



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-8040

VOL. XXXI No. 174 - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 2 FEBRUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 2 February, 1984.

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 . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

Garrison Diversion Project

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

In view of the news from Washington about unprecedented high levels of expenditures being proposed on the Garrison project, what has the Minister done today about expressing our continued concerns about this whole matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Today, Mr. Speaker, as I have in recent days, in preparation for further initiatives in respect to Garrison, met with staff and considered options of strategy to be pursued in respect to this matter. I've been in communication on a number of occasions with the Federal Government and confirmed today with the office of the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, a tentative arrangement for a meeting to exchange strategy between ourselves and the Federal Government in respect to this matter.

I have indicated in statements to the press that the additional funding comes as no surprise to us because we can appreciate the fact that the proponents are anxious to proceed. In an election year, public works projects such as Garrison have an attractiveness to people like President Reagan and we are not surprised by those activities. What we are concerned to do is work as effectively as we can to convince the Congress and the Senate of the United States that this expenditure should not be authorized because it has not been proven that the development can take place without harming our waters.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, first things first. Has the Minister satisfied himself that the proposed \$53 million of new expenditures and the works that they will be applied to do will not in any way violate the International Boundaries Treaty that we have with the United States?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the short answer would be to say that I have not because, quite frankly, we do not accept the fact that Phase I, the developments that were authorized in this past funding year, satisfy the requirements of the International Joint Commission.

We disagree with those American administrative officials who say that the developments thus far pose no threat to our waterways and our water quality and the protection of our fisheries. The developments do provide for a transmittal of water into the Hudson Bay drainage basin. They say that none of the works will be used in a manner to derogate from, or deteriorate our water quality, or introduce any foreign fish species, but we are not convinced that any of those works are fail-safe, so we protest even those measures that have been authorized thus far. We are convinced that the whole project should be changed. We will continue to argue for that and we will hope to have a broad support for that position.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm for me and members of this House that, does this government still retain on a full-time basis a lawyer seconded from the Attorney-General's office in Washington as our watchdog, if you like, on the Garrison matters? Of course, along with the ongoing function of the Garrison Focus office here which provides, I suppose, an interesting newspaper clipping service to us, are these operations still in place?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, we have continued with our funding arrangements and our staffing. We maintain an ongoing watching brief through a law firm in Washington with whom we have contact, and they make preparations for all of our applications of strategy. We have had the use of a lawyer from the Attorney-General's Department from time to time in the previous period, and we intend to follow the same strategies again.

We have, as you know, developed an anti-Garrison leaflet. Another leaflet is in the work. There are a number of strategies that we're looking at to reinforce our continuing opposition.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, not very reassuring. The Minister indicates he's following the same strategy that has now brought about a situation where some \$53 million are being proposed on further construction of the Garrison, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Minister seriously consider removing himself from further negotiations with respect to Garrison matters, and asking the First Minister to designate somebody else who perhaps is more compatible in carrying on the kind of negotiations obviously necessary with our American friends on this very important issue?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I should resist answering such a silly question as that. It's almost a — (Interjection) — . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, we know that the previous government, of which the honourable member was a Minister, did very little in their efforts to try and

convince the American people that this project should not proceed.

A MEMBER: Come on now, tell the truth.

MR. H. ENNS: We didn't have these kind of headlines either. We didn't have \$53 million allocated to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: The people of Manitoba know that this government set up an office, set up facilities, got the agreement of the Federal Government to appoint an ad hoc committee composed of Ministers of the Federal Crown and members of this Assembly to work out a strategy. They know that that strategy, upon application in Washington, produced a dramatic reversal in a vote in the House of Congress where Garrison funding was defeated by some 100 votes, so that the proponents of Garrison had to utilize the Senate to secure funding. The honourable member knows that. The honourable member knows also that we increased our support in the Senate as a result of the visits we made in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the administration of the United States under President Reagan do not concern themselves with environmental matters, think that the environment does not count. That is their attitude in respect to acid rain, that is their attitude in respect to Garrison. We know that the people in the Congress of the United States have a growing appreciation for our concerns and we anticipate, with goodwill and effective action on the part of all concerned citizens, that we will convince more people in the Senate to join in opposition and that we will get a reversal of that funding.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. I ask the First Minister whether or not he should now consider saving the taxpayers of Manitoba a considerable cost of money for what can be described as flim flam and ballyhoo, perhaps somewhat soothing for local consumption, but certainly the outburst from the person charged with the negotiations with the United States on this important matter, the best thing the First Minister can do - and I'm asking that question in the interests of Manitoba - is to remove him from further negotiations and put somebody in place that can carry on the kind of reasoned discussions, the reasoned negotiations that worked so successfully during the Schreyer years, during the Lyon years and stopped the Americans from proposing these kind of monies to this project that is of concern to us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Resources certainly doesn't require my defending him because Manitobans recognize, by and large, that this Minister responsible for Resources in the Province of Manitoba has led a principled, determined opposition to Garrison; that this Minister has represented Manitobans well in the difficult task of combatting the movement towards the Garrison project in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, my only regret is, that I hoped we could continue on ensuring that there be a bipartisan overall approach in the interests of all Manitobans, and should continue because this matter is one of crucial concern to Manitobans. It is a matter which Manitobans want the political parties of this House to put aside their partisanship and to join together, in fact, as honourable members did a few weeks or a few months ago in joining with members from this side of the Chamber, in approaching congressmen and senators in the United States.

What Manitobans want is a provincial-wide consensus, a consensus that is expressed through both of their political parties and the party that's not represented in this House, the Liberal Party, expressing clear opposition to Garrison, a bipartisan approach, and not an approach, Mr. Speaker, that could deteriorate into a partisan approach, a cheap trick-like approach trying to take advantage of a difficult situation confronting Manitobans.

Flyer Industries Limited

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister responsible for Flyer Industries and would ask him in light of the problems that Flyer is faced with the Vancouver contract and now the reported problems being faced with regard to the Chicago contracts and the announcement yesterday that there will be some layoffs, some of a permanent nature, I wonder if the Minister responsible for Flyer could inform the House as to what the projected losses for Flyer will be this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't have the information with respect to the projected losses for Flyer. I can say that the present difficulties facing Flyer are somewhat complex. He made mention of the situation in Vancouver. The problem related to the buses in Vancouver was a result of, not Flyer Industries, but the subcontractor that installed that particular piece of equipment at the request of the City of Vancouver.

The problems in Chicago are of somewhat different nature and the chief executive officer of Flyer is in Chicago at the present time, and I would expect to receive a report from the board within a matter of days with respect to that problem.

The situation with the layoffs is also due to a number of factors. First of all, there is a problem with two of their suppliers, one of which has a strike situation and cannot provide the necessary supplies, and as a result of that, there has to be short-term layoffs at Flyer Industries until the problem with those supplies is rectified.

With regard to the permanent layoffs, that is as a result of the protectionist policies of the United States and their so-called Buy American policy, which means that some parts of the production of the Flyer buses has to be the assembly in the United States, which obviously, Mr. Speaker, means less work for the people on the production line here.

I would hope with the new chief executive officer that's in place at Flyer that we can correct some of these long-standing problems.

MR. R. BANMAN: A further supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether or not the order book for Flyer is in such a position that they have enough orders to keep them going for awhile.

The other question that I would have, in light of the fact that the "Buy American" situation has been one of concern with Flyer for the last 10 years, is the government contemplating opening up a U.S. subsidiary or a U.S. branch with regard to Flyer Industries?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: In regard to the first question, I do not have the detail of the order book but it is sufficient, with the present contracts, to continue production well into this year, indeed into 1985, but I would be pleased to provide that detail for the member.

With regard to the "Buy American" policy, Flyer is in discussions with respect to the assembly of some parts of the bus in the United States and at this point the option of opening a subsidiary company in the United States is not one that is being pursued in detail. Rather, they are looking at specific arrangements with specific companies for the final assembly of the buses in the United States.

MR. R. BANMAN: I appreciate the Minister letting us know what the order book looks like. I wonder if he could also, at the same time, provide the House with the information with regard to the projected loss for last year and what the picture looks like for the coming year.

The other question that I have is, I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether the government is consulting with any large corporations or people in the private sector with regard to either the possible sale of Flyer or a joint venture arrangement with regard to the operations of Flyer Industry.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, we have not had specific discussions that I'm aware of with respect to any possibilities of private ownership of Flyer or joint ventures but we certainly are open to any offers or any suggestions that may be made by industries; but we intend, over the next few months, to take a good look at various options that might be available for Flyer to ensure its long-term viability in the Province of Manitoba, as an efficient producer of urban buses.

Constitutional resolution

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. In view of the statement he made in his speech yesterday to the House that he was following the advice of constitutional legal advisors in the proposal before the Legislature, would the First Minister undertake to table today, if possible, copies of all legal opinions which the government has received with respect to this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought the honourable members had already seen Mr. Kerr Twaddle's legal opinion, for example. I don't know just what other legal opinions honourable members have seen, but I thought honourable members had had Kerr Twaddle's legal opinion, who is an eminent constitutional lawyer in the Province of Manitoba, and was indeed a constitutional lawyer who worked on behalf of the previous government in the Province of Manitoba, I thought that legal opinion had already been tabled in the House. If it has not been tabled then, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly ensure that it's tabled, but it was my understanding it had been tabled.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the legal opinion of Mr. Twaddle dated January 5, 1984, was tabled in the House. He does, however, refer to a previous opinion of August 17, 1983. I'm asking the First Minister, particularly in view of his speech yesterday when he said the government is relying on the advice of constitutional legal advisors. Would he table the opinion of Mr. Twaddle of August 17, 1983 and all other legal opinions received by the government with respect to this resolution and would he do so today if possible, Mr. Speaker?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought indeed that the honourable member would recognize that the legal opinion in August of last year dealt with other matters not before the House. What we're dealing with is a matter that is presently before the House and legal opinion pertaining to those matters that are presently before the House, the wording of the resolution, the wording of the bill that is presently before the House.

Surely it's time, Mr. Speaker, that we started to debate this bill, this resolution, not the resolution of last May and June.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the Premier again, in view of his speech yesterday in which he said the government was relying on the advice of constitutional legal advisors, is the opinion of Mr. Twaddle dated January 5, 1984 the only written legal opinion received by the government and the only advice they have received from their constitutional advisors with respect to the amendment proposed by the Government House Leader that is now before the House, Mr. Speaker, is that the only written legal opinion they have received? And if not, would he table all other opinions upon which they are relying?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I don't know whether there are other legal opinions or not, that would have to be checked.

What I do know, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the Member for St. Norbert to make note of this, that our legal advice from Mr. Kerr Twaddle, and it's also my understanding from the other constitutional lawyers that met, discussed this matter with the Attorney-General, with the House Leader, including Mr. Gibson, I believe Mr. Tallin and others, is to the effect that our chances of success in respect to the particular matter that is before us, insofar as the question of remoteness, is five times better than depending upon the outcome of the Bilodeau case proceeding to the Supreme Court of Canada in Ottawa. That is the legal opinion that we've received.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I can only presume then that there are no other written legal opinions which the government has with respect to the matter before the House.

Moratorium on adoption

MR. G. MERCIER: A supplementary question to the Minister of Community Services. Yesterday she said that 74 Native children have been permanently placed in homes and that is equivalent of adoption.

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: Just for purposes of record, because I think it's important that we attempt to ensure that procedure is kept as neat as possible, it's my understanding that a question to a different Minister cannot be phrased by way of a supplementary. The honourable member asked me a question, he asked me supplementaries resulting upon his question to me; now he's asking another member of the front bench a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I don't think the terminology was exactly accurate. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert may pose his question.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for St. Norbert. Order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Community Services said, in response to a question by me, that 74 Native children have received what she calls permanent placement, the equivalent of adoption. Would the Minister confirm that permanent placement is a form of placement in a foster home, that the people who look after the children are paid for those services and that a permanent placement is not the equivalent of an adoption where a parent/child relationship permanently is formed? Would she confirm those facts and confirm that none of the 74 Native children have been adopted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was imprecise of me to say the equivalent of adoption. What has taken place is full adoption.

The reason for my not remembering whether it was the full adoption or not is that we have had discussions of a kind of adoption that is more in tune with practice with Native communities, but in fact that is not law and the placements that have been made, 74 of the 98 in the past year-and-a-half have been full adoptions.

Mining Industry - accidents

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Energy and Mines.

As the Minister knows, there have been three tragic fatalities at the Inco mine in Thompson in the space of the last five months, the latest occurring earlier this week. In view of the fact there was a great deal of concern in Thompson about these tragic events, I would ask the Minister if he can assure my constituents there will be a thorough investigation of the fatalities and that every effort will be made to ensure that these kind of accidents don't happen again.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the concern of the Member for Thompson and of the workers in Inco and the residents of Thompson with respect to this latest very tragic fatality.

There will be a detailed investigation under The Fatalities Investigation Act. I've asked for reports from my department and, in addition, I would expect that the Workplace Safety and Health committee that is established at Inco, at the site, would also conduct their investigation, so that from these different perspectives one could get a full assessment as to what went wrong and perhaps try and ameliorate the situation.

Hydro employment - northern preference

MR. S. ASHTON: I thank the Minister for that assurance. I have another question to the same Minister in regard to his capacity as the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro.

In view of the fact that I and a number of other northern MLAs have received reports from our constituents that Winnipeg contractors are doing hydro work in the North and are by-passing northerners for the work on the sites in contravention of the policy of northern preference in employment, I would ask the Minister whether he would investigate this and investigate it with the view of enforcing the clear policy of northern preference for employment?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the government does have a commitment to the northern preference in northern development and that is especially true with respect to hydro development. There is an allied hydro contract with the various unions involved and the companies have been respecting that. I have asked Manitoba Hydro to give me a very detailed report on the situation and I would hope to have that report soon and report to the member and to other members of the House on this matter.

Lotteries

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week I was asked a question re the hiring practice of the Manitoba Lotteries Foundation by both the Members for La Verendrye and Pembina. I want to give the complete answer now.

As was announced, the policy of the government is first of all to hire, take over the responsibility as well as the staff of the Manitoba Lotteries Commission, as well as the Western Lotteries Manitoba distributor who were marketing for the government and whenever possible, any people that are making a living out of the lottery - as long as it's not a redundant position - to give them the first opportunity and to hire them by the Foundation; and then there was a specific question that is being credited to the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, wrongfully so. This important and far-reaching question should have been credited to the Member for Pembina. Mind you, it was an answer that is public, but the fact is that I'm sure he's anxious for me to answer it because it deals with my son-in-law, so I'd like to give him the information.

I might say that the Director of Marketing who was hired, not by me, and who was kept in office by four years of the former government — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: H—, we kept Al for a couple of years.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I beg your pardon?

A MEMBER: We kept Al for a couple of years.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, that's your baby. Anyway, the all-revealing answer to that all important question is that he made, when he was employed by the WLMD, \$52,400 plus increments and car allowance of \$3,600 for a total of \$56,000 and he is now working strictly for the government. He is now getting \$51,976.00.

Logan Avenue Park Plan

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House as to whether or not there are any commitments from private industry to locate in the Logan Industrial Park, the original concept which was drastically changed by the former Minister, now the Minister of Industry and Technology, over the objections of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government is pursuing the industrial development of that particular area, and the Provincial Government is pursuing the housing component. That is the way the division occurred and that is the way things are happening now. My understanding is that the Federal Government does not, at this point, have a large industrial component ready to move in there but is looking at smaller components instead. This will be discussed and verified probably in the next several days when I meet with the Ministers responsible.

North of Portage - development

MRS. G. HAMMOND: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker, how much money has the Minister committed

to the expropriation of property north of Portage Avenue?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, to answer that question, I think we would have to have the report of the development corporation which is due, as the member probably knows, towards the end of March - 100 days from December 16th. What will be expropriated is what will be needed, and we don't know what they are going to recommend that we need at this point. The province is the expropriating authority but it is done on behalf of the city.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, are there any commitments from private industry to locate north of Portage on the properties that have been expropriated?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Again, Mr. Speaker, I would have to refer the member to the press releases and announcements surrounding the establishment of the North of Portage Corporation. They have 100 days from the signing of the agreement on December 16th to investigate such possibilities surrounding the development north of Portage and to recommend to the shareholders, through levels of government, what will happen in that area, what they recommend should happen in that area. Following that recommendation, the shareholders have 15 days to determine whether they agree with the direction that the corporation is recommending. Then we will know what has come to pass.

They certainly are hearing representations from various groups and from developers and from all kinds of people who have ideas about what should happen there. What they recommend to us will determine what happens there, and that determination will have to be made by the three levels of government agreeing upon it.

Now, to ask at this point whether a particular group or a particular organization or a particular retail establishment has determined that it will, in fact, be in place north of Portage is not appropriate. I cannot answer that at this point because the North of Portage Development Corporation is the group that is hearing these representations and, in fact, is seeking them out.

Crosswalks

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways responsible for the Highway Traffic Board.

In light of another serious accident in a crosswalk last night, and with the increase of accidents and fatalities in the crosswalks, does the Minister plan to take any action to ensure the safety of people using the crosswalks?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, we are aware of the importance of reducing the number of accidents in crosswalks. There has been a number over the last period of time, and there is a committee currently constituted between the department - our

Registrar of Motor Vehicles is involved with that committee, chairing that committee - and the City of Winnipeg to review the regulations surrounding crosswalks.

There have been a number of changes over the years to improve the safety. We are concerned about that and we want to improve the safety in crosswalks.

Most of these crosswalks are under the jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg. The Department of Highways has about 12. But we, through the Highway Traffic Board, control the regulations regarding the safety and the physical layout of crosswalks. So what we are doing is proposing some changes that will improve the safety, we hope. These should be coming forward very soon, and they will involve flashing lights at crosswalks, undoubtedly and hopefully, I will be recommending to my colleagues that we look at some public education because one of the greatest problems with crosswalks is that both pedestrians and motorists are not fully aware of the responsibilities with regard to crossings. Pedestrians tend to feel very safe, that they should be able to just stick their arm out, or even not doing that, just proceed to walk across the street. Of course, with slippery conditions and so on, it is very dangerous and there has to be a lot more done with regard to public education in this regard and we intend to do that.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Can the Minister advise the board not to authorize any more crosswalks until the study is done on the effectiveness and safety of the walks presently in place?

HON. J. PHOHMAN: Looking at the number of pedestrian collisions, I should remind and bring to the attention of the House that there have been nearly 5,000 pedestrian collisions in the last period of 1975 to 1982. Only 343 of those have occurred in pedestrian crosswalks; that is about 7 percent. Now that is not to minimize the importance of improving the safety, but you can see that it is a small percentage of the total number. I wanted to bring that to the attention of the members opposite.

One thing, as I have said, that we are doing is studying the changes that should be made. Meanwhile, the City of Winnipeg is reviewing its obligations with regard to providing further crosswalks. I don't know at this time whether they are continuing to put in place other crosswalks with the current system that is in place, with the current signage and so on, but we will have these new proposals in place very soon. The city and the province are very anxious to see those changes come into place and we will take action as quickly as possible. Undoubtedly, there will be very few additional crosswalks put in place by the city in that short interval of time before action is taken.

Boundaries advisory committee

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the First Minister.

Some time ago, the First Minister was invited by the Governor of the State of North Dakota to participate with the Government of North Dakota and the

Saskatchewan Government in a boundaries advisory committee to deal with interjurisdictional problems, whether it be problems of rivers flooding or other matters of mutual concern, Mr. Speaker. Has the Premier made his mind up whether to accept the invitation and become a part of that advisory committee, or is he continuing to ignore it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Minister responsible for Resources has some additional information pertaining to that matter that might be of assistance to the honourable member. I have had meetings, in fact, with both the Governor of North Dakota and the Governor of Minnesota in the past two or three months, but I think the Minister of Resources can add some additional information that might be of some benefit to the Member for Arthur.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been studies made of the Souris basin. As most members know, the Souris is a river that not only affects lands in Saskatchewan, but also North Dakota and Manitoba. While we — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: While we have indicated our interest in joining North Dakota and Saskatchewan in any further dialogue in any way, getting together or joining and participating, we have not received any favourable response to that.

While I have the floor, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — well, the Honourable Member for Lakeside doesn't know which way the Red River flows. That indicates the kind of knowledge he has about Natural Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Wildlife Report

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain asked me about a report dealing with wildlife and poaching. I wasn't certain of the answer, so I took it as notice. I did indicate there were studies that were funded by the department from time to time, and I wasn't sure of the arrangements in respect to, I think the studies he was referring to.

I want to confirm that in accordance with past policy of the department, we do contribute grants to the Natural Resources Institute and that institute does authorize studies in various fields in the resources sector.

One of those studies authorized was one dealing with wildlife poaching and a study was authorized by the Natural Resources Institute, and to that study the Province of Manitoba also contributed some funds.

We don't control the release of the study. A copy of it was made available to us. I'm sure that the Natural Resources Institute, a publicly-funded body, is open to

release a copy of any of its reports. I would gladly make that available except that, you know, it does cost money to reproduce very large studies. If the honourable . . .
— (Interjection) —

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, if those loud and raucous voices over there would just be patient . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . and hear the conclusion of my remarks, perhaps they would be somewhat less strident in their tone.

Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the study that the honourable member is interested in. It's called "The Bessey Study." I'll be happy to loan my copy of the study to the honourable member, or if that's not satisfactory I will ask that a photocopy be made. But really I don't think that the citizens of Manitoba should be expected to duplicate in large quantity those things and provide them because that does involve a good deal of expense. It is a fairly substantial study. The honourable member can have my copy, can have it for a weekend for bedtime reading or if that's not satisfactory to him, I will make him a copy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate that response from the Minister. I would ask him if perhaps when I borrow that from him if I could take it down to the Garrison Focus office and have it copied there.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if wildlife poaching has something to do with Garrison, and the honourable member seems to think it has, that indicates the knowledge of the honourable member in respect to the Garrison project. It has nothing to do with the Garrison matter.

It is true that we hear, on the radio, comments about the activities of those proponents in Garrison in mitigating wildlife problems, but that is not the focus of our concern. The focus of our concern in respect to Garrison is water quality and degradation of our fishery, not wildlife, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 27 students of Grade 9 standing from the Elmwood School who are under the direction of Mr. Harrison. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND SUB-AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that debate on the motion of the Honourable Attorney-General respecting the proposed amendment to The Manitoba Act concerning Section 23 thereof, and on any amendments proposed thereto shall not be further adjourned.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. I have been advised by the Official Opposition Whip that the opposition will not return before 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. In view of this advice I have informed Chamber staff that they will not be required to remain on duty outside normal working hours. I have made arrangements to secure the Chamber, and the sounding of bells will be minimized to the greatest extent possible.

I am accordingly leaving the Chair to return at 10:00 p.m. this evening in order to adjourn the House.

(And the Division Bells having stopped ringing at 10:00 p.m.)

MR. SPEAKER: The time of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).