



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. 62 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 6 MAY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, 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	Rupertstland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, 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, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 6 May, 1983.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of members to the gallery where we have 36 students of Grade 12 standing from the Notre Dame Collegiate School under the direction of Mr. Delaquis. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

There are also 28 visitors from North Dakota, Grade 12, from the Thompson School under the direction of Mr. Swenson.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

British Columbia elections

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. I believe most people in Manitoba would agree with me that this is a great day for British Columbia and a great day for Canada.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba has the dubious distinction of having the only socialist government in Canada which, as one might expect, is totally out of step with economic reality and is the only one trying to spend its way out of an economic depression that it has contributed to rather greatly, would the First Minister on this gorgeous Manitoba Friday, early in May, do the people of Manitoba the greatest favour he could do, resign, call an election tomorrow so that Manitoba can join the rest of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would be tempted to do so if the Leader of the Opposition will assure me that he will carry on as Leader during the campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I do note with some obvious and candid disappointment the results of the election in British Columbia yesterday. What I am somewhat reassured about, Mr. Speaker, that since 1980, with very, very few exceptions, Manitoba being indeed pretty well the only exception - one other notable exception that will go unmentioned at this point - people returned their incumbent governments during difficult times. That, I think, is the trend across the country from Newfoundland to Nova Scotia to New Brunswick to Prince Edward Island to Ontario to Alberta and to British Columbia. Fortunately, it was not the case in the Province of Manitoba; unfortunately, it was also not the case in Saskatchewan.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in that same mood of sharing this morning, I would ask the First Minister if he would agree to this proposition: That if he will call an election in Manitoba this month, I'll agree to stay on as Leader of the Conservative Party on two conditions: first of all, the precondition is that he must stay on as Leader of the New Democratic Party and, secondly, that he must have all of those MLAs who participated so actively in the election in B.C. working up front for him here in Manitoba.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must say the Leader of the Opposition is tempting me very very strongly to take the advantage of a golden opportunity.

New Arena - Core Area Initiatives Fund

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, and it is this: How can the First Minister justify his statement that he agrees with the city's concerns about the redevelopment proposal by the Federal and Provincial Governments for north Portage Avenue? He agrees with the city's concerns about building an arena, but feels that the city can approve the project in principle and worry about the details of building a massive multimillion-dollar arena later on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I must acknowledge that I didn't hear the full content of the member's question and if I misinterpret by way of my answer to the question then I would beg the honourable member's patience.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, in the view of this government and the Minister of Urban Affairs, we certainly sympathize with the concerns of the City of Winnipeg pertaining to the particular item of arena, as to whether

or not we should proceed with an arena or whether there are obvious alternatives to an arena that ought to be examined.

I believe that should indeed be done in a co-operative way involving the federal, the provincial and the city levels of government. That does not detract from support in principle to supporting, with the other two levels of government - both the municipal and the federal level of government, a co-operative venture to inject public funds in the core area development and extensions of the core area development in order to revitalize and to create employment in the City of Winnipeg.

The principle is one that, I think, is clear and I'm confident that three levels of government working co-operatively and co-operatively injecting funds into the proposal can bring about that kind of revitalization, that kind of employment without at this time facing the danger of the entire project being shot down, because at this particular point there are some reservations that we might have in regard to particular points or particular details of the proposal.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Federal Government, the Federal Minister, Mr. Axworthy, has indicated that an arena is an essential component of the redevelopment plan north of Portage Avenue, how can the First Minister suggest to the City of Winnipeg that they approve the plan in principle and worry about the detail of building a multimillion-dollar arena in the downtown later on, Mr. Speaker? It seems to be such a large component of the plan that I'm having some difficulty finding out how the First Minister can justify approval of the plan in principle and worry about such a large detail later on.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware as to the details of the honourable member being accurate. I think the Minister of Employment has indicated at the federal level, although he prefers an arena, that he is prepared to examine other alternatives that would be equivalent to an arena, in order to obtain that kind of downtown development in the core area of the City of Winnipeg. Or alternatively, and the city's expressed an interest in this aspect too - whether alternative uses can be obtained insofar as the existing arena, so that there not be two arenas in the City of Winnipeg, as the member has referred to, but only one arena.

These are details that I'm satisfied that if the Minister of Urban Affairs, the Minister of Employment, the Regional Minister for the Province of Manitoba, the Federal Government, and the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg sit down, that they can co-operatively work out a solution, rather than us trying to - as it would appear the honourable member is desirous is doing - puncturing holes in a project before we've really had opportunity to ascertain whether we can come to agreement, so that we can bring about that kind of revitalization, that kind of creation of employment, that I think all Winnipeggers would like to see occur in the core area of the city.

Jobs Fund - unemployed

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, another question to the First Minister.

As the Chairman of the Jobs Fund Committee of Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the unemployment statistics released this morning, which indicate that of selected Canadian cities: Vancouver, Edmonton, Regina, Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Hull, Montreal, Halifax and St. Johns; the City of Winnipeg has the largest unemployment increase of all of those cities - a full half percentage point. While the City of Regina went up .1 percent, and Toronto went up .2 percent, all other major cities noted went down in unemployment, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister, as the Chairman of the Jobs Fund Committee of Cabinet, advise this House as to the reasons why such an increase took place?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not received the details of this morning's report. The Minister of Finance, acting on behalf of the Minister of Labour, who is not present, does have those details and I will ask him to deal with the specifics and the particulars. I am pleased to hear, by way of radio report, and I have not had an opportunity to confirm this, that the overall Manitoba unemployment figure is down by 2,000. Not enough to indeed cause much satisfaction on our part, but I think it does demonstrate that the trend, the movement in the Province of Manitoba is now heading, slowly but surely, in the right direction of a reduction in unemployment. I would ask the Acting Minister responsible for the Ministry of Labour to respond more to the detail of the question, re the rate of unemployment in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for St. Norbert obviously doesn't see the forest for the trees. What he is missing in total is the fact that, in Manitoba, we have .2 percent fewer people working now than we had a year ago; in Canada as a whole, we have 1 percent fewer people working now than a year ago. Our economic performance indeed overall has been five times better in terms of job retention than the average of what has happened in this country. The Member for St. Norbert ignores the fact that the figures for this month show us almost 5 percent below the average in Canada for youth unemployment.

The numbers show that we are at a point now where we have 1,000 less people employed in Manitoba than we had a year ago. Really it's unfortunate, but in Canada overall, there are 115,000 less people employed than a year ago. It's a very clear demonstration that in this province, we have done better in fighting the recession than we have across the country. I really would hope that the members of the opposition would stop just picking on the one or two specific numbers that may on a month-to-month basis show some difficulties, instead of looking in total at year-over-year numbers - (Interjection) - the Leader of the Opposition wants to get into this. I'm sure he has some comments that he's prepared to make on it, but let's talk about what the real numbers are and not just be so very selective and ignore the real picture.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the clear statistics that show that the City of Winnipeg, containing well over half the population of the Province of Manitoba, has the highest increase in unemployment of any of the major cities in Canada referred to in the unemployment statistics.

Mr. Speaker, the Acting Minister of Labour has referred to youth unemployment. Mr. Speaker, in November of 1981, the month before this government took office, the unemployment rate among young people in this province was 9.8 percent. It has gone down from last month, from March to April of 1983, to 17.8 percent. My question to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, is this: In spite of all of the make-work projects which the government has undertaken, in the light of this 17.8 percent increase, how many of these high school students, community college students, and university students are still going to be unemployed under this government this summer?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, it's pretty obvious that the Member for St. Norbert missed the announcement that we've just made several days ago. We're tripling the funds for the Careerstart program. We are right now in a position where we have almost 5 percent less unemployment for youth than in other parts of the country and he is totally ignoring as well, when he's talking about one month's increase in unemployment and he mentions that Winnipeg has by far the majority of Manitoba's workers, he's ignoring the fact that in Manitoba our seasonally adjusted unemployment rate is 9.6 percent and in Canada overall, it's 12.5 percent, as far as I know. Indeed, contrary to where we were when the Tories were in government when we were in third lowest or fourth lowest, we are now in the position where we are second lowest in terms of unemployment in this country. Indeed, in Alberta, the seasonally adjusted rate is now at 10.5 percent over the whole province; we are at 9.6 percent. We are, comparatively speaking, doing quite well. We are doing very well, and I would hope that members opposite would acknowledge that.

The Member for St. Norbert knows full well that our student employment programs don't click in until about the end of April. A lot of these numbers are now out of date, some of them in May, and some of it clicks in in June, at the end of June and into July. So those figures, because of the money that we are preparing to spend on the Careerstart, will be alleviated in accordance with the money spent.

Unemployment increase

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, further to the questions of my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, about the unemployment rates in Manitoba and the picture that the Minister of Finance is trying to paint about that unfortunate situation, how does the Minister of Finance square his statement that he just made about Manitoba being comparatively better off with the statements that used to be made by the Member for Brandon East - now the Minister of Community

Development - two years ago when he was saying that Manitoba's economy was on the rocks, when there were 30,000 fewer unemployed than there are today? How does he square that? Or is he like the man who falls off the 30th floor and somebody asks him on the 12th, as he's falling, how are you doing now? And he says, so far, okay. Is that his thesis?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. ENNS: Quiet, quiet!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Harry.

I think that the Leader of the Opposition requires another short lesson in history. He doesn't recall that in those days people were voting with their feet. We were losing population. We were the only province in the country where high school students had to leave the province in order to get employment. They had to leave to go to Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, etc.

Since the New Democrats have come to office we have an increase in population in this province, an increase. We are comparatively doing better. When he talks about the 30,000 unemployed when they were in office, you have to compare it to what was happening elsewhere.

At that time we were third and fourth-lowest, at a time when we were losing population. Now we're second lowest at a time when we are gaining in population, and for them to suggest that the two situations are comparable is utter nonsense. People know that - that's why they're coming back to Manitoba.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question and a favour of the Minister of Finance, if he could put down on paper and make 30,000 copies of it, a statement which would explain to the 30,000 people who are unemployed in Manitoba today, who weren't unemployed two years ago, and would he mind telling those 30,000 more unemployed, how they are better off today under the New Democrats than they were when they had jobs under the Conservatives two years ago.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: If you were here, we would have to print 60,000 copies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, there are now approximately 52,000 people unemployed in this province. This government has as its very first priority the issue of job creation. We are doing everything in our power to ensure that we get more people working in this province contrary to the policies that were followed by the previous Conservative Government.

If they were in office today, you can rest assured that we would have far more unemployment than we have today, and those people who are unemployed know that full well. They can see the numbers for other provinces, they can see what's happening in Conservative provinces.

HON. S. LYON: That is not what the polls are telling us. Have you looked at the polls recently? Why are you running 10 points behind us?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the voters spoke on election day. They saw what happened in four years of Lyon Conservatism.

HON. S. LYON: Try them today and see what they say.

A MEMBER: No, we tried them a year-and-a-half ago.

Motorcyclists - proposed helmet legislation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the First Minister and would ask him, in view of the fact that in a speech in front of the Legislature to the motorcyclists yesterday the Minister of Agriculture indicated that he is personally opposed to compulsory use of helmets, and also in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that he also indicated to the motorcyclists that they should keep up the pressure on the government and that it would be the NDP Caucus who would be making a decision on this matter, in light of this particular statement yesterday, I wonder if the First Minister could inform the Legislature whether or not he will now be listening to his Caucus and allowing a free vote on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The honourable member is alluding that I made statements to the group of motorcyclists that I supported their position.

What I did say to the motorcyclists at the meeting was that they should be aware of my longstanding position, where I supported safety legislation in all aspects including helmets for motorcycle riders, so the information that he has presented is not accurate to this House.

Sir, as well, I indicated that it was not my position to be able to tell the motorcyclists whether or not any changes would be made, but at any point in time changes might be made to legislation. One member does not have that sole position to be able to make that kind of a change, unlike, Sir, the statements that were made by the Member for Lakeside who said that he was coming from a party supporting freedom of choice. I wonder where they will stand on the issue of abortion. Mr. Speaker, in terms of a party of freedom of choice.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture left the distinct impression yesterday that he was personally opposed to the use of compulsory helmets, and in light of the fact that he indicated that the motorcyclists should continue the pressure on the government, and that the

Caucus would be making the decision, has the First Minister delegated the responsibility to allowing a free vote on this matter to the Caucus to decide?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I ask the honourable member to withdraw the inference that he made to the statements that he alleges that I made.

Sir, what I did say at the meeting was that some of the suggestions in terms of safety measures, that the members should be presenting their views and continue to present their views, that governments would want to listen to the concrete suggestions and that they should make their presentations known to the Law Amendments Committee when the bill appears.

Certainly I would be one member that would want to encourage public participation in the democratic process of making their view known on any piece of legislation.

As one member of government, I would have been remiss in not encouraging that participation and those kinds of submissions, because I say, Sir, some of those suggestions dealing with safety measures in terms of licensing, in terms of ideas that they had, deserve merit and deserve the consideration of governments whoever is in power, Sir. I wanted to encourage that kind of position and situation to be put forward. But to make the kind of statement that the honourable member has made, Sir, about what I had said is untrue and I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member of La Verendrye to the same point.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister while speaking left a definite impression with me that he was against helmets.

Mr. Speaker, further, on the way in today listening to the news reports, he indicated that the Caucus would be making a decision on this matter. Mr. Speaker, we've all heard that radio clip, and I was there last night when he said it.

All I want to ask the Premier of this province is whether or not the Caucus will be making a decision with regards to a free vote on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. R. PENNER: The Minister of Agriculture, who spoke and whose words are a matter of record, has indicated to the House that the statement attributed to him is erroneous and has asked that it be withdrawn and, indeed, I think that it should be. I would simply like to point out that the legislation, which will be given introduction on second reading today, represents the decision of our caucus, represents the decision of our government, and the reading of that legislation by the Minister of Transportation will demonstrate the unity on this side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, further to the same point of order; having also been present at that same meeting,

there's no question in my mind and I would say in many of the cyclists' minds that were gathered there, that although the Minister did not say in words clearly that could be interpreted as support for their cause, the protestors' cause, in the manner and the way in which he spoke, he left that impression, and that is the way the news clip is being picked up on the radio this morning.

Mr. Speaker, let me also take this opportunity to make it very clear that in my brief statement to the demonstration, I made it very clear that I was not authorized to speak on behalf of the Conservative Party, and the member will verify that; and that is that I was proud and privileged, however, to belong to a party that, by and large, believes in freedom of choice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I remind honourable members about Citation 322 of Beauchesne, which says, "It has been formally ruled by Speakers that a statement by a member respecting himself, and particularly within his own knowledge, must be accepted." That being the case, when a member gets up and makes a statement that he in fact did say something, that must be accepted. If another member wishes to stand up and say that he understood personally - personally understood something different - that too must be accepted, and I believe that settles the point.

Seat belt legislation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Highways, who is introducing the seat belt, helmet, and child restraint legislation. I wonder if the Minister of Highways has given any consideration to breaking up the bill, allowing separate votes on these three different issues; in other words, allowing a separate vote on the helmets, the seat belts, and the child restraint.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Transportation.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think the member should recall a number of statements that were made on this issue over the last year and one-half, and I believe they were all very much the same; that we would be introducing a safety package as one bill, and that it would not be a position where the government will be bringing in piecemeal the helmets, the child restraints, the safety belt and so on, as occurred in other provinces. We have the history of that legislation introduced in other provinces behind us. The benefit of their experience is here for us to judge, and on that basis, we are proceeding with a comprehensive safety package.

Manitoba Government - logo

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier and I wonder if he has, as yet, had

an opportunity to ascertain from his Communications Director, Mr. Dan O'Connor, whether or not a contract has indeed been awarded for the redesign of the Manitoba Government logo.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't confirm that the Queen's Printer did invite major Manitoba design firms to present proposals for improving the provincial visual identity on the basis of the . . .

HON. S. LYON: Why don't you resign? That would improve it.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Well, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if the members would like the answer or not. I would presume they do.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Premier who Mr. Dan O'Connor reports to in this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that it's very very clear. The request pertaining to the item comes from the Queen's Printer, and the Queen's Printer falls under the responsibility of the Minister responsible for Communications.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not referring to any request that came from the Queen's Printer. I have a simple question for the Premier. He obviously has difficulty in understanding it, but the question is: Who does Mr. Dan O'Connor report to in this government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just can't understand the Member for Tuxedo, because it has been a matter of public record for some time. I only invite the honourable member to examine the items of public record. If he would do that, he would not need to consume time during the question period asking questions that are very very clear and have been for some time clear on record by way of Order-in-Council, by other statements in this Chamber.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the Premier's sensitivity in being caught in a position where he doesn't know what contracts are being entered into, what agreements are being undertaken by his own Communications Director. I can understand why he's a little concerned about that. I am not the one who's wanting to use up the time of question period. He's the one who has avoided answering a direct question, so I'll go on, Mr. Speaker, with another question then. What other contracts and undertakings is Mr. Dan O'Connor able to enter into on behalf of the government without the knowledge of the Premier and his Cabinet?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, it's a wonderful example of open government on behalf of the Premier. Mr. Speaker, then, a further question.

In view of the fact that the government has so many very very serious issues confronting it - and we're talking about 52,000 unemployed Manitobans, we're talking about a record deficit of \$579 million, we're talking about a reduction in the credit rating - how is the changing of the Manitoba Government's logo a priority for this administration? How can that be a priority, given what's facing the government today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member was concerned that this government is afraid of freedom of information; yet, when I rise in my spot to respond to the opposition, I get yelled down by the sometimes Leader of the Opposition and get dictated to that I have to do what I'm told by him.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, on a point of order. I realize that during question period there is some latitude which you, Sir, as Speaker are prepared to give with respect to the framing of questions, with respect to the length of answers, but there is one thing that I think must be respected in the House, and that is the right of a person who is asked a question to answer that question. The public of Manitoba are getting sick and tired of this breakdown in decorum in the House. They expect the House to act in a civilized manner in a civilized society. If that can't happen, if you, Sir, are not being allowed to keep order in this House, then indeed this will be a poor example for the citizens of Manitoba.

Twice now, the Minister has risen in his place to attempt to answer a question; twice there has been the sound of hyenas and jackals in the jungle. That kind of society we do not want to live in.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. I would hope that when members ask a question, they would be courteous enough to listen to the reply that's given.

The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the question of the Member for Tuxedo, it is not a priority of this government with respect to looking at the redesign of the coat of arms of the province, the province's word mark. There has been a contract let with the Tom Powell Design firm of the City of Winnipeg. There was a call by the Queen's Printer to a number of design firms in the City of Winnipeg to bid on the project to look at redesigning the provincial logo, using the existing coat of arms and the existing symbol that is well-recognized by Manitobans, that

being the buffalo. The contract was awarded to Tom Powell Design Studio, based on their price and on their expertise in this area.

It is a matter of concern, one that's been expressed by a number of government departments, including the Manitoba Design Institute, that the government should look at its provincial identity, and there is an ongoing committee that includes the Queen's Printer, the Executive Director of the Manitoba Design Institute, the Communications Co-ordinations Secretary, the Premier and the head of the Preparations Section of the Queen's Printer that is monitoring this project.

Weppler Report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, again my question is for the Premier. In view of the fact that this is a direct recommendation out of the Weppler Report on Communications of this government; in view of the fact that we learned just a week ago that another direct recommendation of the Weppler Report is being implemented in the Department of Education whereby a new Communications Branch has been set up at a cost of \$300,000 a year with a staff of seven people; and in view of the fact that previously the Premier had indicated that he repudiated the recommendations of the Weppler Report and was not going to be carrying through on most of them, what other aspects of that report are going to be implemented in the near future as a priority of this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Minister of Education and myself, I thought had succeeded in straightening out the Member for Tuxedo. Three hundred thousand dollars of additional monies were not obtained in order to carry out additional communication activity in the Department of Education. For the honourable member to continue to so advise this Chamber after being clearly so informed by the Minister of Education and by myself is really unforgivable, Mr. Speaker, because the Honourable Member for Tuxedo knows otherwise. He continues to make the statement that he has been making repeatedly. What the Minister of Education has done is to rationalize the services within her department without adding additional cost, without adding additional staff.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, for the information of honourable members across the way, the communications system that exists and has been existing for some time has not been an adequate one in informing the public in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it is important within any democratic society that the public are properly informed of the programs that exist, the programs that are there to serve Manitobans. We are going to be able to do that without adding additional staff, without adding additional dollars, but in a way, Mr. Speaker, that will reach Manitobans in a more meaningful way than the practice in the past.

The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, an important department, has not had adequate communications services in the past. Other departments

in this government have not had adequate communications. It is a question of reorganizing and rationalizing the existing services to inform Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, if we are to provide good government, we must inform Manitobans as a whole.

I'm pleased, Mr. Speaker, to advise you that it is a task of this government to inform Manitobans of the programs that are available, and it won't be by putting full one-page ads in the papers suggesting to Manitobans that they're sitting on some sort of mythical pot of gold.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I think that it's unforgivable of the Premier of this province to be so ill-informed or to attempt to mislead the public such that he doesn't realize that, in the Department of Education, 16 positions in Field Services were declared redundant, people removed from their jobs so that they could then be transferred and reappropriated to Communications. That is the priority that's being given in this government, and I think that it's terrible.

So, Mr. Speaker, following from that, my question is: In view of the fact that one senior administrator hired by the Department of Energy and Mines has succeeded in destroying all the economic opportunities that were available to Manitobans for employment in the future, that person having come from Mr. Broadbent's office . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we have had a free-roaming speech that has gone over the Department of Education and is now into the Department of Mines, simply making statements. It's a supplementary question. We have had rulings from you before with respect to preambles. This is becoming exceptionally abusive of the precedents and rules in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I would hope the Honourable Member for Tuxedo would be able to phrase his question in such a manner that it is not a speech or suggesting its own answer.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very simply, my question is to the Premier. Will he now call a halt to the expansion of the propaganda machine of the government in response to the Weppler Report? Will he now tell the public of Manitoba that he has greater priorities than to simply work up the apple-polishing image of this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't really know how one responds to a question that is based on so much misinformation as, unfortunately, the Honourable Member for Tuxedo is basing his question upon. Mr. Speaker, I have indicated very clearly and did so at the time of the issue of the Weppler Report, that there were many aspects of that report that we would not be adopting. Specifically, we would not be adopting

the very expensive Alberta kind of motto by which there would be one centralized public information service. That was beyond the capacity of Manitoba to do so.

Mr. Speaker, what I did say and what I continue to say and my colleagues say is that it is crucial, it is important to inform Manitobans of the programs that exist. Mr. Speaker, it would be a failure on our part not, for instance, to have announced to Manitobans the Careerstart Program, to advise those that are between the ages of 16 and 24 to advise the employers of this province, both profit and non-profit, that the government is interested in employing young people. It would have been a dereliction of duty on our part to have not informed the public, Mr. Speaker. It would be a dereliction of duty on the part of the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Minister not to inform Manitobans pertaining to consumer practices. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, that kind of information . . .

Mr. Speaker, I do think there is some responsibility to ensure that when questions are asked members are given an appropriate opportunity of answering without having to shout members across the way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in addition, let me make it very clear, we will - although members do not like this across the way, for obvious political reasons - inform Manitobans of programs that the Minister of Agriculture is presenting, the Minister of Economic Development, the Minister of Community Services. We have a responsibility and we will fulfill that democratic responsibility of informing Manitobans of programs that exist so they can take advantage of those programs.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Orders of the Day, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 80 Grade 11 students from the Edward Schreyer School. They are under the direction of Mr. Grant and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Highways.

There are also 26 students of Grade 9 standing from the Mackenzie Junior High School under the direction of Mr. McCallum. They are from the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River, that an humble address be voted to her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence with and any and all responses thereto from the members of the Executive

Council and any department, agency, branch or division of government, including all Crown corporations, concerning the demonstration in front of the Consulate General of the United States of America at Winnipeg on March 23, 1983, attended by Members of the Executive Council and NDP Government caucus at which an American flag was burned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, the government accepts the requests subject to normal rules and practices governing communications sent or received in confidence, whether that confidence or established Crown privilege is expressed or implied, and whether existing by reason of statutory provision or common law or by reason of accepted parliamentary practice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since 1958, I've heard a number of caveats attached to addresses for papers. I've never seen a House Leader have to read a caveat the way this House Leader just did. We'd be interested in knowing what his interpretation is of accepted parliamentary practice. We know what Beauchesne and the Rules say, and if his caveat means subject to the normal caveats that apply in Beauchesne and under our practices here in this Legislature, then the matter need not be debated. But if he's trying to apply a further caveat than that, then perhaps this should be debated.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter is not debatable at this stage. Is it the pleasure of this House to adopt the motion? (Agreed) Agreed and so ordered.

SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please call the second reading on Bills 60, followed by 26, followed by 23 and 24, and thereafter, Mr. Speaker, time permitting, we will move to debate on second readings, the adjourned debates?

BILL NO. 60 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT (2)

HON. S. USKIW presented Bill No. 60, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act (2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I note with some concern the lack of interest in this particular subject at this point

in our day. I would have thought after yesterday's demonstration that everyone or every member of the Legislative Assembly would have been here to participate most fully on such a contentious issue.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation that is being introduced, of course, is not new to the Canadian public. It's not new to Manitobans in the sense that we have brought this kind of legislation before this Assembly before and, of course, didn't proceed with it to the point of implementation.

I believe at this stage, however, Mr. Speaker, we have now the advantage, if you like, and the benefit of the experience of mandatory seat belt legislation, of child restraint provisions, of helmet laws throughout a number of areas of the world but certainly five other provinces of Canada. We, now being the sixth province, where it will become law that these provisions must be met in the interest of public safety and health.

I want to say that means, Mr. Speaker, that after this bill is passed in this Assembly that approximately 20 million Canadians out of about 24 million will be living under similar laws and regulations with respect to safety on the highways, so that in essence the few Maritime provinces have yet to conform to the idea and the Province of Alberta. Apart from that, the whole of the nation will have adopted this method of improving the health and safety of our people while they are travelling on the highway system across Canada.

One of the things that I think we should take into account, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we recognize that it is indeed an intrusion of freedom of choice - no question about that - but I think we should recognize that is not unique, in itself, that every time this Assembly or any Assembly or any Parliament passes a new measure, a new law, that it is probably a reduction of some people's freedom somewhere along the way in its effect and its implementation, and so on.

I can think of no better example, for example, than The Planning Act of Manitoba, an Act that may be found in many jurisdictions, in all jurisdictions across the world, Mr. Speaker, and certainly in North America. Anyone that is familiar with that piece of legislation knows fully that there are very great restrictions on personal freedom and where, in fact, even the restrictions apply in economic terms. So this kind of provision, Mr. Speaker, is not new, wherein it does, in fact, take away the freedom of choice in the overall interests of the person whom we're trying to protect, and society, we believe, will be better for it by the fact that we will hopefully have reduced our fatalities and injuries as a result of the passage of this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, we move on this knowing that we are treading in this area, but satisfied that the information, the knowledge, and the collective statistics of those jurisdictions, that have had in place this kind of legislation, justify this measure at this time.

Mr. Speaker, there are arguments made by some that there may be instances where the wearing of a seat belt while driving a car could be hazardous or could cause injury. I suppose one could find such examples, and we don't want to make the point that that will never happen, because I'm certain, that in certain circumstances that it may be that one would be better off without having worn a seat belt. But that, in itself, does not satisfy the need of those people that argued for the freedom of choice, in that the statistics

clearly show that in the majority of cases, one's position is enhanced with the use of these safety devices. So we're not going to make the argument, Mr. Speaker, that under no circumstances will you be worse off because of the provision in this bill that requires one to wear a seat belt. There will be instances where it may not have been or will not be an advantage.

We are also aware, Mr. Speaker, that over the last three or four decades, we've had numerous studies conducted throughout various parts of North America. It should be noted that the first country that introduced this kind of legislation was Australia some years ago, and within the first year, their experience was a 30 percent reduction in fatalities and somewhat lesser percentage improvement with respect to injuries, but a very substantial improvement of highway safety in Australia at that particular time.

In Canada, of course, we have now the provinces of British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec, and Newfoundland, that have already passed this kind of legislation. In each of those provinces, with the exception of Newfoundland, for which we still don't have statistics - at least it's too early to quantify and to analyse one way or the other - but in each of those that we have data on, we see a marked decrease in the numbers of fatalities and injuries since the introduction of the legislation in those respective provinces.

In terms of Manitoba's statistics, Mr. Speaker, to the argument that there is a danger of being trapped in a vehicle in a collision by the use of a seat belt, our own study conducted in 1980 of 127 rural accidents in Manitoba, showed that 64 persons were ejected from the vehicle and of these 64 people, 79 percent or about 50 of them were killed. Many of these deaths could have been avoided with the use of a seat belt, Mr. Speaker. Roughly 80 percent of people that are thrown out of their vehicle on impact are people that die as a result of that accident. So the argument for being free to fall out and hopefully escape injury or death doesn't hold up statistically at all.

With respect to child restraints, Mr. Speaker, one of the things people fail to appreciate or understand and it's the dynamic of movement itself, the speed at which one is travelling in a vehicle. One has to appreciate that you are moving along very much like a missile, Mr. Speaker, even though you're in a vehicle and you appear to have a lot of protection around you, but on sudden impact, your body movement is still travelling at the speed at which your vehicle was moving and that's where, of course, the injuries arise from - the fact that you are indeed a missile in the car at that stage, on impact. That is why many people who are not belted in, end up going through their windshields and are ejected from the vehicle one way or another, either through open doors or directly through the windshield, which causes death and severe injury.

With respect to children, many mothers have assumed that the safest place for their child is, of course, in their lap while they're, in fact, travelling on the highway system. Well, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the analysis is that that is the most dangerous of all situations. If you observe the data that has been put together on child restraints, I don't believe there has been argument against it to be found anywhere, we find that on impact the child leaves the arm, if you like, or arms, and hits

the dash or the windshield. That's the first scenario. Behind the child, the mother then comes along and impacts the second time the child against the dashboard or against the windshield. Quite often, the mother causes the death of the child - the second round, the second blow. The child flies from the mother's arms, hits the dashboard, absorbs two or three radio knobs in one skull, if you like, or breaks through the windshield. The mother then comes behind and impacts again on that same person or the child. That is proven beyond doubt, Mr. Speaker. Child restraints are, in this bill, extremely important. I want you to note that in the Province of Ontario, they have just recently amended their legislation to make child restraints compulsory as well.

The most glaring illustration of the value of child restraint systems in automobiles was a study carried out, Mr. Speaker, 1970-79 period, of motor vehicle accidents in the State of Washington. The conclusion drawn from the study was that if all children involved had been wearing child restraints, there would have been 93 percent fewer deaths. It's indeed a significant figure, Mr. Speaker. The study further concluded that in that 10-year period, no child passenger less than one year of age and who had been restrained at the time of the accident had died. That's an important statistic.

Additional research conducted by the California Medical Centre at Irving, California, found that nearly 25 percent of injuries to infants resulted from non-crash incidents such as sudden stops or turns. We have had examples of that here in this province, and most recently during one of our ice storms here on Garvin Avenue a couple of months back where a child's life was taken as a result of a car getting out of control on the slippery highway. The child was thrown out. There was no accident involved. The driver wasn't injured, but the child was killed. We have all kinds of examples like that, Mr. Speaker.

A further study conducted by Robert Sures and published in the American Journal of Public Health stated that child restraint systems when properly used can reduce fatalities by approximately 90 percent and reduce crippling by 65 percent to 70 percent. There is a very important implication not only for the benefit and the health of the people involved, but the cost to society in looking after people who are injured; a very significant saving in costs involved there.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are figures and statistics and analyses that, I believe, we cannot ignore. I believe we have a responsibility to look at them most seriously and determine that indeed the course of action that we are taking is one that must be taken, even though it does sacrifice a measure of freedom of choice, if you like.

With respect to the helmets, Mr. Speaker, we have heard many arguments pro and con. Naturally, one has to appreciate the mentality, if you like, the disposition of those that like to drive bicycles or motorbikes, motorcycles, and I know that we all have had that natural inclination at some point in our lifetime where we wanted to be free-wheeling along, exposed to the world if you like — (Interjection) — yes, the idea of the wind whistling by and blowing through your hair, and all of the macho arguments, is the term I believe that one could use, about driving bikes. I have to admit that our two sons

were in that category. They both had bikes; they both had helmets, strangely enough, and it wasn't by my instruction. It was by their choice, interestingly enough.

So, Mr. Speaker, we all have at one time or another, either ourselves or our children, experienced these pleasures with or without the use of safety devices. We've also experienced some grave concerns while our children were experiencing the pleasure of driving these vehicles either on the highway or off the highway. Parents have always had concerns about whether or not their children are going to come home that day in proper shape, in one piece, if you like, and certainly not injured; and that's something that I don't need to elaborate on.

I want to take a moment or two to remind members that in another study done by the University of Southern California, we have the study dealing with some of the statements that oppose the use of helmets. We would like to deal with that, because I think it's of a great deal of interest to those that have expressed the desire for the freedom of choice option.

The statement that helmets can be a hazard in themselves restricting hearing and vision, in the Hirt Report (phonetic) the rebuttal is that helmets provide more than 180 percent of peripheral vision. I think that pretty well covers it if that report is indeed accurate. We can deal with it in that way. Less than 9 percent of all motorcycles involved in accidents are struck from outside of a 180-degree angle.

With respect to fatigue, 90 percent of all motorcycle accidents happen within the first 36 minutes of a person getting on that bicycle or on that motorcycle. So fatigue is certainly not the argument that can be held up.

With respect to neck injuries, out of 899 accidents studied at length, only 12 serious to fatal neck injuries were recorded. Nine were without helmets. Nine of those people did not wear helmets out of the 12.

With respect to hearing, most helmets actually enable the wearer to better perceive traffic sounds because of the reduction of wind noise and, of course, the noise from one's own motorcycle.

With respect to the statement that 33 states have repealed their legislation in this area, in April, 1980, in their report to Congress, the administration of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration stated as follows, "Since 1976, 27 states have repealed or weakened their laws requiring helmet use and motorcycle fatalities have increased by more than 40 percent, while new motorcycle registrations have gone up less than 1 percent. It is estimated that motorcyclists triple the risk of death by failing to use protective helmets."

Out of 899 motorcycle collisions studied in depth, 40 percent of riders were wearing helmets. In that example, 23 percent were fatally injured; 77 percent, on the other side of the ledger, were not wearing helmets who were fatally injured. So we can see that of those that were wearing helmets, a much larger percentage suffer the ultimate death penalty, if you like, for not wearing helmets. Only one helmeted rider died specifically of head injuries due to crushing in this analysis.

The University of Manitoba Road Safety Research Unit on-scene investigations of 125 fatal or serious motorcycle collisions, retrospective analysis of 700 collisions between 1975 and 1976 based on police

reports and clinical information. Helmets were observed to withstand impact with rigid structures for a change of velocity of up to 40 miles per hour without shattering; suggesting that helmet failure is an unlikely cause of head injuries in the majority of collisions. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are important things to note when one is considering the wisdom of this legislation.

Let's talk about some of the myths and facts, Mr. Speaker, about seat belts as well. Good drivers don't need seat belts is the argument that you will hear out there from those that are wanting the freedom of choice. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that no matter how good a driver you are, you can't control the other car. It's as simple as that. It could be subject to mechanical failure. As well, there is no way to protect yourself against someone else's poor judgment and bad driving. I think that's a fair statement.

Another myth: Not wearing a seat belt harms no one but the individual himself or herself. Hospital, medical and rehabilitation costs are borne by the taxpayer, and we should recognize that as a fact. In Manitoba, 1981 motor vehicle injuries required 12,250 days of hospitalization. Seat belt usage would have saved \$1,068,144 in hospital costs alone. That's an estimate, but it's a fairly accurate one based on what experience other provinces achieved. Ontario estimates an annual saving of \$2 million in hospital costs due to the seat belt law in Ontario.

Another myth: Seat belts trap you in; it's better to be thrown free in an accident. Well, I've dealt partly with that but I'm going to restate it. Fact: Being thrown free is 25 times more dangerous. If you are wearing your belt, you're far more likely to be conscious after an accident to free yourself and help your passengers.

Now, the argument that you should be free in the car for freedom of action raises the question, if you hit the dash with your head or the steering wheel goes into your chest, or whatever happens, and you are knocked out, you are obviously not in a good position to escape from that vehicle. The argument that if your car is burning, the time consumed to unbuckle may be fatal to you, it's just not valid, because if you're knocked out you certainly will need a lot more time in order to get out of your car than if you were not knocked out. So all of these things have to be looked upon in actual reality rather than based on emotion, Mr. Speaker.

Without seat belts overall, risk of injury is increased by four times; risk of serious injury by 65 percent; risk of death by 50 percent. They also make the point that, yes, sometimes seatbelts can cause injuries - and I said before that that may be so - although injuries are less severe than those sustained by unbelted occupants. The three major causes of death and injuries are occupants colliding with interior components of a vehicle, colliding with each other, and striking surfaces following ejection from the vehicle. I believe everyone of us that has had some experience or has witnessed an accident could very readily confirm that observation.

People won't use seat belts is another argument, even if we legislate it. Let's look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. Usage increases following enactment of compulsory legislation: In Ontario, usage rates rose from 16 percent to 75 percent following introduction of legislation; in Australia, usage levels rose from 25 to 77 percent; the present level of seat belt usage in Manitoba is estimated at about 7 percent.

Children do not need to be restrained - let's deal with that one as a statement in opposition - Facts: Children are no less susceptible to death and injury than adults. Each year in Canada about 70 children under the age of five die; 4,000 more are injured in motor vehicle collisions. Infant and child restraint seats when properly used can reduce fatalities by 90 percent, and crippling by 65 to 70 percent. These are recaps of some of the points I made earlier, Mr. Speaker, but I believe it's worth going over them. In Manitobam 1979, eight children between the ages of one and fourteen were killed; 614 were injured in motor vehicle accidents.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe the statistics do bear out that there is a need for this kind of legislation. I know that it's not always the most comfortable thing to have to wear either a helmet, seat belt or whatever restraining device that we have provided for us, but overall I think the benefits are quite obvious.

I want to take a moment to point out to you the number of areas throughout the world where this law is in effect for the benefit of those that are not aware: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, The Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxemburg, Mallawi, Malaysia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Puerto Rico, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, USSR, West Germany, and Yugoslavia. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that should give us some indication as to the worthiness of this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to point out to members opposite the various groups in Manitoba that are promoting and supporting this measure; people that have indicated concern in this area and presented briefs to the government, asking the government to move in this way.

For seat belts: Council of Women, Winnipeg; Provincial Council of Women; Public Health Nursing Directorate; Consumers Association of Canada, Manitoba Chapter; Kinette Club of Melita; Winnipeg Boys and Girls Club Incorporated; Canadian Paraplegic Association; Altruistic Club of Winnipeg; Canadian Jaycettes; City of Winnipeg Police Department; City of Brandon Police Department; Royal Canadian Mounted Police; Honourable Jean-Luc Pepin; Dr. Richard S. Stanwick, Assistant Professor of Pediatrics and Social and Preventative Medicine; Jaycettes Buckle-Up-Baby people; Pembina Valley Senior Citizen's Council . . .

A MEMBER: Pembina Valley?

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, Pembina Valley. Young Women's Christian Association — (Interjection) — Pembina Valley Senior Citizen's Council for the benefit of the Member for Lakeside, the Manitoba Medical Association, these are all people that have been indeed been pressuring the Government of Manitoba to get on with it in order to reduce the slaughter and injury on the highways.

In respect to the campaign that's been under way on either side of the ledger, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the members opposite that on the seat belt issue, my office has received about 750 signatures in favour and 125 against. Now, I don't know whether that tells us anything, but I would believe it's important to note those numbers. I wouldn't be in a position to make the same

case for the bikers, Mr. Speaker, I believe there it's about 2,000 to about 100. So, I think we recognize that, but for whatever it's worth, those are the numbers.

With respect to the helmets, though, supporting the legislation is the Manitoba Safety Council, the Manitoba Police Commission, the Jaycettes, the Red Cross, the Manitoba Teachers' Society, the Manitoba Health Organization, the Canadian Paraplegic Association, Consumers Association of Manitoba, and indeed, the Registered Nurses.

So that gives us a fairly good outline of the broad base of support for this measure and I know that members opposite wouldn't want to look at this in very narrow political terms. I'm almost convinced that they are more responsible than that, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to look at this legislation on the basis of its merit, what it will do for society, how many more people will be living, and more people will not be injured as a result of this piece of legislation. I believe that's the important part.

So, Mr. Speaker, to sum up, I want to say that all studies reveal that seat belts reduce fatalities and injuries. By using seat belts, in the event of an accident, the chance of surviving without serious injury or death is increased by about 30 percent and the millions of dollars that we save because of the loss of injury are self-evident, based on statistics that are available to us from the other provinces that have had the legislation for some time, and so we commend this legislation for the consideration of the House and hope that there be unanimous approval, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would just permit one question for clarification?

Mr. Speaker, the legislation makes it clear that all drivers and passengers driving in a vehicle supplied with seat belts must be restrained by those seat belts, but the legislation doesn't make it clear, and I'm assuming that maybe we'll hear more about it at committee or in future regulations, about additional passengers in a vehicle for which there is no seat belt, the case of say three persons in the front seat of the car that is supplied by two belts?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member makes a point, but the legislation merely states that where there is a belt provided it must be used. There is obviously no penalty for those people in a vehicle that haven't had a belt provided for them by the manufacturer of the vehicle. So, the normal laws governing the occupancy numbers in a vehicle govern, but where there are not enough seat belts for the number of passengers, then, of course, there is no penalty for those that are unable to wear them.

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

MR. G. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 26 THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

HON. V. SCHROEDER presented Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act, for second

reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Bill 26 contains a number of amendments to The Financial Administration Act, some of which merely make the wording of the Act more clear, some of which provide the Minister of Finance with broader investment authority, some of which increase dollar thresholds which the passage of time and inflation have made obsolete, one of which provides the government with a limited ability to make loans, advances and guarantees where no specific Loan Act authority is available, and one of which provides greater flexibility to the Minister of Finance in arranging capital financing while ensuring that the Cabinet is fully informed and approves of the financing.

When detailed clause-by-clause examination of the bill commences, I will be able to provide the rationale for each section in the bill.

I commend Bill 26 to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 23 THE REAL PROPERTY ACT (2)

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 23, An Act to amend The Real Property Act (2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Bill No. 23, An Act to amend The Real Property Act is a companion piece of legislation to the proposed Farm Lands Ownership Act. As members may be aware, Section 82 of The Real Property Act requires individuals or corporations that are registering an ownership interest in farmland to furnish information in the form of a statutory declaration. As is the case at present, statutory declarations will continue to be used to support the administration and enforcement of farmlands legislation in Manitoba. Terms used in Bill 23 correspond to those employed in The Farm Lands Ownership Act and the provisions of Bill 23 are complementary to those in the proposed farm lands legislation.

I wish to advise members opposite that a number of significant amendments to Bill 23 will be moved when the legislation is reviewed in committee and I propose to, in fact, circulate those amendments for consideration

and review today, so that the members even in speaking to the bill on Second Reading will have those amendments available to them.

The purpose of the amendments, in general, is to strengthen and clarify the bill and to delete unnecessary information requirements. Information to be deleted from the bill as printed include, for example, the requirement of landed immigrants to furnish information on their visas, their date of birth and their date and place of landing in Canada. There are other examples that will be seen from the amendments themselves where on review of the bill as printed, it became clear that there was information being required by the bill amending The Real Property Act, which was really not necessary for the proper administration of The Farm Lands Administration Act.

There are other examples in the speaking notes and I propose to circulate a copy of those to the members opposite, together with the amendment to Bill No. 23. I commend the bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I firstly rise on a point of order. I do so, because I do not want to give up my right to speak on this bill. The point of order simply being that while I appreciate the Attorney-General's acknowledgement that substantive amendments are coming with respect to this bill, we will find some difficulty to debate the bill without being aware of those amendments. We regard this bill as an important piece of legislation and we will — (Interjection) — pardon me. Then I missed the offer. I thought I only heard him to say that amendments were forthcoming.

If in fact those amendments are being supplied then, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, that the debate on this bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 24 THE REGISTRY ACT(2)

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 24, An Act to amend The Registry Act(2), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, like Bill 23, Bill 24, An Act to amend The Registry Act, is a companion piece of legislation to the proposed Farm Lands Ownership Act. Section 20 of The Registry Act prescribes the information which must be furnished by individuals or corporations that acquire interest in farmland under the old deed system, the old land title system as we used to call it.

The amendments outlined in Bill 24 parallel those presented in Bill 23 which I have just introduced. Again some minor amendments to Bill 24 will be introduced when legislation is reviewed in the committee to ensure consistency between the provisions of this bill and those of 23, but they will be distributed to members today

so that they have the advantage of having those proposed amendments before them when speaking to the principle of the bill.

Accordingly, I recommend this bill to the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that the debate on this bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Government House Leader indicate the next item of business?

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debates on second reading in the following order: Bills 14, 3 and 61?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 14 THE ELECTIONS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 14, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I took the adjournment on this bill several weeks ago and I did have some notes prepared for it, but I seem to have misplaced them while waiting for this bill to come up. Maybe I threw them out a couple of weeks ago.

The changes in The Elections Act, Mr. Speaker, are changes that everyone who is concerned with democracy must view and consider them to see whether or not it increases the democratic process in our country. Democracy is a fragile thing that we must protect, because it is a system that we believe in, and we must view any changes in The Elections Act as changes that would enhance the democratic process and ensure that democracy prevails.

I think the changes that have been proposed in this bill, many of them, are of a housekeeping nature, or changes that had been reviewed by the Elections Commission, the Chief Electoral Officer and his advisors, and I think that most of them are moves that are probably beneficial to the conduct of an election.

However, there are one or two things that do cause me some concern in the bill. The one is the removal from The Elections Act of the requirement that anybody whose name has been left off the list should have to provide proof that he should be on the voters' list. I think that is a very important point, and it's one that has been enshrined in legislation for many, many years, because the preservation of democracy is dependent on the assurance that those that vote are qualified to vote. So I think that it is important to find out why the Attorney-General would want to remove that right or that obligation.

If you look at history, you will see that obligation has been there not only in this jurisdiction, but in many others for many many years. It's there for a very good reason. I am sure that anybody that has studied elections in this jurisdiction and others has seen valid reasons come forward for why? The right or the obligation of anybody who asks to have their name put on the list should provide some proof.

So I would hope that when this bill goes to committee that that is the No. 1 issue that requires extensive review by the entire Legislative Committee that the bill is referred to, and also, I hope that there will be good public representation at that time, either to support the viewpoint put forward by the Attorney-General in these proposed amendments, or by those that would require, or those that have a concern about the proposals that have been put forward.

I think that is the No. 1 issue in this bill and I would prefer to have a very open discussion of it at committee stage, rather than debating on second reading here. Because here all we can do is debate the principle of whether or not a person should be required to provide some proof to have their name added to the voters' list.

The changes that have been brought forward by the Chief Electorate Officer would provide for an ongoing review and updating of the elector's role, I think, is one that would remove most of the arguments that maybe put forward to have the swearing in or the vouching of electors at the last minute. So I would think that it's an even stronger argument to leave the vouching in the bill or in The Election Act as it is. When you bring forward such a significant change as having a daily review allowable, which means that anyone, at any time, almost up to the day of election, can have their name added to the list, so I see no reason for the removal of the vouching that presently exists in the Act.

So with those few words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are my comments on this particular bill and I think that it is something that should be handled at the committee stage.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. P. EYLER: Are you ready for the question? The Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: Mr. Speaker, I move that debate be adjourned, seconded by the Member for The Pas.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 3 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 3 - on the proposed motion of the Minister of Agriculture, standing in the name of the Member for Swan River. The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Swan River is unable to be here at the present time, but I would like to speak on the bill and have it stand in his name, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed) The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, this is the type of legislation that led to the defeat of the NDP Government in 1977; this is the type of legislation and philosophy that led to the great win of the Social Credit Government over the NDP in B.C. yesterday; this is the type of legislation that will have Manitobans become very disappointed with their government, and although the First Minister likes to make a lot of remarks and make light of the fact that we only lasted four years and they came back, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the reason they're back is because of a lot of inaccurate promises, statements that were made during election campaigns of things that were going to be done that were never done and the people of Manitoba will never buy that again and they will never buy the Premier of this province again, because he has let them down continually regarding the promises of an election.

The philosophy behind this piece of legislation is exactly that. It's exactly going back to where the NDP were before when they were in power and found a way to purchase all the farmland that they could and lease it to farmers.

HON. B. URUSKI: Ah, come on.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It was their policy. The Minister of Agriculture can say, ah, come on. That was their policy, to buy as much farmland as they could and lease it to farmers. It was announced by the then agricultural Minister. It was announced at the municipal banquet, Mr. Speaker; it was announced there that, you know, they were going to have this policy and they did. They didn't really make a lot of it during this particular election because they knew that the people of Manitoba wouldn't buy it and the farmers of Manitoba wouldn't buy it.

Mr. Speaker, so now what do we have? We have a situation at the present time where this NDP Government is going to work their way back into land ownership, through this bill. This is going to be the beginning of it, to find a way for them to own land and lease it back to farmers, because they sure wouldn't do it the way they did before, because it turfed them out of office.

HON. R. PENNER: It's paranoia.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The Attorney-General says, "paranoia." Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying will be proved right. The philosophy is there. It's always been there, they've always announced it, and they always will have it, and that is to own as much of the land as possible, and lease it to the farmer, or lease it to people. That is the philosophy. Now, if you want to get up and argue about it, go ahead, but that's your philosophy.

So, Mr. Speaker, what happens? We have the reasons for the legislation, which the NDP give, on the basis of all of these speculations, etc., that's going on. All of the problems that we had with the other bill and the Member for Ste. Rose was saying how deplorable it was that there was a section of a bill that there were loopholes in. They didn't try to just plug loopholes. They brought in a new bill. They brought in a new bill, with all of these reasons that they gave and the Leader of our party, as the Member for Woodlands had

explained earlier, let's start from a new base, as to really who owns the land in this province?

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: The people do.

MR. F. JOHNSON: And we went out. Mr. Speaker, I just heard the Member for St. Johns say that people do. What do you regard as the people's government or the government should own the land, or should people be allowed to own their own land? — (Interjection) — People. Well, now we have one that disagrees in their Caucus, you see. — (Interjection) — That's right.

Mr. Speaker, we will tell you that we went out with a lot of research and found out that the Minister of Agriculture's statements were completely wrong. There is the list. We have been showing this list here all the time. We haven't been updated, although - hold it. Hold, hold. The Premier has said that's false.

Mr. Speaker, if he says it's false - I can't rely on anything he says at any time but, if he says it's false, produce. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier through you to produce one showing it wrong. Very simple. He's got all his research staff. Show it as wrong, or else take the smile off his face and sit there and listen.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague has commented to me that municipal people gave this to us, so we went out and we did our research which was not done by the Minister of Agriculture. We find from this research that it is not the most important issue out there with farmers. Farmers have many more problems that have been put on them by this government than this legislation is going to cure. This legislation is not going to cure any of the farmers' problems, but will create problems for the farmer.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's just inconceivable to me, as a person who believes in freedom, that if I had somebody offer me a price for my land or three people offer me a price for my land that I couldn't take the highest price, that I could not accept the price that I wanted to accept. Isn't that really inconceivable, Mr. Speaker. I know of nobody that comes to me when I live in a house where I live in Winnipeg and says to me when I want to sell it that I can't take the price that I want to take.

Mr. Speaker, we hear comments again from the Attorney-General. He'll argue that point, because his philosophy is to own farmland. His philosophy is to own all the houses, too. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, that's the Attorney-General's philosophy, and the Premier can say, bunk, or could say whatever he likes. I'll debate that with the Attorney-General, if he had come to the dinner last Wednesday night. Where I've ever seen him, I've told him before his philosophy is not good for this province. I believe it and I stand by it, very simple . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: It's a lot better than your philosophy.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my philosophy is that I should have the right to be able to accept the price that I want on my property.

Isn't it kind of inconceivable then too, you know, if my wife and I or my daughter and I, or my son and I decided to form a corporation or one within the whole family and purchase a piece of farmland in the Province

of Manitoba, and we wouldn't be allowed to do so. You know, they were all born here. They all know the province better than most of them over there. They've travelled more of it than most over there. They are born and bred Manitobans, that if we formed a little corporation of our family and wanted to buy a piece of farmland for investment purposes, we could not do it.

But, you know, there is nothing to stop any young farm boy the same age as my son or two daughters from walking into Winnipeg and buying up every apartment block in town. Does that really make it fair to the young people that live in the city? Why could a group of young farm people or farmers form a corporation and come in and buy five houses on my street, an apartment block somewhere else, a shopping plaza anywhere they want? They are allowed to do that. I am not allowed to do that with my family when we wanted to buy some farmland in Manitoba because, if we form a corporation which probably would be the best tax structure, etc., under the investment laws, our income tax laws, and everything else, would probably be the advice from a lawyer and tax people to form a corporation, I couldn't do it. I couldn't take the best financial advice if it was to form a corporation.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Minister keeps saying, why not, when I keep asking these things. There is a reason why not and he put the reasons there. That is this government's philosophy. The government's philosophy in time will have - because the farmer can't take the best price, because it can't be purchased from foreign investors, because it can't be purchased by Canadians, and because it can't be purchased unless there is a committee that says you can buy it or you can't buy it, and isn't that a marvelous thing, Mr. Speaker?

We now have a committee. We're going to have a committee or a group of people set up in the Province of Manitoba that is going to decide whether somebody can buy land or not buy land. They will make the decisions. Now tell me what philosophy that came from?

Mr. Speaker, then all of a sudden with all of these conditions that we seem to have on people being able to buy and which will make it tough for people to sell land, then your price is not as good. Your land is not as valuable, because there are controls on it. Who will buy it then?

As my colleague, the Member for Emerson, said, he's suspicious that the government would buy it. I am not suspicious at all, Mr. Speaker. I have been here 14 years, and I know the philosophy of that government. They will buy it at a price that will be less, because the farmer can't sell it to who he wants. They are actually getting legislation that will give them better prices than they would get ordinarily, and then they will lease it to the farmers. We will be right back into the state farm business, and they're going to do it slowly and quietly, just the same as the Premier doesn't know who's responsible to him and won't say so in this House; doesn't know that there's a man roaming around in this government without permission from the Cabinet to give a contract to change the logo. Mr. Speaker, if there's a Minister that's done it without the Cabinet knowing it or the Premier knowing it, he should resign; but there's people like that walking around and it's being done in a nice quiet way, hoping nobody will

know about it, and this is what's being done by this government as far as the land is concerned. They will gradually work their way into as much ownership of farmland as they can. That was their policy before; it hasn't changed. In fact, if anything, this NDP Government is about 4, or 5, or 10, or 20 - maybe 20 steps more to the left than the Schreyer Government ever was. The Schreyer Government were pikers compared to the socialist thoughts of this government.

Mr. Speaker, so then we have the situation of the people in this province who want to have rights to own land and, really, you don't know why that legislation would be here, which is handicapping Manitobans from buying an investment in farmland, unless the government has an ulterior motive behind this bill. Who in their right mind would put through a bill that says Manitobans can't invest in farmland? Who in their right mind would put through a bill that says that rural Manitobans have more rights on purchasing of property in this province than city Manitobans? Who in their right mind would put through a bill like this at the present time when farmers are out there and many times they want to sell their land for the best price they can get because it was their sweat and toil that went into it. They built the farm up to be something that is more valuable than it was when they started and now they want to take their investment. They want to sell it and they may want to invest somewhere else or retire or, if anything, leave the money to whoever they want to leave, which really bothers this government as well. They'll be back into estate tax as soon as they can get there too. No question about that. They'll find a way to get into that; that was one of the first things they did when they became government.

Then you have a situation that if you own a piece of land and you decide that you want to lease it and rent it, you know, it might have been in your family for years and you decide maybe for health reasons or some reason, I want to go and live in Vancouver or Victoria, Kelowna, Regina, wherever you want, and did you know, Mr. Speaker, if they do that . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: Don't talk about Kelowna this morning, Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's chirping away again about Kelowna. I happen to know about Kelowna. I have a relative in Kelowna and I assure you he's a very good friend of Bill Bennett's and he grew up with him. You see, Mr. Speaker, I have better information than they have. They had theirs from the Member for Springfield. I had mine from my first cousin in Kelowna and I can tell you, because I had the good information, I made money off those guys and there was nothing to it. It was like shooting ducks in a barrel; it was no problem; I assure you.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I lost some money.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, if you listen to Anstett, you're going to lose. There's no question about who's going to. If the Premier takes his advice from the Member for Springfield, he's in trouble; I'll tell you that.

Mr. Speaker, the land, after they've decided to move, all of a sudden they've got to divest themselves of it

after a while. Isn't that just absolutely ridiculous? You know, if you happen to be a farmer and, unfortunately, through some circumstances you pass away, as we all do in this world sometime, and leave your property to one of your children that is not living in Manitoba at the present time - mind you, they were born and raised here and decided to take a vocation in Toronto as an engineer or architect or whatever it may be, as many young people have done - you know, that was the reason the couple built up the farm, so they could give their children the best education they possibly could and the children went out on their different vocations - they couldn't even leave it to them in Winnipeg unless he'd have to form a corporation to keep it if he was even living in Manitoba. But he's not living on that farm; they've got to divest themselves of it. Now what kind of province is this government turning Manitoba into?

That is the kind of thing that we see in other areas of the world. You build something around the province, and you don't want to let people in and you don't want to let people out; you don't want to let them come back, or you're fined if you don't. If you own farmland and you don't live here, you're actually fined. You're fined on the basis that you must sell it or divest, and you can only sell it to certain people. You couldn't sell it to my colleague from Tuxedo here, his family, if they were a family corporation of people born and raised in Manitoba. You couldn't sell it to them. You couldn't sell it to somebody who is going to give you the best price; and what happens, the price goes down and the government will buy it.

A MEMBER: Now the plot thickens.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The government actually has a system that will keep prices low because they want to buy farmland. Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite believe for one minute that they have kidded the farm community about what they're really trying to do in this legislation, they're wrong. The Minister of Agriculture has repeatedly argued in this House, I've talked to everybody. We know he did some talking, it might have been five minutes, or 10 minutes, or two-hour meetings, but who did he listen to? Did he listen to the Farm Bureau, the largest representative of agricultural people in this province? No. Did he listen to them after he presented the bill and they came forward and said this is not good? No. Did the Minister when he went out and had all those hearings around the province - you know, he went to Portage where there was about eight people, he went to other places and he practically had to drag them in. He could get the National Farmers' Union there, but of course we never did know the membership of the National Farmers Union in Manitoba, and we never will.

But, you know, they would come out and there would great big to-dos and what have you. Very few people there; organized type of presentations but when it was all over they were a flop; the message was there that this was not legislation that was required at this time, and it's not desirable for this province. Did he listen? No. But you see, he's listening to the National Farmers' Union. — (interjection) — Well that's a good point, I'm glad my colleagues brought that up.

Mr. Speaker, when he went through all these hearings and he had the representations in his office from the National Farmers' Union, did he listen to that?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Yes!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It's very simple, very simple, it's very simple. You see, Mr. Speaker, honourable members opposite they kind of have the feeling that people forget; they kind of have the feeling that when they're government, they're the only people that Manitobans talk to. Well, they don't. People don't have that attitude. They talk to us too and we have memories.

You know, this hearing business is a favorite game of the NDP. — (Interjection) — Yes, yes. Well the First Minister says they remembered us from 1977 to 1981.

The Premier is sitting there at the present time because he made a lot of promises that he's never kept, and that will never happen again in this province, they won't accept them. So he can say what he likes, but we can read those promises, that's the reason why he's here. In fact, I sit and I watch, well I'm not on the bill, Mr. Speaker, I better get back to the bill, but when I watch - I am so happy that the Premier is on television every day, it isn't even funny, because everybody I talk to out there says to me, does he ever answer a question, or does he just get up and smile at the camera the way he was taught with his course to let people think he's moving along?

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, it doesn't bother me to have the camera there, it doesn't bother me at all. — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Cultural Affairs says I could have a personality course, but if I go, he's got to go. How's that.

Yes, well Mr. Speaker, let's get back to the bill. I was saying this business of having hearings, Mr. Speaker, is a favorite game of the NDP.

I remember when the then Member of St. Johns, a Mr. Cherniack, the man showmen referred to as a financial ignoramus. I'll never forget that. No, that's the same one, Mr. Speaker. He referred to him very clearly as a financial ignoramus. See, I remember those things. Morton Shulman is one of the best financial men in the world, and was an NDPer, and said the then Member for St. Johns was a financial ignoramus.

Mr. Speaker, he roamed around through this city.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Where Frank?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It's there. I assure you I don't mislead people like the Premier, but I assure you he roamed around this city and he had hearing. He had hearings of all kinds, the same as there were hearings on this bill, and everybody in the city told him they didn't want to have amalgamation. Not everybody no, not everybody, they had those NDP members of the party come to those meetings and do the same as the National Farmers Union did at these meetings. But you know nobody gave a damn, they didn't listen to anybody and he put it through.

You know, this is exactly the same game they play. We are the party that listens to everybody. We are going out to have hearings, and unless the hearings go the way they want them to, they're very disappointed. Disappointed, Mr. Speaker, but it doesn't change their mind, they'll do it anyway whether the people want it or they don't.

Mr. Speaker, that boils down to the proof that they have a philosophy that they are going to ram over to the people of this province. That philosophy is to own as much farmland in this province as they can.

Mr. Speaker, I say, Sir, with all due respect, if you could get into the debate - I have a great admiration for your sincerity when you were speaking in the House before - I know that you would say when I was part of the Schreyer Government we believed in owning all the farmland we could. If NDP believed it then, they believe it now, and they won't change 200 years from now. That is fact. That is fact and there's no question about it. Company, farm ownership, any type of ownership of anything that is productive they want to get their hands on.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have any farmers in my constituency, but I grew up as a boy where we have the industrial area in St. James, there were farms there, there were farms right next to me and, you know, the First Minister again tries to embarrass me because I'm a city member. He grew up in Woodhaven as close to the farms around that area as I did, and he knows that I was there. — (Interjection) — Yes, well, that's fine, but you see it's the old story again, once you corner a socialist they try to change the subject. They try to say as a legislative member from the city that I can't speak on this bill.

Well, just the same as my wife, and I, and my son, and my two daughters can't form a small corporation, and buy a piece of farmland in the Province of Manitoba. Now, as a city member, I don't like that. You know, the Premier's family can't do it either. The Premier's family can't do it either. Do you know - and maybe the Premier wasn't here - but I said a group, a family that is a farming can form a corporation, and they have a corporation. If they own a farm they can come in and buy all the apartment blocks in Winnipeg if they want, there's nothing to stop them; and the Premier says to me, why am I speaking on this bill?

A MEMBER: Freedom.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's what it's called, Sir - freedom.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I didn't ask you that.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Speaker, he didn't. He inferred that I don't have any farms in my constituency, and he's probably wondering why I'm speaking on the bill. I'm speaking on the bill for exactly what my colleagues have said: Freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the NDP will not get away with it. The NDP, Sir, after last night's happenings in B.C., I would suggest to them, Sir, and I shouldn't tell them this; I should tell them to go ahead because the people of Manitoba will react to this type of legislation. They know it. I should tell them to just pull this bill if they want to be wrong. They're not going to be; but if there's any hope of them being wrong, they should get rid of this bill.

I was in Brandon a couple of weeks ago and I had the opportunity to talk to some people from the rural area, several of them, and I travel the rural area fairly extensively, and most of the people that I talked to,

unless they're Farmers Union people, which is the smallest majority group of agricultural people in this province, unless they are National Farm Union people, they don't want it. And this government, which as I said is about 25 steps further to the left than the Schreyer Government ever was, they're going to move ahead and push this down the people's throat. Well, they're going to find out what is going to happen to them.

Mr. Speaker, I think I heard the word "pass" from the Member for Elmwood. Mr. Speaker, he speaks quite often in the House, but the most intelligent thing he ever says is "pass." He says that well. Don't you think he says that well, fellows? He does that well, but that's the best thing he does.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say on this bill, there are freedoms involved in this. There are freedoms for people to have the right to do with their property as they want to; the freedoms to own property which, by the way, the NDP in Ottawa are not going to go for anymore. They had the one little vote where they voted for it, and what have you, because they knew there was a problem of the government being defeated. But now what's their excuse? What's the excuse now?

Mr. Speaker, it's the old story again of the Premier trying to change the subject. He's trying to bring all the reasons in about the Tories. It was said this morning. Mr. Murphy was on the radio this morning on the Peter Warren show or with Bob Beaton and he said, no, we can't pass that. We can't pass it in a day or four hours; no, we just can't do that. They have found another little reason to try and hold it up and the NDP Party does not believe. The NDP Party believes that government should own the land. It's as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, I don't really care what the First Minister is saying about other provinces and other places. As a matter of fact, the other people that I talked to that I've said, I've seen the Premier on television every day - that's another thing they say to me - he said - Is the Premier the Premier of Manitoba or some other place? — (Interjection) — See, I keep saying it; corner a socialist and he'll change the subject. Very simple. It's in Page 2 of their manual.

HON. R. PENNER: Page 3.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Page 3. Well, now we know it's there, Mr. Speaker. But you see, Mr. Speaker, this is Manitoba and I'm not concerned while I'm speaking here today about what's happening in the other provinces or what has happened in the other provinces. I'm saying the NDP philosophy is to have the government own as much of the private property as possible and I'll stand on that at any time.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP Party in Manitoba, regardless of what is happening in other provinces, is bringing in a piece of legislation that takes away my freedoms and my family's freedoms. It takes away freedoms from the people who elect me to be here, and I can't understand how any member opposite could vote for it when it takes that type of freedom away from your constituents. Mr. Speaker, I just don't understand how they can possibly walk down the street and look somebody in the face if they wanted to form a family corporation and buy and invest in a piece of land in this province

if they happen to live in the city or if they live in Brandon and they want to buy something in Souris; if they live in The Pas and they want to buy something down in Morris. — (Interjection) — Not if you have a family corporation. This is what the members opposite are trying to get around. — (Interjection) — Well, I tell you this, I understand this; that I could probably want to do something in an investment by forming a family corporation, and my financial advisors and my accountants and everybody would probably say to me, the best way to do it is to form a corporation. Oh, come off it. That's what I mean. Mr. Speaker, I heard somebody say, do it a different way. If your financial advisor said that's the best way to do it; you can't do it that way in Manitoba. So you can't take the advice from the best financial advice you can get, if they say that's the way it should be done.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the NDP Party in Manitoba are now moving in a direction that they moved to have themselves beaten before; they got back because of misleading the people. It's there; it's fact; it's in writing and it's in black and white. They misled the people. The Premier doesn't really care about Manitoba; he worries about all the other provinces first; never gives answers in the House, and they've gone through all of the same process they've gone through for years to finally force this type of legislation, which is a left-wing NDP policy that they'll stand by all of their lives, and they will regret the fact that they've done this in Manitoba because it will defeat them the next election.

This legislation will be one of the ones that is the greatest thing that will defeat them in Manitoba, and all of the other little pieces of legislation that take freedoms away from people. All of the pieces of legislation that says, the government tells you you must do this, will all be part of the legislation that will beat them the next election. They can have it tomorrow; they can have it three years from now or four years from now, and I'm not worried about them being defeated because their philosophy is to still keep bringing forth legislation that takes control over people's lives. They believe in control over people's lives; they think they know better for everybody, and that will defeat them, Sir.

Thank you very much.

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

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The debate will remain in the name of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I would like to speak to this bill, please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Let it stand.

BILL NO. 61 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE INSURANCE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On Bill No. 61, the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate

Affairs, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye took the adjournment on my behalf.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, we have reviewed the contents of the bill and the introductory remarks of the Minister responsible and are prepared to have it proceed to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the Acting House Leader indicate the next item of business?

The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is general agreement to dispense with Private Members' Hour and call it 12:30.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Monday.

ADDENDUM RE:

RES. 9 - RELEASE OF YURIY SHUKHEVYCH

(Translation of Mr. G. Lecuyer's remarks of May 5, 1983, Vol. XXXI, No. 61A)

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

I would also like to speak in support of this resolution. As a Canadian citizen enjoying the rights and freedoms guaranteed under our democratic system and our Constitution, we should all be able to appreciate what is being denied to Yuriy Shukhevych. Indeed, it is our duty as fellow humans to exert pressure wherever possible to bring to an end Russia's flouting of Shukhevych's rights and to arrest those flagrant injustices perpetrated against him.

Many men, women and children throughout the world are in prison at this very moment, accused of crimes that they have not committed, often pronounced guilty without a trial or by means of a rigged trial. In addition to being deprived of years of freedom, they are often tortured so as to extract admissions of guilt to all sorts of false accusations.

As Canadians, enjoying our full rights and freedoms, our affluence and abundance of food, we must act. We must raise our voices in defence of those who are mistreated throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I give my immediate support to this resolution to the effect that the Prime Minister of

Canada and the government intervene with the Russian authorities in order to obtain the release of Yuriy Shukhevych from prison and an exit visa for him and his family to leave Russia. This is the least one could offer to a man who has been incarcerated for nearly 30 years. The treatment he has experienced is a criminal act. Less severe treatment meted out to an animal would, in Canada, be condemned in a court of law.

Recently, in both England and the United States, people in various public demonstrations have censured laboratories which conduct research and experimentation with animals for purposes of testing new medicines in the interests of improving and extending the health of human beings. We have all read many times in the newspapers of those who are so fond of animals, that they leave money in their wills, sometimes exorbitant amounts in order to ensure a sumptuous existence for their cat or dog. I fully agree, of course, with good treatment for all forms of life, but I believe that human life must take precedence over all other forms of life, and I believe that effort and money should first and foremost be spent on behalf of Yuriy Shukhevych and others like him, who languish in prison cells in those countries of the world where totalitarian regimes practise oppression with impunity.

Mr. Speaker, during the demonstration in front of the Legislative Building on March 29th last, several persons offered prayers and gave a fervent appeal for the release of Yuriy Shukhevych. The Leader of the Opposition speaking to the crowd at that time, said: "I feel that Yuriy would have us sound a cry in favour of the hundreds of millions of people who must live under Marxist totalitarianism." I do not doubt the truth of this statement, but I am also convinced that Yuriy Shukhevych in his heart and soul does not entertain such a desire for oppressed humanity in a restrictive sense. For Yuriy, whose rights have been suppressed, and whose freedom of movement and expression have been unjustly taken away, I say, he would surely wish for the freedom of all humanity - in Russia, of course, but also in Chili, in Poland and throughout the world wherever the dignity of mankind has been attacked.

What is even more repugnant in the case of Yuriy Shukhevych is that he has been in prison and has undergone torture since the age of 14 years - for more than 30 years, because he has refused to denounce his father, his compatriots and his culture. These latter are accused of having struggled for their own freedom against foreign imperialism. Yuriy, for his part, is deteriorating in exile in a concentration camp because he has refused to submit to the oppressor's yoke. He is therefore guilty of love for his father and for his own country. He has been found guilty simply because he is his father's son. His crime, as my colleague from Seven Oaks said earlier, does not relate to something he has done, but quite simply to who he is.

The least that can be said of Yuriy is that he is a very courageous and honest man, a hero who will leave a mark on his people and who will give them an example to follow. His suffering should arouse all free men to an unremitting struggle for freedom everywhere that it is threatened. The heroic resistance of the Ukrainian people must not remain a mere fact of history, but should inspire us all in the struggle for freedom and serve as a motivating force for generations to come.

Those who have spoken before me have related the grievous incidents which were Yuriy's lot from August 22, 1948, when he was imprisoned for the first time with his mother. I would however like to refer to his marriage and the birth of his two children during his three and one-half years of freedom between 1968 and 1972, after which he was again imprisoned. He was accused of writing memoirs of his life in a concentration camp, of showing interest in the events surrounding the death of his father and of initiating unrest and anti-Soviet propaganda. He is still in captivity for he has been identified as a political symbol who must continue to be punished and thereby serve as a lesson for the edification of the Soviet masses.

Yuriy hardly knew his father, who was killed in combat for his country. Another generation, namely that of his children, must not have to experience the same fate. We must therefore, at all costs, convince the Canadian Government and also all other organizations, such as Amnesty International, to strenuously and incessantly intervene on behalf of Yuriy Shukhevych. Our government must also seek support from all other freedom-loving countries. No one can honestly claim to be supporting the preservation of rights and freedoms while at the same time remaining silent when these same rights and freedoms are denied to others. If we remain silent in the face of such aberrations, we deserve no more rights than those presently granted to Yuriy Shukhevych.

I wish to close by citing a passage written by Shukhevych in which he pleads as follows: "Let us promote everywhere the concept of an international order based on the idea of a free and independent state for all nations of the earth. Only such a system can bring about optimum conditions for political and economic success, for cultural co-operation and unity between nations, for this system is predicated upon the principles of equality, freedom of choice, mutual respect and confidence. Only an international order of this kind will see an end to bloody wars and bring a lasting peace."

Having quoted those words, Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate that a man of this calibre, and a man of such ideals surely deserves that we emulate his own courage and rally to his cause.

Thank you.