percent of them would have been created - without the hundreds of thousands of dollars of NDP advertising that they are now sludging around the Province of Manitoba, trying through smoke and mirrors and sleight of hand to indicate to the people that they're doing something for unemployment, whereas, in fact, their very existence in this province, as a government, is the greatest



deterrent to employment by the private sector of anything that we can think of. These antibusiness fools, Mr. Speaker, who are at the present time passing antibusiness legislation, they don't care about real job creation in Manitoba.

They think that creating a real job, Mr. Speaker, is hiring John Morrisseau. They think that's creating a real job; hiring one of their political hacks, putting him through the smoke and mirrors of an alleged competition and then creating him a Deputy Minister after the former deputy - who was also a political hack appointment of theirs - leaves the government service. That, to them, is creating jobs - looking after their friends.

They took Mr. Scotton out of Saskatchewan, that well-known old left-wing workhorse and hired him in Manitoba here. That's creating a job at \$58,000 a year. That's their idea of creating a job, paying off one of their own with the taxpayers' money.

But, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to really creating jobs, building something for the future in Manitoba, building highways, building roads, building public structures that need to be done - what about the School of Music at Brandon? - oh, no, they promised that, but they're not going to build that one by a long shot. Now, they've got to size it down. That might create a real job. But they've got money for Hydro to build a \$3.8 million staff house at Jenpeg; they've got money for that kind of nonsense. They really think that creating jobs by spending taxpayers' dollars, which they have to borrow and for which they have to increase the taxes exorbitantly in Manitoba, is the way out of economic trouble.

Do they not read anything? Do they not realize that even the President of France has disavowed this kind of simplistic left-wing thinking and has said, we are not going to get any real job creation in France by throwing money, taxpayers' money, at the problem. And is President Mitterrand not now the one, who having come to his senses - which is a rare thing for a socialist to do, being inculcated as they are with that kind of nonsense - has he not come to his senses and said, we've got to in France, under a socialist government, restrict the amount of government expenditure, to restrict the amount of government borrowing and to stop the crazy program of nationalization. That's exactly what President Mitterrand is doing at the present time.

West Germany has escaped from the clutches of so-called social democratic government and is back on a course of recovery again. Everything that this government is doing here in miniature, Mr. Speaker, has been disavowed on the national and international level by every stripe of politician that we know of in the free world. Yet, they hew on, like the lemmings going over the cliff saying, well, if we don't tax more and spend more and borrow more, then we won't be true socialists - even though it doesn't make sense.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's so much for the Jobs Fund. The Jobs Fund is by and large the expenditure of 80 percent of tax monies that were going to be voted in any event. It's a fraudulent Jobs Fund because my honourable friends are trying to pretend that these are new jobs.

I merely say to them, Mr. Speaker, and my honourable friend, the First Minister, takes some Uriah Heep kind of hand-wringing joy in the fact that our party voted

for the bill. He said in his Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, that he was going to bring the bill in immediately. He wanted to set up these great advisory committees, and what happened? We waited and waited and waited. We kept asking for the bill. The minute the bill was brought into the House, we passed it through and said, now, get on with it. That's how the bill was passed. We wanted them to get on with it. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, does the incompetent who is filling the treasury post at the present time wish to say anything, or does he wish to go out and talk to a bunch of Labrador dogs who could probably speak more intelligently than he, or worse than that, Sir, does he wish to retire to his office, take off his shoes and start counting up the deficit again?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we voted for the Jobs Fund to get the legislation through, to see what this government could do, and they haven't done anything. They made a fraud out of it from Day 1. They talked about all of the froth of having, Mr. Speaker, an advisory committee. They never called the advisory committee in. They talked, Mr. Speaker, about consulting the advisory committee about all of the plans. Well, they didn't consult with the President of the Manitoba Government Employees Association about their brash advertising program and they've now got him in the position where he says, representing one of the biggest unions in Manitoba, the biggest union that is responsible largely to this Legislature as well, that he doesn't want to sit. He's considering whether he's going to sit on this "fraud" fund any further because of the manipulation, the sleight of hand, the fraudulent opportunism of this bunch of people across the way who have long since ceased to earn the name of being called a government. They are not a government, they're a collection of Central American irregulars who don't know where they're going, where they've been or what they're doing. They're not a government any longer; they're sort of a lopsided majority that wallows around from pillar to post. They don't know from one day, one hour to the next what they're doing.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing in this House a punch-drunk, reeling and lurching government. It's lurching its way to adjournment and, Mr. Speaker, this government certainly in my recollection - and I've been watching Legislatures in this province pretty closely since about 1950 - this government has the worst record of any government that I've seen in my experience which covers about 35 years now. I believe Mr. Sid Green when he says that it is the worst government in the history of the Province of Manitoba. That's what we're facing today and that's why I'm speaking on Supply today, because we are facing the worst government that this province has ever had. Mr. Speaker, it's the worst government, I believe, certainly of this century. Incompetence is its hallmark, confusion and disorganization are its record and, Mr. Speaker, abysmal defeat will be its just reward. — (Interjection) —

Well my honourable friends want to talk about elections. Mr. Speaker, I invite my friend, the Leader of the New Democrat Socialist Party in Manitoba, to have an election tomorrow, and he won't be back. I tell him, Mr. Speaker, he won't be back if he has one tomorrow. If he called an election tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, he wouldn't come back with 18 seats because

the people of Manitoba aren't gullible, as he said, and the people of Manitoba have been treated to one of the most incompetent mishandlings of their public affairs that's ever been seen in this province.

Mr. Speaker, incompetence is its hallmark, confusion and disorganization its record, abysmal defeat its just reward. A government, Mr. Speaker, that is laced with scandal from its own appointees, Mr. Moore, the scandalous action of Moore at McKenzie Seeds done with previous knowledge of the Minister who sits in his place and tries to deny, tries to say to the press, oh, I've been hard done by, Mr. Moore didn't tell me everything.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, the Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure which particular rule the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has broken but he's made a statement that is false, and I have indicated clearly before that I did not have any foreknowledge and I would ask him, out of courtesy, as an Honourable Member of this House to withdraw that statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister has made a statement regarding information within his own area of knowledge which must be accepted by the House which I'm sure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will readily recognize.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to do the Honourable Member for Brandon East the courtesy of repeating exactly what he said in the House, namely, that days before my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, raised the matter of conflict of interest in the House, Mr. Moore spoke to him about it after a committee meeting. That's what the member said himself; he had prior knowledge, Mr. Speaker. If my honourable friend wants to deny that then he's going to have to get our Hansard and deny his own words and make himself thrice a liar.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated quite clearly and truthfully and honestly exactly the circumstances, but the honourable member in his previous remarks made a blanket statement about foreknowledge which is not true and I would say, Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about foreknowledge or previous knowledge, you should talk to his colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain. I would indicate again, Mr. Speaker, that the

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. L. EVANS:** . . . Member for Charleswood, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, has made a statement that is not true; the way he has stated it is not true.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I'll take the matter under advisement to review what was said in Hansard.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** Well, with respect, Mr. Speaker, there's nothing to take under advisement. The honourable member said . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. ORDER PLEASE. If I said that I will take a matter under advisement, I will do so.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition may continue his remarks.

**HON. S. LYON:** I fully intend to, Mr. Speaker, and what I said about the Member for Brandon East stands that he had prior knowledge . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. ORDER PLEASE. The honourable member will take his seat.

I have taken the matter under advisement, there is no need for any further debate upon the matter.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** We all know that Mr. Moore is a friend of the NDP, a candidate of the NDP . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. ORDER PLEASE. The honourable member will take his seat.

There will be no further debate upon a matter that I have taken under advisement.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition may continue his remarks.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak about the role of Mr. Moore, the appointee of this government with respect to Brandon Seeds and the scandal that is infusing this government and I intend to speak about that, Sir, because that's part of the record of this province. This government can hide behind the Provincial Auditor, but it can't hide behind you, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition may continue his remarks but should not refer to remarks made or alleged to be made by the Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, you've taken that under advisement. I'm speaking about the scandal of one of their political appointees, the President of McKenzie Seeds, their candidate in the last federal election, the personal friend and organizer of the Member for Brandon East, the man whose been cheek by jowl with them from Day 1, and the scandal that he has brought to this government. And that's not the only scandal, Mr. Speaker, that's not all, but that is enough. While they try and hide behind, at this moment, behind the Auditor's report and keep it out of the House they have had to fire Mr. Moore and two other senior appointees at McKenzie Seeds; had to do that - reluctantly, I know. And then the Member for Brandon East goes into the paper and says, oh, but I've been hard done by, my friends have let me down. He's got a weak enough leader who will permit that kind of nonsense to continue as a Minister of the Crown when, Mr. Speaker, any government worthy of its place in the history of this province would have fired that Minister out of hand for his involvement with McKenzie Seeds.

So, Mr. Speaker, we know about that - incompetence, confusion, disorganization, now laced with scandal, rank patronage - let's not forget the rank patronage that has become more apparent this Session because you know what the talk in the corridors is around the building now, they're out within two years. Everybody around the building knows it; everybody in Winnipeg knows it; everybody in Manitoba knows it. So what are they doing in the meantime? They're hiring on a bunch of their friends into high positions from which they will be unceremoniously booted out, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, when the government changes. We know, Mr. Speaker, all about Mr. Morrisseau, the former head of the Manitoba Metis Federation; we know the kind, Mr. Speaker, of talents that he brought and brings to the job of Assistant Deputy Minister at \$54,000 - \$58,000 a year. His main talent is carrying a card in the New Democratic Party, that's his main talent. And he went through a sham form of competition and got the job - isn't that strange? - with Mr. Michael Decter being one of the people who appointed him. Isn't that just a coincidence, how all of these things could happen? And Ron McBride picked him; Ron McBride, a former member of the front bench across the way.

So, Mr. Speaker, laced with rank patronage. Mr. Speaker, what about Mr. Scotton? They've got room for Mr. Scotton here, the former National Secretary of the New Democratic Party who was turfed out of a job in Regina, and just on the way through Manitoba, lo and behold, he went into a competition in Manitoba, and guess what, Mr. Speaker? He won the competition. Isn't that something, Mr. Speaker? — (Interjection) — Oh, what a marvellous coincidence that a man who probably had never done anything more than fly over Manitoba before in his life, is now a senior advisor to the Minister of Labour, doing a great job for Manitoba, I am sure.

Did they give Mr. Scotton a no-cut contract too, or what? How much is an honourable government, on behalf of the taxpayers, going to have to pay to sever Mr. Scotton, when sanity is restored to the government benches in Manitoba? We'll have to find that out.

They have Mrs. Turnbull. Oh, I know the Minister of Labour doesn't like anybody to talk about Mrs. Turnbull because somebody might mention that she was the wife of a former Cabinet Minister, and do you know what by coincidence? She won a competition too. Three in a row. Three in a row, Mr. Speaker. Oh, isn't that marvellous how this talent of NDP can always win these competitions? Isn't that just marvellous, Mr. Speaker?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. S. LYON:** You know, Mr. Speaker, looking at the vast Sahara of talent across the way, one wonders where these brilliant people pop up from, these Morrisseaus, these Turnbells, these Scottons and so on.

Here is a government, Mr. Speaker, incompetent, confused, disorganized, readying itself - and particularly its hangers-on - for a defeat, laced with scandal, ranked with patronage, particularly at high levels of \$50,000, \$60,000, \$70,000, \$80,000 level - that's the kind of patronage they go in for. No use fooling around with

the petty accounts. Get your people right into the top. It doesn't matter if they're qualified or not. My God, since when did it ever matter that you had a qualified socialist? There aren't too many qualified socialists in the world in any event, so let's not worry about qualifications. Let's not worry about qualifications. Let's just appoint our friends because they happen to think in the same funny way that we do. Well, Mr. Speaker, with all of this extra baggage on board, laced with this kind of scandal, with the incompetence right in the ranks of the government, let's just take a minute to look at their record over the last 20 months.

The credit rating has been reduced for the first time in about 15 years under the great guidance of these people. Competent? I should think not. Deficits, in the first two years of their being in government, the two largest deficits ever in the history of the Province of Manitoba and they say they're giving good government to the people of Manitoba? Terrible. Taxation, increased by \$200 million cumulatively in the last year. One percent increase to the sales tax, which they said they would never do. The abhorrent employment tax which acts as a deterrent on employment in Manitoba.

The Federation of Independent Business in Canada said it's the worst tax that this government could have put on the people of Manitoba. Oh, they say, but we are so concerned, said the First Minister in his Uriah Heep stance. We are so concerned, said he, about the small business in Manitoba. Well if he's so concerned, does he not realize that small business pay about 70 percent of the employment tax in Manitoba? Why doesn't he take that socialist albatross off their necks, instead of offering them a few crumbs of reduction in the small business corporate tax. He offered them \$1.5 million or \$2 million and he hit them with \$70 million in the employment tax. Some concern that these left-wing people have for small business.

The only concern they have for small business is to try to take it over, Mr. Speaker. Unemployed, 46,000 today, down from 52,000. These were the people who said in their election brochure, we are going to turn around the economy of Manitoba. Well they turned it around all right, Mr. Speaker, into degradation and that's where it's going to stay, so long as they people the benches of the government side of this House, because no major business in Canada feels that it can do business in a trustworthy way with this government.

Look what they just did on the Pensions Bill. In the face of the best expert advice that was available across this country, that that Pensions Bill would put an extra cost of doing business on all businesses in Manitoba of about 2 to 2.5 percent, they pushed it ahead. The Minister of Labour, who isn't all that familiar with the province yet, says the people of Manitoba want the Pension Bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, are the people of Manitoba going to want her Pension Bill when the pension plans are being destroyed in this province; when people fail to come into this province to hire people so that they can have pension plans. It's that kind of middle-headedness, that kind of skewed thinking, Mr. Speaker, that is resulting in this government being the most disgraceful and contemptible government that this province has ever had. Contemptible, not because of their political philosophy, contemptible because of their sheer intellectual incompetence, mulishness, stubbornness and

foolishness in the face of the world's reality. That's why they deserve to be defeated; that's why they will be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, Alcan, let's talk about real jobs. What have they done about Alcan? We just had the Minister of Mines and Energy say he's got a document that the world has seen, that he is using for negotiation or a later version thereof, that he has probably asked to be created, a later version of that document, that is being used in negotiations for an aluminum plant. Who is he negotiating with? Who? Is he negotiating with Alcan who just announced that they are building out in British Columbia, after announcing that they were building in Quebec? Well, if he's doing the negotiating, I suggest to the First Minister, he'd maybe better get another negotiator for us because when Quebec gets one and B.C. gets one, we lose out, we lose out; and, Mr. Speaker, we want to see a little bit of action in terms of real negotiations, for real jobs. They killed the Alcan plant in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I hope it isn't true, but I fear that until these people leave the office of government, there will be little or no likelihood of an Alcan plant ever being located in the Interlake or in any other part of our suffering province.

Mr. Speaker, what about the Grid? What about the Grid? Oh, they were going to renegotiate the Grid. The Grid was the biggest economic advantage that this province could hope to have. It was the linchpin of further economic development for our province and they frittered it away in the first three months that they were in office, under the same Minister of Mines and Energy and I wonder to what extent the relationships between Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta are enhanced in those negotiations.

When the First Minister of this province goes down to the Premiers' Conference with his funny ideas and then has the social inhospitality not to even meet or not to even ride socially with the other Premiers in Canada, that creates a really wonderful milieu and atmosphere, doesn't it, Mr. Speaker, for Manitobans to have to suffer under? Because we've got a temporary socialist at the head of our government who is a "Typhoid Mary" at Premiers' Conferences, this province is suffering and I don't think that it's worthwhile, Mr. Speaker. That's quite a luxurious price for the people of Manitoba to have to pay for want of and for the holding up of development, the holding up of Grid negotiations, because a group of people with funny ideas of the left are temporarily in in this government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Jobs Fund we've talked about, the bad legislation I've talked about, The Elections Finances Bill. The Elections Finances Bill is an act of grand larceny by the New Democratic Party, to fill its own party coffers, that's all it is. It will never benefit them, Mr. Speaker, it will be repealed as we have said before but I think it shows more clearly to the people of Manitoba, the lack of morality that undergirds this party it shows more clearly that lack of morality than anything we could say on this side of the House. It's a form of thievery, Mr. Speaker. The people of Manitoba know it; the people of Manitoba will deal with the thieves when they have the first opportunity when an election is called.

The Farm Lands Bill has been dealt with eloquently this afternoon by my colleague from Turtle Mountain and by my colleague from Portage la Prairie and by

all of the speakers who have spoken heretofore. It is bad legislation; it is narrow, mean, class-ridden legislation alien to our whole background of freedom in this province and, indeed, in this country. It too should never be proclaimed.

Mr. Speaker, as I've said before there is one base instinct that I know I can appeal to across the way and that is self-survival. I merely say to my honourable friends across the way that before this bill is promulgated and the Cabinet approves this bill into law, why don't they stop and think that this bill is going to kill them in every rural district in Manitoba, No. 1. No. 2, it's only going to be in effect for 18 months to two years. No. 3, what's the point of it all? Why don't they do themselves a favour and not proclaim the legislation? They've got one more step left to save themselves. I don't ask them, Mr. Speaker, in the name of freedom; I don't ask them in the name of the farm community; I don't ask them anymore in the name of what is decent or honourable or in the public interest; I ask them to plumb their basest instinct, their own self-survival, and if there's no other reason for not proclaiming the bill, it's their own self-survival.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people who supported two of their Ministers who alienated the Americans. They are busy alienating the Premiers of Canada. They alienate our friends in the United States by attending stupid demonstrations in favour of left-wing governments in Central America and they say, that's in the public interest. Mr. Speaker, to cap it all, they're now on the bilingualism caper, which is the most incompetent piece of negotiating that this province has ever seen.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, the bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I think there would be leave or an agreement on both sides to continue if we had some of idea of when this Swan song would come to an end. If it's going on, as it now looks for the next interminable period of time, then . . .

No, I'm just asking. Give us an idea. If you want leave, we're willing to grant leave, but there are others who must be accommodated, someone who has a dinner engagement who is standing by. I'm simply asking a sensible question. I'm asking the Opposition House Leader, to whom I can ask a decent question, if he can give me an idea of how much time the leave is requested for, or by consent.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Government House Leader knows that the Leader of the Opposition has unlimited time to speak. He also knows that he has an undertaking that we would finish the Business of the House expeditiously, and he was told earlier that we would not expect to run very far past 5:30 in order to finish the Business of the House. If he wants me to put it in writing and sign it, I will.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I have no difficulty accepting the word of the Opposition House Leader.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have leave to continue? (Agreed)  
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** The ultimate incompetence of this government is demonstrated by its willful decision to enter into negotiations with a plaintiff in a case, and with the Franco-Manitobaine Société, and with the Government of Canada, their ultimate bed mates in practically all ventures, in the ill-fated resolution to amend our Constitution which is before this House, Mr. Speaker, a piece of proposed legislation which has divided this province in a way that I have never seen this province divided before in its history.

So, Mr. Speaker, while that matter is still under discussion, while the committee will be meeting to hear the people of Manitoba, the people of Manitoba are looking at this abysmal record of incompetence, of confusion, of disorganization, of lack of leadership, a government laced with scandal, smelling rankly of patronage and are saying, we've had enough.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we come to these hearings on bilingualism, the people of Manitoba, their feeling is going to be coloured obviously by the contempt and the disgust in which this government is widely held throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba today. It is a government now, it's a collection of individuals, who form a temporary majority in the House which has lost all of the mandate that it gained by fraud on the 17th of November, 1981.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's what we're dealing with now, a hollow, shambling, lurching bunch of leaderless people who have no concept of what the public interest of Manitoba stands for; whose every act has been contrary to that public interest, except a few, who find that they can hardly gather their strength together to do anything decent, or honourable, or compassionate on behalf of the people of Manitoba without having to tell half truths about it; without misleading the people; without engaging running to their ad agencies and engaging in an election type of propaganda campaign to try to prop up their failing image; that's what we have. It's not a government anymore. It's just a hollow shell of self-seeking individuals who are trying, Mr. Speaker, to pretend that what they do is in the interest of the people of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we know what kind of democrats these people are too, because when they announced the unfortunate initiative in forced bilingualization of Manitoba, when they announced that, trying to pretend that they were going to restore some constitutional rights that the Franco-Manitobans were being deprived of.

I asked the First Minister the other day, identify, delineate the Constitutional rights of Franco-Manitobans that are today being deprived of them and which this ill-considered amendment of yours is going to remedy. He failed, of course, to answer the question.

Mr. Speaker, we've come to understand that it will be the response of the First Minister, and I must say - and I say it as fairly as I can - I don't really think the First Minister understands the question. That's why he

can't answer it. He has never understood the constitutional question and that is why he is at sea on this. That is why, for better or for worse - largely for worse - their party is in the hands of the Attorney-General on this issue. — (Interjection) —

The Attorney-General can make mock of saying that he's got the party. I'm sure he has. He's been using the New Democratic Party as a convenient lever for himself for the last few years because we all know what party he really belongs to, Mr. Speaker, and it sure as the devil isn't the New Democratic Party.

So, Mr. Speaker, these people, these reluctant democrats - let's call them that with a small "d" - these reluctant democrats announced the bilingual matter and then said, it's engraved in stone and we're not going to have any committee hearings; we're not going to go throughout Manitoba; we're just going to have our propaganda hearings. Mr. Speaker, until such time as the opposition, aided and abetted I must say by the Member for Elmwood, literally forced this government to hold committee hearings, and a meeting this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, again ensured that those committee meetings would be held after the bulk of the business was done, as we said in the first instance, not to clutter up the business of the House with this important constitutional initiative.

They were dragged, kicking and screaming, every foot of the way, to this exercise of simple democracy. So much for New Democratic democracy, dragged, kicking and screaming, under the leadership of this Attorney-General into what a reasonable, honourable government would have said right from the beginning was the right thing to do. Let's have hearings on this matter; let's not try to pretend that we can rush this matter through. Mr. Speaker, we forced them, kicking and screaming, into public hearings and, if necessary we'll force them, kicking and screaming, into doing the right and honourable thing by the Province of Manitoba and all of the people of Manitoba, by withdrawing this agreement and starting over again. Mr. Speaker, if they don't do that, we'll then force them, kicking and screaming, into a provincial general election so that the people of Manitoba will have their opportunity, will have their best and fullest opportunity to tell this contemptible group of people what they think about them today.

We're going to vote Supply, because Supply has to be voted to carry on the functions of government. We're going to vote Supply for this government, but in voting Supply, I wanted this government to know not only what the official opposition thinks of them, but I wanted them to know what the vast majority of the people of Manitoba think of them. And, Mr. Speaker, what I've said today is not political rhetoric; it's a reflection of the reality of the Province of Manitoba today.

If my honourable friends have any consciences, they will try to repair the damage that they have done to our province and to its people in the last two years. If, as I suspect, they have no consciences, they will continue on the present disastrous course, Manitobans will be forced to kick them out of office, as they will in a matter of months - at most, 18 months to two years - and they will go into the deserved oblivion that they should rank in the history of this great province.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bills 30 and 31, referred for third reading.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report on Bills 30 and 31, referred for third reading, with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair.

### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

#### BILL 30 - THE LOAN ACT, 1983 (2)

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee come to order. We are considering Bills 30 and 31. What is the will of the committee? Page-by-page?

Bill 30. (Pages 1 to 10 were each read and passed.) Title—pass; Preamble—pass; Bill be reported—pass.

#### BILL 31 - THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1983

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Bill 31, page-by-page? (Pages 1 to 22 were each read and passed.) Title—pass; Preamble—pass; Bill be reported—pass. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered certain bills and reports same without amendment.

### IN SESSION

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** I move, seconded by the Member for Radisson, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### THIRD READING

**BILLS NOS. 30 and 31, were each read a third time and passed.**

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, by leave, could we revert to Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports, the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Minister of Consumer Affairs are ready to table some documentation.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, as per arrangements with the opposition, I wish to table a draft proposal

for The Dangerous Goods Handling Act; Avant-projet de loi sur la manutention des marchandises dangereuses, and a statement that is of some length and explains the reason behind the tabling of the bills so that we can take it out for consultation.

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

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Mr. Speaker, in a similar manner, I'd like to table a draft proposal for a new Mortgage Dealers Act and, in lieu of giving an introductory speech on this, I've left with the Clerk copies of a speech that provides some of the information with respect to this proposed legislation.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, I now move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the Speed-up Resolution agreed to by the House on July 25, 1983 be rescinded; and that government business take precedence over all other business of the House.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources that when the House adjourns today it shall stand adjourned — (Interjection) — No, this is when the House adjourns, this is not an adjournment motion. That when the House adjourns today it shall stand adjourned until a time fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the government.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### ROYAL ASSENT

**DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS (Mr. Myron Mason):** Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

Her Honour, P. McGonigal, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne:

Mr. Speaker addressed Her Honour in the following words:

**MR. SPEAKER:** May it please Your Honour.

The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several Bills, which in the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

No. 2 - The Law Enforcement Review Act; Loi sur les enquêtes relatives à l'application de la loi.

No. 3 - The Farm Lands Ownership Act; Loi Sur la Propriété Agricole.

- No. 6 - An Act to amend The Pesticides and Fertilizers Control Act.
- No. 7 - An Act to amend The Dairy Act.
- No. 12 - The Water Rights Act; Loi sur les Droits d'utilisation de l'eau.
- No. 14 - An Act to amend The Elections Act; Loi modifiant la loi électorale.
- No. 18 - The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Conflict of Interest Act; Loi sur les conflits d'intérêts au sein de l'assemblée législative et du conseil exécutif.
- No. 19 - The Survivorship Act; Loi sur les présomptions de survie.
- No. 20 - The Occupiers' Liability Act; Loi sur la responsabilité des occupants.
- No. 21 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
- No. 22 - The Wills Act; Loi sur les testaments.
- No. 23 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act (2).
- No. 24 - An Act to amend The Registry Act (2).
- No. 25 - An Act to repeal The Statute of Frauds; Loi abrogeant la loi intitulée "Statute of Frauds."
- No. 26 - An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act.
- No. 32 - An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act.
- No. 35 - An Act to amend The Trustee Act.
- No. 36 - The Agrologists Act; Loi sur les agronomes.
- No. 38 - An Act to amend The Society of Management Accountants of Manitoba Act.
- No. 39 - An Act to Validate By-law Number 1311 of The Town of Melita; Loi validant le règlement numéro 1311 de la Ville de Melita.
- No. 40 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Portage Avenue Baptist Church.
- No. 43 - The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act; Loi sur le transport des marchandises dangereuses.
- No. 44 - An Act to amend The Fisheries Act.
- No. 45 - An Act to amend The Forest Act.
- No. 46 - The Perpetuities and Accumulations Act; Loi sur les dispositions à titre perpétuel et la capitalisation.
- No. 47 - The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act; Loi sur les conflits d'intérêts au sein des conseils municipaux.
- No. 48 - The Elections Finances Act; Loi sur le financement des campagnes électorales.
- No. 49 - An Act to amend The Provincial Police Act.
- No. 51 - An Act to amend The Local Authorities Election Act.
- No. 52 - An Act to incorporate The Salvation Army Catherine Booth Bible College; Loi constituant en corporation le Collège biblique Catherine Booth de l'Armée du Salut.
- No. 53 - An Act to Grant Additional Powers to Steinbach Curling Club Ltd.; Loi accordant des pouvoirs additionnels au Steinbach Curling Club Ltdf
- No. 55 - An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.
- No. 56 - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter.
- No. 57 - An Act to amend The Co-operatives Act.
- No. 58 - The Occupational Therapists Act; Loi sur les ergothérapeutes.
- No. 59 - An Act to Grant Additional Powers to Victoria Curling Club Limited; Loi accordant des pouvoirs additionnels au Victoria Curling Club Limited.
- No. 60 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).
- No. 62 - The Provincial Court Act; Loi sur la cour provinciale.
- No. 64 - An Act to amend The Marital Property Act.
- No. 65 - An Act to amend The Family Maintenance Act.
- No. 66 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.
- No. 68 - The Change of Name Act; Loi sur le changement de nom.
- No. 69 - The Marriage Act; Loi sur le mariage.
- No. 70 - The Vital Statistics Act; Loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil.
- No. 71 - An Act to amend The Child Custody Enforcement Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'exécution des ordonnances de garde.
- No. 72 - The Wild Rice Act; Loi sur le riz sauvage.
- No. 73 - An Act to repeal The School Capital Financing Authority Act; Loi abrogeant la loi connue sous le nom de School Capital Financing Authority Act.
- No. 74 - An Act to amend The Elections Act (2); Loi modifiant la loi électorale (2).
- No. 75 - The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act (1983).
- No. 76 - An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act.
- No. 77 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur les écoles publiques.
- No. 78 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.
- No. 79 - The Engineering Profession Act; Loi sur les ingénieurs.
- No. 80 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.
- No. 82 - The Jury Act; Loi sur les jurés.
- No. 83 - An Act to amend The Builders' Liens Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur le privilège du constructeur.
- No. 84 - An Act to amend The Residential Rent Regulation Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur le contrôle du loyer des locaux d'habitation.
- No. 85 - The Highways and Transportation Construction Contracts Disbursement Act; Loi sur l'acquittement du prix des contrats de construction conclus avec le ministère de la voirie et du transport.
- No. 87 - An Act to amend The Workplace Safety and Health Act.
- No. 89 - An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.
- No. 90 - An Act to amend The Cattle Producers Association Act.
- No. 91 - An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.
- No. 93 - The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act; Loi sur la commission de régie de l'Assemblée législative.
- No. 94 - An Act to amend The Optometry Act.

- No. 95 - An Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act.
- No. 96 - The Domicile and Habitual Residence Act; Loi sur le domicile et la résidence habituelle.
- No. 97 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine.
- No. 98 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act and to repeal the County Courts Act, The Surrogate Courts Act and The County Court Judges' Criminal Courts Act and to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine, abrogeant la loi sur les Cours de comté, la loi sur les Tribunaux des successions et la loi sur les Cours criminelles de comté, et modifiant la loi sur les limites municipales.
- No. 99 - The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act; Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances a la Cour du Banc de la Reine.
- No. 100 - The Court of Queen's Bench Surrogate Practice Act; Loi sur la pratique relative aux successions devant la Cour du Banc de la Reine.
- No. 101 - An Act to amend Various Acts of the Legislature to facilitate the Reorganization and Expansion of The Court of Queen's Bench.
- No. 102 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pension Act.
- No. 103 - An Act to amend The Law Society Act.
- No. 104 - An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.
- No. 105 - An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act (2)
- No. 106 - An Act to amend An Act respecting the Taxation of The Canadian Pacific Railway Company by The City of Winnipeg and to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956.
- No. 107 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act (2).
- No. 108 - An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act (3).
- No. 110 - An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act.

- No. 112 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1983).
- No. 114 - An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act (3)

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** In Her Majesty's name, Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these bills:

No. 30 - An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the Same (2), The Loan Act, 1983 (2); Loi autorisant des dépenses en capital et l'emprunt des sommes requises à cette fin (2).

No. 31 - An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Fiscal Year Ending March 31, 1984 and to Authorize Commitments to Expend Additional Money in Subsequent Years and to Authorize the Borrowing of Funds to Provide for Cash Requirements of the Government, The Appropriation Act, 1983; Loi allouant à Sa Majeste certaines sommes d'argent pour l'année financière se terminant le 31 mars 1984, et autorisant le gouvernement à engager des dépenses pour les années subséquentes et à faire les emprunts requis pour subvenir à ses besoins de fonds.

**MR. CLERK:** Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources that this House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House is accordingly adjourned.