



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. 111 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 20 JULY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 20 July, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

ORAL QUESTIONS

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

Highway Construction

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports By Standing and Special Committees . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. I assume that Cabinet met this morning since, in the title of a book by a well-known Manitoba author, it is said that Wednesdays are Cabinet days and my question is, did Cabinet at its meeting this morning approve an additional \$8 million expenditure for Highways as was being contemplated in order to ensure that the heavy construction industry in Manitoba continues to be viable and that employment opportunities for many Manitobans can be maintained in the heavy construction industry, particularly with respect to highway construction for the remainder of this year?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement, but I do not have copies at this time for the members of the opposition, so if I could have leave to give that statement as soon as the copies are made, with your permission, I would like to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave?

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honourable member's question. When we're in a position to make any announcement I will certainly be making announcements, but I'm not in such a position now.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: We, in the opposition, deserve a copy before he makes the statement, so we can respond.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that indicates that at least one member does not give leave to the Minister to proceed.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that at least 50 percent of the money invested in highway construction goes directly into wages; in view of the fact that this year out of the Highway's budget, at least \$10 million was diverted into the so-called Jobs Fund, so that Manitobans might continue to be employed; does the First Minister not believe that this is a needed project, that this is a worthwhile endeavour that will build infrastructure for the future for Manitoba and will create jobs when they are needed?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, when the government Minister is able to get all his information together to make the announcement with the copies for the other members, we will revert back to accommodate them once again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the Honourable Member for Tuxedo would like to reword his question so that it asks for information rather than opinion.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what I was asking for. I have the statement here, but I don't have the copies and I was just asking for leave to revert back at the time that I get those copies; that's what I asked for.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the First Minister is, will he consider utilization of the Jobs Fund - after having diverted some \$10 million from the Highways Department budget into the Jobs Fund - will he consider reinstating that so that worthwhile full-time employment opportunities will be provided for Manitobans in the heavy construction industry?

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have a Dr. Herbert Landmann who is an elected member of the German Democratic Republic in Berlin. He is visiting Canada for the International World Conference on Smoking and Health.

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, probably the honourable member is not conscious of the fact that we have indeed allocated substantial sums of monies now to various programs. It was only some two, three weeks ago that some \$3.2 million was allocated to the City of Winnipeg, matched by City of Winnipeg dollars, for \$6.4 million re street repair in the City of Winnipeg.

The honourable member may also not be aware that it was but approximately one week ago that I announced

a \$7 million program; \$5 million of which was directed towards municipalities for various projects that municipalities will submit pertaining to street repair, sewer and water, other substantial projects pertaining to heavy construction work that may be necessary at the level of municipalities.

I want to assure the honourable member that this government is very sensitive, very concerned about the unemployment situation as a whole. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to overstate, but I think the efforts of the Jobs Fund has assisted us in improving our relationship proportionate to the unemployment situation in other parts of this country and we'll continue to do all that we can in order to reduce unemployment in the Province of Manitoba.

We're sensitive to the concerns of the heavy construction industry. When I have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to make an announcement I will certainly make an announcement directed towards that particular field and area; but let the honourable member not be mistaken insofar as the announcements that have been made up to this point and the efforts and the energies that have gone into assisting in respect to heavy infrastructure in the Province of Manitoba, monies directly payable from the Jobs Fund.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the unemployed people in the construction industry appreciate the Premier's concern but they can't eat that for dinner tonight. I would say that actions speak louder than words and it's up to the Premier to take some action.

In view of the fact that the lead time required for calling tenders, awarding the tenders and letting these projects go to construction is such that we are right now jeopardizing the opportunity for good weather to permit these projects, will the Premier recognize that the need is now - it's not a few months from now - and will he act quickly in order that these people who ordinarily are employed in the heavy construction field will not have to lose their opportunity even to get in 20 weeks of work to collect unemployment insurance? Will he act now instead of giving us his assurance of concern?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, indeed, I indicated to the honourable member but a few questions ago that we would be making an announcement because of that very concern. I want to also be candid to the honourable member that the problems that are confronting the heavy construction industry cannot be resolved by one level of government alone. We do not have the jurisdictional nor the financial capacity in order to resolve what is a very very heavy unemployment rate in respect to the heavy construction segment of the construction industry.

The housing industry and the commercial construction industry have had a considerably greater improvement in respect to their unemployment levels in the heavy construction area. We will do all that we can by squeezing every possible dollar that we can in respect to the financial wherewithal, — (Interjection) — the means of the Province of Manitoba.

But I do want to be candid, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable member is looking towards a drastic

reduction insofar as the unemployed in the heavy construction industry, I can't promise that, but we will do all that we can humanly do within the jurisdiction, within the financial wherewithal of the Manitoba Provincial Government.

Consumer Price Index

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I wonder if the Minister can advise the House what the Government of Manitoba is doing to stop the rising consumer prices in the Province of Manitoba. Winnipeg, for the last five months steadily, has been above the Canadian average for six out of seven months and I wonder what the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is planning to do about it.

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

HON. J. BUCKLASS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't quite recall the figures the member used but I think that the member should have referred to the latest figures we have which indicates that with respect to the major cities in Canada, Winnipeg ranked fifth. I'm talking about the 14 major cities. For information, Regina with an index of 114.9; Charlottetown, 115.3; Saskatoon, 115.9; Vancouver, 116.3 followed by Winnipeg of 116.5 and these go all the way up to Toronto with 118.6. I don't think that going on a month-to-month basis is a clear indication of what is happening; rather one should look at a longer period of time.

I am informed that for 1982, the annual average increase in CPI for Winnipeg 8.8 percent, the lowest growth rate in Canada and 2.0 percent below the Canadian CPI increase of 10.8. This is the second consecutive year in which the increase in Winnipeg CPI has been amongst the lowest in Canada.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for his answer but I would ask the Minister, in the same report it states that Winnipeg has the second highest increase in June '83 over June '82 of any other province in Canada. The only city that is higher, Mr. Speaker, is St. Johns, New Brunswick, when you take '83 over '82 as far as percentage change, '83 over '82.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister, on May 30th the Minister said I can assure the Member for Turtle Mountain when he was questioned that our government will be watching the CPI and we will take whatever steps we can to keep the increase to a minimum. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister regards Winnipeg being the second highest twice in the last three months, and first highest last month, and second highest this month, if he regards this as watching it closely and taking action.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to reword his question so that it asks for information and not for an opinion.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Gasoline prices - Manitoba

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I read to the House the Minister's answer previously where he said, "Our government will be watching the CPI and we'll take whatever steps we can to keep the increase to a minimum."

What is the Minister doing or is this just another promise like the NDP Government gives us or like the First Minister gives us that mean nothing?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: To answer that question - I'm sorry I don't have the full information that the member has in front of him. I believe that if he takes a look and sees some of the reasons for the price increases, certainly if I recall correctly last year transportation costs were some of the reasons for the increase in CPI. I notice that prices have leveled off somewhat in Manitoba in gasoline prices. The increase was due to the fact that we had a price war. There was a substantial increase in cost of gasoline that contributed significantly to the CPI.

I would still go back to the figures that I have from Stats Canada which indicate that the index for Winnipeg is 116.5, reflecting a 0.3 increase from June of '83 over May of '83, and a year-to-year increase of 7.0 which still puts Winnipeg in the fifth lowest index level of the 14 major cities in Canada.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister reads the first part of it right, but 7.0 is a 7 percent change over the previous year which is the second highest in Canada. I instruct the Minister on how to read the report; 7.0 is the second highest increase, June over '82.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister - since he gives me statistics on what is the cause - why, in Winnipeg, food is plus 9; housing is plus 1.9; transportation is .9 increase; recreation and education is minus 0.1; health and personal care is plus 2.5; tobacco and alcohol plus 1.1? I wonder if the Minister can inform the House why all of those commodities are higher this June over last June and have been going up steadily for 1983.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I'm going to go back to the question the member asked before, as to what are we doing in Manitoba with respect to keeping the CPI down. The Conference Board of Canada indicates that one of the major reasons for the increase in CPI has been the housing component; and I think - and I'm surprised the member isn't aware that our government has done considerable in terms of making housing available to thousands of Manitobans through a low-interest mortgage program - and that certainly is assistance to the CPI.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I know the Minister keeps mentioning the housing figures. There probably wouldn't be 10 houses built if it hadn't been for the federal program, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the Minister again, what steps has he taken with the Minister of Finance regarding discussions on the payroll tax and other taxes that have been placed in this province which have been increasing the consumer price index for the last five months in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Yesterday, in response to a question as to the reason why gas prices recently increased in various areas of the province, the Minister indicated that was because the dealer support program with the major oil companies was removed in a number of areas.

I was wondering if the Minister can confirm that the price in Thompson has not increased, largely because we've never had such a dealer support program.

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

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I'd just like to correct a point there. I had indicated that the oil companies had removed the dealer support part, .5 cents, whatever it was. The fact is the oil companies also increased their costs by .5 cents.

With respect to the question about Thompson, I don't have that information; I'll take that as notice.

MR. S. ASHTON: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this dealer support program resulted at one time in the price of gasoline varying 25 cents between Winnipeg and Thompson, I was wondering if the Minister could include an investigation of this highly discriminatory pricing practice in the investigation his department is presently conducting into the differential in gas prices.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: That certainly will be one of the items we'll be looking at in our study that we're carrying on at the present time.

Information Services

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. We note by the newspaper this morning that the First Minister's former Executive Assistant and person in charge of the information section of the government, Mr. Dan O'Connor, has unfortunately had to take leave from his job for a period of time and we express our personal regrets to him. Can the First Minister inform the House who will be taking over Mr. O'Connor's position in his absence?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words by the Member for Turtle Mountain. Mr. Garth Cramer will be acting in the place of Mr. O'Connor during Mr. O'Connor's absence.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can we expect now that there will be a return to the more non-partisan approach to information distribution in the province than has been the case during the previous months of the government's administration?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance properly remarks, when are you going to stop beating your wife? The question of information and the provision of information is always . . .

A MEMBER: That's a dumb comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: It is always a matter of understandable debate between a government and an opposition. It was our view, of course, that the displaying of ads such as "Sitting on a gold mine," and "Please stay in Manitoba" were non-informational ads and I'm sure honourable members across the way will be suggesting that some of the present Jobs Fund ads that are running are of a non-informational nature. I would say to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that what we're trying to do and what Mr. Cramer has done quite well and Mr. O'Connor has done well is to contribute to their maximum ability in ensuring that Manitobans receive reliable and sound information as to various government programs.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the First Minister could inform the House whether or not Mr. Cramer is a career civil servant.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, he would fall into the same category as one James Armit during the previous administration, a policial appointment.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the analogy there is. Mr. Armit was not in charge of the Information Services division of government; Mr. Cramer evidently is. Is the First Minister indicating then that Mr. Cramer is not a career civil servant; that indeed he is a political appointment, a further political appointment placed in charge of the government's propaganda ministry?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cramer was appointed, as far as I can recall, in the same way that Mr. O'Connor was appointed, by way of an Order-in-Council; in the same way I believe, that Mr. Armit was appointed by the original government that was responsible for communications on behalf of the Premier.

Air Conditioning - Legislative Building

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour who is also responsible for the Civil Service. Given that she is responsible for the working conditions of all government employees as well as private employees, and since the 300 to 400 employees in this building are suffering from another hot Manitoba summer in a non-air-conditioned building, I'd like to ask the Minister whether she would be prepared to recommend to Cabinet that this building be fully air-conditioned to improve efficiency and the working conditions of our Civil Service?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that this is a topic that has been on all of our minds lately. I am not prepared to recommend that we air-condition this building but I have, in fact, had information brought to me which I'm investigating at a personal level that the new technology which we see as sometimes a positive and a negative impact on us is coming up with new ways of air-conditioning old buildings such as this, and as a third floor resident of this building I certainly will be pursuing that on a personal basis to take a look at it.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Minister how she can justify the following, namely, that the Woodsworth Building is fully air-conditioned; the Norquay Building is fully air-conditioned; the old Law Courts as well as the new Law Courts will be fully air-conditioned; how can she justify those working conditions to government employees who all work in the same downtown legislative core area?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would think that the member asking the question knows a great deal more about the age of the buildings that he talks about than I do. As compared to this building, certainly the buildings he referred to in the first instance are much newer. Secondly, I understand that there are changes being made in the power house which will affect the ability to air condition the Law Courts and I suppose that something having to do with the necessity of sitting in judicial robes for a long period of time has something to do with the need for cooler heads and cooler thoughts.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my final question is to the First Minister. I won't ask him whether his car is air-conditioned because that may prove embarrassing, but I would like to ask him whether he would consider the following. Given the heat in this building and the uncomfortable temperature and humidity in this Chamber, would he consider discussing with the opposition a policy of allowing the male members of the Legislature to remove their jackets in this Chamber during the months of July and August?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would have no objection to the Government House Leader and the Opposition House Leader discussing that matter if they deem fit. I know it's contrary to traditions in this House. I have no particular hang-up personally, but I can't speak for anyone else outside myself. I'm not sure how my own House Leader would respond to the idea and I don't know how the House Leader for the opposition would respond to that idea. I'm quite prepared at any time to take my coat off.

Farm Land - prices

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

A MEMBER: Is that a jacket or a shirt, Jim?

MR. J. DOWNEY: You wouldn't know the difference. Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. Could the First Minister confirm that the reports in today's

newspaper that farm land prices in the last two years since he's been the Premier in the Government of Manitoba, that the prices of farm land in Manitoba have dropped by some 20 to 25 percent?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that. I certainly recognize the fact that with the recession there has been a decrease insofar as the price of farm lands is concerned throughout the whole of Canada so that information would not surprise me, but I can't confirm it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the First Minister if he would have his Department of Agriculture find out if that is a factual number and at the same time check out to see if it's correct that there is an additional 2 percent more farms on the market than there traditionally is? I think it's up from 8 percent to 10 percent as reported in the newspaper and that is a substantial amount of farms when it comes to the total farm numbers in Manitoba. Would he as well check out and see if those numbers are accurate, Mr. Speaker?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'm pleased to accept that question as notice. Indeed, if there is an increase by way of the numbers of farms that are presently being sold, it might very well indicate some upward pressure insofar as the market is concerned, but I'll take that as a question for further response.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, with the numbers that are provided here in the paper and the First Minister when he checks it out, if in fact it is the case that farm values are dropping and that there is evidence that the farm community are continuing to have difficult times with both incomes and the investments that they have in agriculture, would he be prepared to change his agricultural policies so that the farm community could in fact do as well in Manitoba as they're doing in other parts of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Perhaps the Honourable Member for Arthur would wish to rephrase his question so that it is not posed as a hypothesis.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba change his agricultural policies so that the people of Manitoba who are involved in the farm community can live as well and do as well as those people in other parts of the Canadian agricultural picture?

HON. H. PAWLEY: There may be some misapprehension on the part of the Honourable Member for Arthur when he compares the agricultural situation in Manitoba with that which exists in other provinces of Canada. I think therefore in response to the honourable member's question, I should place on record the fact that Manitoba had the fourth highest rate of increase in farm cash receipts in 1982 at 1.6 percent; Manitoba had the fifth highest level of farm cash receipts of all provinces in 1982 at 1.6 million; Manitoba had the fourth highest rate of increase in farm cash receipts in February, 1983 at 1 percent.

Also, it is my understanding - and I will take this as notice - but only a couple of weeks ago I saw figures insofar as the situation pertaining to Manitoba farmers compared most favourably with that of the three provinces further west of us. So when the honourable member, I think unwittingly, attempts to leave some impression that Manitoba is No. 10 or not doing as well as other provinces in respect to farm income, that is not the case, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister would like to leave the impression that things are okay in the Manitoba farm community. Would the Minister tell the people of Manitoba just how many taxes and cost increases that he has been responsible for, like the payroll tax, like the hydro cost increases of 9.5 percent and like the fuel taxes that have been increased and no relief from the Provincial Government to the farm community like the high interest rates that he's charged through MACC of some 18 percent and wouldn't budge on them, Mr. Speaker?

Would he, as well, assemble those kinds of programs and policies that he's continued to implement on the farm community when he's getting the rest of the information?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think this probably is the proper occasion to advise the honourable member. In fact, he may not be fully conscious of the efforts that have been undertaken by this government pertaining to the agricultural community in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we were I believe the only province in Canada to have instituted an Interest Rate Relief Program insofar as farmers were concerned. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, if I am mistaken, if there are some other provinces, I readily acknowledge that but certainly we were amongst the first, if not the first.

Mr. Speaker, that program has saved some 1,000 farmers from losing their lands. The Interest Rate Relief Program insofar as Manitoba has been concerned, insofar as Manitoba farmers, has been a success. The neighbourhood of those farmers that have received such assistance is in the vicinity of 1,000.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the fact of the contribution of the Manitoba Government to Manitoba's important beef industry in this province. Despite the fact that we don't have a national beef program - and I regret very much that the Ministers of Agriculture, along with the Federal Minister of Agriculture in Charlottetown, are not coming together in support of a national beef program - it was this government, Mr. Speaker, that initiated and announced and has proceeded with a Beef Stabilization Program which is assisting some 5,000 farmers in the Province of Manitoba; a Beef Stabilization Program that has stabilized beef prices and according to the reports that I have received; and this last weekend when I had an opportunity to visit some of the constituencies of honourable members across the way has indeed been successful, in fact, much more successful than many beef farmers had thought that the program would be.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have contributed in a very significant way, in a very major way by way of concrete agricultural programs initiated in the space of some

18 months, in order to contribute to some improvement in the farm economy. In saying that, Mr. Speaker, I readily acknowledge that Manitoba farmers, like farmers in Saskatchewan, Alberta, Ontario and elsewhere are having very very difficult times but we are doing what we can to contribute to the bettering of the agricultural community under trying circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with leave that was so generously granted earlier by the opposition, I would ask permission to make the - we had leave during the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Education and I want to say how pleased we are to see her back with us and we approve of her new colour scheme.

My question to the Minister — (Interjection) — to the Minister of Urban Affairs, if he would do something nice I might return it in kind.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

Transportation - Schools

MR. G. FILMON: My question to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, is that many school divisions are currently wrestling with the logistics, the methods and indeed the costs of the expansion of French language training in their divisions. There are rumours abounding and I don't like to trade on rumours so, I would like to ask the Minister the direct question. Is the Provincial Government planning to provide financial support to school divisions to cover the entire cost of transportation for French immersion training in school divisions throughout the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member opposite for that question and also for his kind remarks. I assume that the question that he's asking is related to this year, in fact, the Budget that has already been approved in the Estimates that have been approved in this House. While this is one of the big areas that we're examining in the Education Finance Review and one of the big issues that we're going to have to deal with, I do not presently have any recommendations or plans to make changes for transportation in the coming term.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has mentioned the Education Finance Review that has been conducted by Dr. Nicholls, it has been said by the Minister a number of times in the past six months that that review would be completed and a report made by June of this year. We are now well into the month of July and I am wondering when we can expect the results and report on that review.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, I did say that the report was due at the end of June and I can confirm that Dr. Nicholls

having continued to do the excellent job that he has done throughout the entire review process I believe has put the report on my desk. It is a very complex and lengthy report. As the member opposite just mentioned, I have been away for a short while, so it is going to take me a little bit of time to catch up on that. It has a high priority and I intend to look at it as quickly as possible, to review it and to begin public discussions as quickly as possible.

French language instruction in schools

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister. Recently her department circulated a position paper to school divisions throughout the province with respect to policies on certain matters dealing with the French language training in the province. One statement in the policy statement says as follows: "Furthermore, school divisions will be asked to consider the development of a hiring policy to ensure that new teachers are competent in the French language and knowledgeable about methods of teaching French as a second language."

It would appear to me to be self-evident that if they're going to be speaking French that they ought to be knowledgeable in the French language. Is there something else implied in this? Does that mean that all teachers to be hired in school divisions, regardless of whether they're going to be teaching French or not, are to be hired on the basis that they are competent in the French language?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, certainly not, Mr. Speaker, that would be both an extreme interpretation I think of those words, and not a realistic or a reasonable thing to try and accommodate. I think to suggest that all teachers should be able to teach and speak in French isn't even practical. As the member opposite knows, we have had our struggles to have the teachers who are teaching French programs adequately prepared and able to teach, and for some time - I think last year - we did have to do some recruiting out-of-province. We have improved our capacity in-province and are able to meet our own needs for teachers who are required to teach French programs, but would not in our wildest dreams, I don't think, expect that this would be a requirement of all teachers teaching school.

MR. G. FILMON: I thank the Minister for that response, Mr. Speaker, because indeed that was an interpretation placed on it, I understand, by several school divisions. I wonder if the Minister might consider ensuring that school divisions are aware of her position on this matter.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, if there's any misunderstanding or any unnecessary concerns, we certainly will be willing to clarify them. I can do them in an omnibus letter, or if there are a few school divisions that he knows are particularly concerned, if he tells me I could send a direct letter to those school divisions.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable First Minister. Mr. Speaker, I watched

the Honourable First Minister perform on television last night with Jim Carr; I watched him in the House yesterday; I watched him in the House today. Can I ask the First Minister, can he tell me and the House, does he know if he in fact shaved today?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the honourable member that he should ask questions about matters which are within the administrative competence of the government.

Beaver Control Program

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll refer to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources then. Mr. Speaker, due to the high level of water and rainfall we've had in the Parkland region, Roblin-Russell constituency, Swan River-Dauphin area, can I ask him if he's got any extra dollars or has he got any programs in place to deal with the escalating numbers of beavers and the terrible damage that they're doing to farm communities and rivers and streams in the area?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that there are areas in the province that have received very substantial amounts of rainfall. I know that my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, and others have pointed out concerns about parts of Manitoba where farmers are threatened with losses of hay and cereal crops because of the heavy rains. Certainly, we are concerned about that. I can't refer to any line in my budget where there is funds for agricultural flooding of various kinds.

I know that we have an ongoing program in respect to lands in the near vicinity of the Riding Mountain National Park involving a Beaver Control Program. That's one in which there's some assistance from the Federal Government. To my knowledge that program has been working very well, despite the fact that I think there has been no lessening in the number of beavers in the vicinity.

Recently, I had an inquiry about beaver control and there was some concern on the part of people about these animals just being shot, asking me to consider the possibility of their being trapped and relocated. I indicated some sympathy for that as well.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for those comments. This is not a normal year, as the Honourable Minister well knows, and especially the area that I represent due to the rainfall and this problem has escalated far beyond anything I've seen in the years I've been in the Legislature.

Can I ask him then regarding the Riding Mountain National Park, has he had any recent meetings with the Federal Government to try and help those farmers who live around the periphery of Riding Mountain, to help them deal with these problems today which are escalating almost every day, and all they're trying to do is save their hay crops and their grain crops? They need help. I'm just asking the Minister - he apparently has no money in his department - have the feds got any money?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I know the departmental staff have an ongoing relationship and ongoing communication with personnel involved in these areas of concern. We also have an advisory committee in respect to Riding Mountain National Park, and that committee brings to our attention problems and recommendations in respect to dealing with those problems. I know that those concerns are being responded to. I know that we can't do enough to satisfy some of those concerns, but they don't go unrecorded and unresponded.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for those comments which certainly are okay on normal conditions, but that group only meets on a quarterly basis, and this problem is real and it's alive today, and there it sits out there. I'm just asking him again, what is he going to do about it or can he do anything? Can the Federal Government do anything? Are they just going to say the municipalities and the local farmers are going to have to deal with it themselves?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think the problem is there. The Departments, both of Agriculture and Natural Resources, are aware of it. Certainly, those concerns have been brought to my attention in respect to various areas of the province. I know my colleague, the Member for Ste. Rose, has indicated to me his concerns about that area. Certainly, we are looking at it and I can't indicate just how or to what extent any relief can be given at this time.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: By leave, the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, as Minister responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization, I would like to inform the House of preparations that have been made to date in regard to the health emergency and the aerial spraying operations, to combat the potential outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis.

The DC-6 aircraft that was used for spraying operations during the 1981 health emergency has again been contracted from Conair in Abbotsford, B.C. The aircraft is expected to arrive in Winnipeg this Friday afternoon, July 22.

I would also like to report that 255,000 litres of Malathion have been ordered from a chemical supplier in Mississauga, Ontario. The first of several tankers bringing the insecticide will be arriving Friday afternoon. The Malathion will be sprayed in "ultra-low volume" form amounting to approximately 500 millilitres per hectare.

Results from our monitoring reaffirm that Winnipeg, Selkirk, Winkler and Morden will be the first regions to be sprayed, with spraying expected to begin Friday evening or Saturday morning, weather conditions permitting.

I would again like to re-emphasize that the spraying times will be approximately 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and in the evening from 8:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. approximately. The reason for these times is that the spraying must be conducted when the mosquitoes are most active.

The government will launch an informational campaign tomorrow on radio, television and newspaper promoting personal protection as the best defence against contracting Western Equine Encephalitis. We are also arranging a radio campaign to ensure that all Manitobans can be made aware of the aerial spraying operations, including the time and place that the aerial spraying will be conducted.

The Emergency Measures Organization has also established an information centre to answer any concerns or questions the public may have regarding the aerial spraying operation or Western Equine Encephalitis. I would like to take this opportunity to again restate the numbers that people can call, in Winnipeg, 944-4844 and out-of-Winnipeg residents can call 1-800-362-3305; that's toll free. The centre which became operational at noon today is staffed with representatives from the Departments of Health, Environment, Agriculture and the Emergency Measures Organization.

Municipal officials within each designated spray area have already been contacted by officials from the Emergency Measures Organization.

On the subject of bees, beekeepers are advised that the Emergency Mosquito Abatement Program involving the aerial application of Malathion is toxic to honey bees.

The Department of Agriculture will attempt to monitor the effects of the spray on honey bee colonies. The government has been in consultation with the beekeepers over the past several weeks in this regard and following the emergency program the government will attempt to evaluate the impact of the program on the beekeeping industry. The government, in consultation with the Beekeepers Association, will establish a Beekeepers Compensation Program to compensate for losses resulting from the emergency spraying.

I hope to provide the House with complete details of the spraying operation on a daily basis throughout the duration of the aerial spraying campaign.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We thank the Minister for giving us that information. We hope that the government in general, and the Minister in particular, are well informed and well on top of the various options, alternatives and consequences of this action that the government is undertaking. I think we on this side found it rather surprising to find, one day the Minister of Health standing up and saying that no emergency existed because there was no infection evident in the case of either horses or humans in Manitoba. There were no incidents reported and therefore he couldn't identify health emergency. Then one day later, despite the fact that there was still no evidence of any infection of either horses or humans, there was a health emergency. So we believe that they

are concerned, that there may be some confusion on the government's part with respect to these actions. We know, of course, that Manitobans are very definitely concerned about this, and should be, because the incidents of the mosquitoes that are able to carry - the vector mosquito - that's able to carry the Western Equine Encephalitis disease, is very prominent and Manitobans are concerned that the government take the proper action.

We hope in taking this action, that the government has selected the proper mechanism, the proper procedure and indeed the proper chemical so that whatever action is taken will be effective to serve its purpose, that is, to reduce the incidents of the mosquitoes and to lessen the possibility of an epidemic of Western Equine Encephalitis because, if not, I think it would be unconscionable on the part of the government, to use any chemical if it did not serve the purpose intended.

I note that the concentration to be used - 4 ounces per acre - is substantially greater than the concentration that was required of the alternative chemical and obviously that must be a part of the matrix of factors to be considered in the decision.

I note as well that the chemical that has been selected, Mr. Speaker, is one that is not effective, normally, below 60 degrees Fahrenheit and evening temperatures in and around Winnipeg are not necessarily going to stay above 60 degrees Fahrenheit; that is information that was provided in the past on Malathion, and obviously if the Minister has alternative views or information on that, it is something that ought to be shared; but certainly that is in the record of the transcript of the investigation that was done by the Clean Environment Commission just a year or so ago.

So with all of that, Mr. Speaker, we thank the Minister for the information. We look forward for continued update on the matter and we hope that the Minister and his colleagues are aware of all of the parameters and consequences of the decision that they've taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave, as a result of this statement, to ask a few questions of the Government Services Minister.

A MEMBER: You had the chance during question period.

A MEMBER: You wouldn't let us make the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: As a result of some of the statements that had been made yesterday by the Minister of Health and today by the Government Services Minister regarding the Western Equine Encephalitis carrier-mosquito and spraying, and only three areas have been identified so far, that is, Winnipeg, Selkirk and Morden, and great concern has been expressed in some of the other areas which are close to some of these

communities, especially the Town of Winkler, in which we have a number of laying flocks not far from town and there is a lot of activity as far as 4H Horse Clubs are concerned and the people in the community are quite concerned.

I wonder if the Minister would be able to tell me whether towns such as Winkler and Altona would also be sprayed.

A MEMBER: How about Gretna?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is currently under consideration. These are the first. I mentioned Morden-Winkler will be sprayed in one block, an eight by sixteen mile block, so they will be done together.

The other towns, the larger centres, as was in 1981, all centres over 1,800 people were sprayed and, of course, we're looking at whether that has to be done across the whole province. It will be determined to a great degree, by the results of the viral counts and the mosquito counts that come in through the constant monitoring process that is taking place. So as we get the results, we will certainly be dealing with that question and any areas that are deemed of high risk will certainly be considered for spraying.

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: I have a committee change. On Statutory Regulations, the Member for Lac du Bonnet will substitute for the Member for Brandon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. Yesterday - and I won't be able to make a motion because the Member for Pembina is not in the House - but yesterday the Member for Pembina had declared that no member of this House has referred to another member of the House as "Kermit." Mr. Speaker, I have found in Hansard where that reference is made and I'll just give notice so that next time up I won't be shot down because I did not raise my point of privilege at the first opportunity; I shall, when the Member for Pembina returns, follow up with a substantive motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm unsure of any provision in our Rules that allows a member to rise and create a reserve position for himself, or herself, to raise a point of privilege at a later date. If the member has a point of privilege, this being the first opportunity to deal with it, let him raise it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources to the same point.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly think it is in order for a member to rise on a question of privilege, and certainly there is an obligation under the rules to do that at the first opportunity. The Honourable Member for Inkster, to my knowledge, has indicated that it is his intention to place a motion before the House, but since the motion deals with a member who is not present at this sitting he is merely indicating that, this being his first opportunity he is raising, and at the earliest opportunity, he is raising the question and indicating to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is his intention, unless you rule otherwise that he has to deal with it today, to deal with that question when the honourable member who is affected by it would be present. I think it would be inequitable to raise a motion of privilege respecting another member who wasn't present to hear and deal with that motion.

If you order, Mr. Speaker, that, notwithstanding what appears to be equitable, that the Member for Inkster must proceed with his question of privilege and his substantive motion today, in the absence of the member affected, so be it. I would say that the member should proceed, but I would recommend to you, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestion that the Honourable Member for Inkster has made makes sense, that he is giving indication, Mr. Speaker, that he has a question of privilege, wants to raise it now, but out of respect and deference for the member of the House affected, will give an opportunity for that member to be present. If he's not here tomorrow then the matter has to be proceeded with, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood on the same point.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I wanted to agree with the Honourable Minister, I think that, although the rule indicates at the first opportunity, I think it would be extremely unwise to have a matter of privilege raised in the absence of the member who is being criticized or attacked or affected in regard to that matter. The Member for Pembina should be here, he should have an opportunity to hear what is said, and he should have the right to respond. He may defend himself or he may explain his actions, but surely it would not be a good policy to make that statement in his absence.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I point out to you the one precedent that comes to mind, had to do with a former Member for Burrows raising a point of privilege with respect to something that I had said while I was Minister of Finance, it was raised on a day which I was not present in the House, because that was the earliest opportunity; the matter was raised, the Speaker took it under advisement, and it was dealt with at a later date. That, Sir, is the precedent and the form which the House has followed in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm informed that there is nothing in our Rules or in Beauchesne that permits a member to effectively give notice of his intention to raise a matter of privilege in the House. Since the honourable member rose on a matter of privilege but did not conclude his remarks with a substantive motion

it would then indicate that he does not have a point of privilege for the House. The point raised that a matter of privilege must be raised at the earliest opportunity surely has to do with a point of privilege taking precedent in debate over all other matters. If it is not urgent enough to raise at the first opportunity, then it would seem that the matter could be dealt with by a normal substantive motion placed on the Order Paper and dealt with at the appropriate time. I would so suggest that the honourable member take that under advisement in order to do that.

Orders of the Day.

MR. D. SCOTT: Could I have some clarification? Are you asking me to make a motion now, or are you asking me to wait until the Member for Pembina arrives in the House, and to make a motion at that time?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not advising the honourable member one way or another he must make his own decision as to the way he wishes to proceed in the House.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of privilege I shall proceed.

HON. S. LYON: Amateur night.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the member have a substantive motion?

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, I have a substantive motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I had charged that the Member for Pembina had previously referred to the Member for Radisson as "Kermit." I had, as well, alleged other comments that had come and are substantiated in Hansard which were not challenged; such as, the Leader of the Opposition's reference for him to go back to his lily pad.

Following that, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Pembina protested and he stated at that time - and you can find this on Page 4407 of Hansard at the bottom of the page - that I would, in reference to myself and my allegations to him, having referred to the Member for Radisson as a "Kermit," which is a frog in any parlance to anybody whatsoever who is conversant with the cartoons of today's day and age. If they can refer ever to a Kermit that is not a frog then I will accept their call, that there is something other than a frog which is called Kermit.

He said at that time that he asked me to withdraw those remarks because "no such name-calling was done in this House," Mr. Speaker, that is the quote. He goes on to say, "No member in this House has referred to any member of this House as Kermit." Mr. Speaker, I withdrew my allegations yesterday afternoon because I did not have written proof, or I could not find in Hansard at that time, where the word "Kermit" had been put on the record.

I have just found, Mr. Speaker, where the words are uttered on the record. They are, Mr. Speaker, for your information, on Monday, the 27th of June, 1983, on

Page 3989. Mr. Orchard was at that time speaking and I believe he was speaking on the motorcycle legislation. Mr. Lecuyer interjected, the Member for Radisson's interjection is printed in Hansard, "Of up to what age?" Mr. Orchard then shot back, "Mr. Speaker, could you control Kermit back there, please?" I then interjected and asked him, "Where does he get Kermit from?" Mr. Speaker, the allegations that I made - and I think I made a mistake yesterday in apologizing to the House - that the Member for Pembina had not uttered those remarks and I think you can reference those remarks to other remarks that are made opposite of having done in accordance with a disrespect for a member of this House, in language that is disrespectful of a conduct of this House.

So thus in concluding, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Radisson that the Member for Pembina apologize to this House for misleading this House in his declaration, in response to my charge, that no member of this House referred to any member of this House as Kermit.

HON. S. LYON: You lie, you lie. Read what you said yesterday.

A MEMBER: Who said Kermit the frog?

MR. D. SCOTT: I shall continue. Yesterday the word, "Kermit the frog," the frog was put in clearly as Kermit is a cartoon character as a frog. Ever so clear for the members of the opposition . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Is the honourable member moving a motion or is he not?

HON. S. LYON: That's like saying the Honourable Member for Inkster is a fool, because he is a fool.

MR. D. SCOTT: . . . is further evidence, Mr. Speaker, of their disrespect . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: You're a real funny government, that's what. You're made up of a collection of idiots. I'll put that in the record any time you want.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I will take this matter under advisement to examine Hansard on the days alleged that this incident happened.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Acting Government House Leader. Order please.

The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Committee of Supply.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY
INTERIM APPROPRIATION ACT (2)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Order please. We are considering the motion for Interim Supply.

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$301,679,720, being 10 percent of the amount of the several items to be voted for the departments as set forth in the main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1984.

The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Perhaps we could have the resolution distributed please?

A MEMBER: What's the item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . this year, does the opposition want that printed? Is the opposition ready to proceed?
The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, now that we have the appropriate item before us, we are prepared to proceed. We, in the customary tradition of dealing with Estimates items, would offer the Minister the opportunity to introduce the item if he wishes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Chairman, in support of the resolution, I indicate to the committee that the original interim supply bill was for 30 percent. We had expected at that stage that would be sufficient funding until the beginning of July of 1983. That time on the calendar has now arrived and we do require a further 10 percent of the amount of the Main Estimates. So, I would speak in support of the resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, since this item deals with, in effect, every item of expenditure that the government expends money upon, of course, this offers a wide opportunity for a debate as to the government's handling of their business. We intend to take advantage of that opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

I should begin by pointing out — (Interjection) — Does the Minister of Natural Resources have an interjection, Mr. Chairman?

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, I was responding to the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, on the point of order, obviously the Member for Turtle Mountain is making. I was responding to the remarks unsolicited from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't speaking on a point of order. I'm speaking to the resolution before us which should be Interim Supply.

The reason that we are here, Mr. Chairman, considering this question of Interim Supply, this necessity for Interim Supply, stems of course from the government's mishandling of business. Traditionally, The Interim Appropriation Act is brought in and that provides the government with sufficient funds to carry them through. On occasion, of course, it happens, as it happened two years ago, that we had a second Interim Supply Bill brought in, and I recall some of the comments that were made by the members opposite at that time.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have to point out to the members opposite, perhaps some of the newer members are not familiar with what has been happening here and just how badly the government has been mismanaging their affairs; that we are up now to over 110 bills, Bill No. 112, The Statute Law Amendment Act was on for introduction at first reading today. Because the government has been introducing so much business, so many resolutions, so many bills to deal with this late in the Session, it has caused the Session to be dragged out an inordinate amount. We completed the review of the Estimates some time in the first part of June, Mr. Chairman; we were done the Estimates then; we were prepared to get on with the business of government. We would have been prepared to see the government bring in the Speed-up Motion to help move the business of government on, provided they had been prepared to not introduce further major bills.

Now, what the government has been doing is bringing in further bills, and we are now just beginning to get into committee hearings on these bills, and we're finding out what the government should have known all along. Last night, for instance, in dealing with the Family Law bills, we find that some of the major commentaries being made by the Law Society and women in the law were, essentially the bills are working, leave them alone, we don't need these kinds of changes. That's maybe somewhat of an oversimplification but, to a great extent, the amendments that were being introduced, the people presenting positions before the committee were saying they weren't necessary.

We have a situation where the Minister of Natural Resources has brought in The Wild Rice Act, for instance, and we have the First Nations Confederacy putting forward a position that says it's in violation of their constitutional rights, it's in violation of their treaty rights, they're opposed to it. What is the government doing bringing in this kind of legislation which it has not discussed with the people who are going to be affected by it, to have it properly thought out before they introduce it in the Legislature, and before they're faced with either withdrawing it or making extensive amendments to it. That's why we're here, Mr. Chairman, that's why we're having to deal with this Interim Appropriation Act for the second time today; the second Interim Appropriation Act, because the government hasn't been able to order its affairs sufficiently to be able to bring the House to conclusion in a reasonable period of time.

We haven't even concluded the hearings of Manitoba Hydro yet, for example, hearings that could have been commenced last November or December. We still

haven't done with them. We have situations now where committees of the Legislature were called last night to deal with certain bills; they only made I heard something like six submissions out of 24 that the committee has to hear. The committee is called, again, for the following evening to consider a new bill, another bill, and we haven't finished the business of the committee for the purposes that it had been called previously. It's that kind of ordering of business that causes us to be here with the government asking for another 10 percent of the money to be put forward.

Mr. Chairman, at the rate they're going, I'm not at all sure that this 10 percent is going to be sufficient to see the government through. I don't think that we're making a great deal of progress as the government keeps introducing major bills; bills like The Pension Bill, for instance. At this stage of the Legislative Session, how can the opposition have the time to adequately review and study bills when they're brought in under these circumstances? That's why we're here, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Natural Resources doesn't seem to understand that.

As I said, initially, Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with an item in Estimates here which touches upon every expenditure that the government makes, every item that is within the Estimates of Expenditure Book is now open for further questioning, for further debate because some of this 10 percent will be allocated to every other item in the government's expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, I expect that we will have a number of questions to deal with this afternoon. It may be necessary for some Ministers to be present to respond to some of the questions, but I'm sure that my colleagues will have perhaps some general comment to make before we get to the specifics.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, this resolution affords me the opportunity to make several observations, and also discuss some of the concerns that have developed in the last while with regard to the operations of the House, as well as the operations of the government. Our House Leader has outlined some of the difficulties that we have had in dealing with members opposite with regard to this particular Session.

I spoke awhile ago about some concerns that I had, Mr. Chairman, about this place becoming a full-time job, in that we would be spending all of our time sitting in the Legislature here rather than affording us the opportunities to go out into, what I refer to, as the real world and discuss the problems of the average Manitoban, not only in rural Manitoba but in the urban areas.

One of the difficulties we are facing here this year is a government who, as the Member for Turtle Mountain put it, over a month ago passed the spending Estimates and is now bombarding us with legislation that, in many instances - we have heard from many groups now - is not really necessary or really warranted. I want to say to members opposite, I went through a Session that closed, I believe in 1980, some time on July 28th and I want to tell members opposite, being a Minister of the Crown and having to go through that and then

jumping right into Estimates, I want to tell members opposite that they probably will have a difficult time in recovering from this kind of a Session.

It would be in their best interests to expedite the proceedings in this House to try and wind this House down so that everybody, not only Ministers of the Crown, but people in the whole Legislature such as the backbenchers and the opposition, could get out and do the thing that we should be doing right now and that is talking to our people to find out exactly what their concerns are.

As I have mentioned before, this place breeds an atmosphere all of its own and very often the things that we as members here believe are important, are of little consequence and of little concern to people in the outside, real world and the only way we can really get back and get our feet planted firmly on the ground is to get out there and meet with these people and rub shoulders with them and shake hands with them and listen to their concerns, because that is the only true way this democratic system will work. Being here 11-12 months of the year will not serve the democratic process and will not serve our people in a way that it was meant to.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the members opposite that I believe there is going to have to be more co-operation between the House Leaders, no matter who it is, with regard to . . .

A MEMBER: Talk about co-operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, it's normal, when we're dealing with a resolution Estimate in the House that the Minister is responsible. I'm wondering which Minister is responsible for this item in the Estimates, since the Minister of Finance is the one who introduced the Estimates and has now left the Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I will take all those questions under consideration, as House Leader.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, there are certain courtesies in this House that are extended to both sides. One of the ways of dealing with the opposition and expediting and facilitating the operation of this House is to consult, Mr. Chairman, and not consult half an hour before a sitting, not to announce committee meetings without consulting the opposition and then sitting back and then withdrawing it. We won't have anybody meeting tonight, because you people opposite are so bullheaded and won't introduce Speed-up Motions - you've been trying every which way to try and get around it. But what has happened is that has really tied your hands and you have virtually brought this House to a standstill because of that.

Mr. Chairman, there comes a certain time, in order to wind this House down, that somebody has to grab

the bull by the horns, and what's happening opposite is I think they're grabbing the wrong end of the bull because the way this thing has ground to a halt, in my 10 years in this Legislature, this is the worst fiasco I've ever seen. I know that the Government House Leader has to co-operate with the opposition. We were prepared to deal with a few bills today; we were prepared to move some things along, but to go ahead and then come in and half-an-hour or a few minutes before the actual sitting takes place, or very often when the question period has started already, we are told what's supposed to be happening.

I tell the members opposite that's a terrible way to run the House; and what's going to happen is this type of thing where you're calling things which we aren't prepared to talk about and prepared to pass - but if you want to do that, if you want to say that I'm government and that's the only way it goes, so be it, Mr. Chairman. I will sit here, because there are certain things that are being introduced right now that have to receive public scrutiny, will receive public scrutiny and if it means spending all the time here, we'll spend the time here.

The members opposite have this terrible hangup about Speed-up, and I can see that. There's certain members opposite, I think some of the Ministers - if it was left up to the Ministers, they'd probably bring it in and some of the members that have been here for awhile, they'd bring it in. But I know there are certain members in the back row that don't like that business about - they say we're rushing through this thing. But Speed-up gives you the flexibility of dealing with this House in a much more expedient manner, and I would say to members opposite that co-operation with regard to the things that the opposition are ready to pass on, just hasn't been there and that's one of the reasons that we're at the stage we are right now.

Mr. Chairman, we're well past the halfway mark in July; we haven't even started to tackle some of the big issues before us; we haven't even started to tackle them. If the government feels that this is the way in which to produce good legislation, I want to tell them they're doing the people of Manitoba a big disservice. Not only are they doing themselves a big disservice, they're doing the people of Manitoba a big disservice. Members opposite, I think, are just starting to realize that what they considered a bit of a game before, is going to be a long, slowed-out, rock 'em, sock 'em session and we're experiencing it now.

The other thing that, of course, happens when this type of atmosphere develops, tempers start flaring. We've had a few cases on both sides where not only the temperature outside but the temperature in here got to be such that I don't think it lends to the best interests of the people, but that's what happens when you put people into a situation the way they are. The frustrations that come out have to be taken out in one form or another and that is what's happening in this House. But there has to start to be some co-operation, some planning by the government to organize their business in a manner which, as I said before, is in the best interests of the people of Manitoba.

To bring a pension bill in at this stage of the game, when we've got the constitutional change before us, when we've got the hearings before us on seat belts, when we've got the hearings before us on marital law

and family law, I want to say to members opposite that that is not doing anybody, neither in this Chamber nor in the province, a service.

We're dealing here now with a bill which asks for the expenditure of some more funds. We are aware that those funds will have to be passed in order for certain commitments to be made, not only to employees but to other areas of government expenditure.

We have found out over the last little while, Mr. Chairman, that the members opposite who were very very critical of any promotional material that was put out by the previous administration, are now in the midst of spending the kinds of funds that nobody ever dreamed of spending before. I'm sure a large portion of this 10 percent is going to go to try and bolster up the public image of this particular government. I wouldn't be surprised, Mr. Chairman, if they haven't earmarked a whole bunch of money for this. We found out during the Education Estimates, the Minister of Education is establishing her own little PR group, you've got a new person now, not from the Civil Service, but some political appointment has been made to take Mr. O'Connor's job.

Now, the First Minister wonders why there is all this hostility very often to things that his government and to things that their news service is doing. We had a classic example yesterday, that not even the resolution, or Article 23 of The Manitoba Act could not be typed properly in a letter to the municipalities. Today we have a question being asked by the Member for Turtle Mountain about the replacement for Mr. O'Connor, as head of the Information Services, and the First Minister gets up and he says, well he's the same as Mr. Armit under the previous administration. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is playing dangerously with the truth. What has happened here is somebody of a political nature has now been - I imagine the First Minister indicated by Order-in-Council - been put in charge of the government propaganda machine.

We had the Member for St. Norbert point out the other day, in one day just on print advertising in the three papers we had \$13,000 worth of advertising just in one day to bolster up this government. This doesn't include the T.V. ads which were running, the electronic media ads. Mr. Chairman, I bet you on a day like that, they must have spent about \$25,000 just bolstering this government's image. Well, you just project that into a few days and you're starting to look at hundreds of thousands of dollars being spent by this government, to what, Mr. Speaker? To try and cover up their mismanagement and their incompetence and trying to hoodwink the people into believing that they are something which they really aren't.

What they really aren't and what they really have demonstrated is that, No. 1, they haven't any new initiatives and new programs which are going to go ahead and show some large recoveries in this province. Their biggest initiative, the Jobs Fund, it was pointed out the other day very clearly and I'm happy that some of these things are being highlighted because we realized this at the beginning, that there was no real new money with the exception of a few dollars going into the Jobs Fund.

You've got the Minister of Highways who is almost pleading with members opposite to start to raise a bit of a stink about the lack of construction on highways

so that he can go back to his Cabinet and hopefully squeeze a few dollars out of them so that the heavy construction industry can see a few contracts flow.

It has been pointed out that the Minister of Highway's Estimates, that his capital project was stripped by some close to \$20 million and transferred into the Jobs Fund and now we are here being asked to go ahead and pass another 10 percent of the total spending so that the government can continue to do what they're doing.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I know that the government has made these commitments and that these funds will eventually have to flow; but I am not at all happy with the places that they're flowing to. I say to members opposite, how can you really in all integrity stand there and spend the kind of money you're talking about on propaganda, some \$20,000 - \$25,000 a day, and realize that when you were in opposition the small few programs that we carried on which would pale into insignificance compared to the kinds of money you're spending now to try and crop up the fraud fund, is something really that I believe, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba are going to catch on to very quickly.

You know the construction worker, the person that won't be able to put in 20 hours worth of work is not going to blame the opposition, is not going to blame the contractor because he knows that the reason he isn't working is that the Minister of Highways had money taken out of his Budget and put into the Jobs Fund. We've used this terminology about the shell game, we've used it often. Probably every member in some speech or another in this Chamber has used that particular terminology.

What has happened here is and maybe, Mr. Speaker, I guess the more you think of it, maybe they are doing the people of Manitoba a bit of a service by keeping this Session going because some things are coming out and becoming crystal clear to the people of Manitoba about the incompetence and the lack of understanding that members opposite have with regard to what the people's needs really are.

The people don't want to be hoodwinked. They want jobs and they want to be told in a straightforward manner what the prospects really are. Everybody knows that the economy isn't as buoyant as it was in the early '70s; everybody knows that. I think the biggest disservice that the government started off doing was that during the last election, of course, they indicated it was all Manitoba's fault and really had nothing to do internationally and now all of a sudden we find out it does have something to do with the international problem and they have come to the realization, but they did heighten the expectations of people out there because they really figured that these gentlemen opposite, and ladies, could do something to try and turn that around.

We have seen now and I think the people in the construction industry now, will see that really the Highways Budget was cut and that really the Minister of Highways is pleading with everybody to get after his government to try and force the Cabinet into providing some more funds. Maybe that is part of the politics the gentlemen and women opposite are playing. I guess one has to just firmly believe that people really aren't as gullible as members opposite think they are.

When the First Minister now announces - and I have no question that he's going to announce in the next

little while, that he's going to announce some more funds for highways construction and he's going to announce it as a new initiative under the Jobs Fund - I want to tell members opposite I really don't think people are naive enough to think that by pulling it out of one department and putting it into the Jobs Fund that this is a big new initiative on the part of this government. I really don't think so. I don't think any amount of money, that \$20,000-a-day advertising program, will be able to salvage that kind of lack of integrity by the gentlemen and women opposite.

So, Mr. Chairman, I know for a fact that by the introduction of this particular resolution at this point in time and a few speeches that are made on this side, gentlemen and ladies opposite will not be able to resist the temptation to get involved in the debate. The House Leader, of course, because he did not listen to this side of the House, because he refused to sit down and discuss this thing in a proper, civilized, co-operative manner, he will now, after I sit down, get up and try and refute exactly what I have said. So what I am saying to members opposite is that there comes a time when the government is going to have to swallow a little bit of pride and sit down and organize the business of this House in such a manner that they see it passed.

It means bending on both sides and it doesn't mean that the government can just come in and announce exactly what they're going to do because without a lack of co-operation from the opposition and from the government, the thing just won't work. We sit down and determine the things that we're ready to speak on, having certain members who have to attend certain things in their constituencies. We arrange our time in a certain way and hope to facilitate the time of the House that way and we discuss those things carefully. But if we cannot rely on the government taking some of that advice from us in dealing with certain bills that are before us or dealing with some of the resolutions, when we are ready to deal with some of those, then, Mr. Speaker, so be it. Then we will come into this House, we will continue on the path that the government has struck for us. If they insist on calling things that the opposition is not ready to roll with or ready to pass at that particular time, so be it. But I want to say to members opposite, that that will not facilitate the quick or orderly proceeding of this House and that bills such as this which do afford the opposition the opportunity of speaking on a wide-ranging number of topics will be spoken on and will be dealt with.

I say to members opposite - today is a classic case of what happens when total communications break down with the government, because we're going to get into a number of debates here today. This day is shot. Then we're into Private Members' Hour. The House Leader is going to get up now and go into a 20-minute tirade and then we're going to get up and have some concerns expressed about the expenditures of this government - but this day is gone and if the Government House Leader wants to continue in that fashion, so be it. But I think the people of Manitoba will see exactly what these gentlemen and ladies opposite are. They are lousy managers. They can't even run the House. How in the world are they ever going to run the affairs of government? No amount of \$20,000 per day of ads on TV, on radio and everything, propping up the mismanagement and competence of members opposite is going to help them in the next election.

Mr. Chairman, they are digging their own graves and I suggest to you they're at the six-foot level and they are going to be digging a lot deeper before these next two years are over. As a matter of fact, if I was down in China, as my little son would put it, I'd look out because I think the spade's going to poking through there before these guys are out of it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to put a few things on the record. It shouldn't take me too long to do that, Mr. Chairman. I don't think that it'll be Private Members' Hour when I'm finished speaking.

What I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, is that in order that there be co-operation in matters in the House, there has to be a spirit of goodwill and an understanding that there is common purpose in what we're doing. Well, let's look at the common purpose of the government and the common purpose of the members of the opposition. They have been saying from the outset, Mr. Chairman, get into Speed-up, get into Speed-up. You know the way it's done. You get into Speed-up. Well, you know, it's not - I can't question the motives, Mr. Chairman, of any member of the opposition, but what have they said about other things? Well, they have indicated in their speeches and the Honourable Member for Lakeside in his speech, indicated that what was wrong in respect to some of the matters that we were dealing with and particularly he was highlighting the resolution on language rights, was that there was a unseemly haste on the part of this government to deal with this resolution.

You know, Mr. Chairman, it is clear. Members of the opposition want Speed-up, so that then they can say to the public, that government ran things through the House against our will. We were overwhelmed by the change in the rules. We were defenceless. We didn't have the opportunity to debate. In effect, they closed off debate. Mr. Chairman, the evidence has been manifest day after day. When, Mr. Chairman, I suggested that honourable members should debate bills, you know that we were not prepared to see them stand. They were here to debate, not just to stand bills day after day as they have done, Mr. Chairman. — (Interjection) — Oh, from time-to-time, the Leader of the Opposition says. He wasn't present in the House, Mr. Chairman, he hasn't been present much of the time in the House when these sort of shenanigans were carried on by the Honourable House Leader of the opposition party. These, Mr. Chairman, were not acts of co-operation. They were acts of deliberate frustration on the part of government business - for what purpose? To try to force the government to do things it didn't want to do.

Mr. Chairman, let the record be clear. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain - I was at his office at 1:30, he was not available. I was at his office — (Interjection) — no, you weren't. I was at his office at 1:55, he still wasn't available, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to talk to him. The first opportunity I had was when I came in the House and I sat down before question period to dialogue with him about business of the House. That was my first opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

Now, long before that, I went to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain and indicated, the government has a time limit in connection with supply. I gave him the option. Shall we deal with the main supply bills which we could have voted on and dealt with it? We're anxious, remember, Mr. Speaker, we're anxious - in the words of the opposition - to get out of the House, let's do things in a businesslike way.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we could have dealt with things that way and we would've been through those matters. No, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain says, well, we normally don't do it that way. You'd better bring in another motion for Interim Supply. I said all right, if that's what you want, we will do that.

Mr. Chairman, there was a time limit. I spoke to the honourable member last week. It is this week that that matter has to be dealt with. I spoke to the honourable member during the beginning of the Session here, the first opportunity I had and told him, we would like to deal with it now; at least put it on the record now. We'll deal with it right now. The honourable member said, well, you'd better deal with it tomorrow. Why tomorrow? Well, because that's more convenient for us. Now, Mr. Chairman, has everything got to be at the convenience of the opposition to be co-operation? Surely there should be some recognition of government need to order business too. Co-operation isn't a one-way street. It's a two-way street. There's some give and there's some take.

I said to the honourable member, what bills do you want to debate? He gave me a list, Mr. Chairman. I said I was prepared to call those. But surely they should accommodate us once in awhile. We want to be able, not at the 11th hour, we want to be able to pay the bills.

Why could they not have co-operated to some extent? The honourable members get up and they say well now we have an opportunity with this motion to have a wide-ranging debate, and we are now attacking the government for lack of control, lack of good business in running the House. We have been running the House. The Honourable House Leader has gone to the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, and we have agreed on the calling of bills. Then the honourable member gets up and criticizes us for not co-operating. The co-operation has all been one way, Mr. Chairman. They have not co-operated with us.

A MEMBER: You didn't call the bills.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, we haven't had an opportunity. I indicated that it was necessary at least to get this issue on the record. Then, honourable members get up and they, again, on this wide-ranging debate, this opportunity for wide-ranging debate, attack the fraud fund. They can continue to do that, but the public record, Mr. Chairman, indicates that they stood up, every one of them that was in the House, and voted for that fund. Now, what kind of integrity is manifest by people who say one thing, but when it comes to the public record, do another? I ask you, Mr. Chairman.

Then, one of the honourable members has the gall to suggest that a member of the Cabinet is going out urging people to urge things of his government. Now, that is ridiculous, Mr. Chairman. — (Interjection) — Mr.

Chairman, I listened, and I didn't interrupt honourable members when they were speaking, and I would expect to get the same courtesy, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we want to co-operate and I was certainly prepared to call the list, as given to me by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. I expected that we'd get a little bit of reasonable accommodation from the opposition in advancing this resolution. Mr. Chairman, let me indicate the number of ways in which the opposition can debate. They can debate on this motion, as they are doing; they can debate on the motion to go into Ways and Means; they can debate on the second reading of the bill itself; they can debate in the Committee of the Whole consideration of the bill. Mr. Chairman, there are many many ways in which the opposition can debate.

They chose to debate this afternoon. Why? To frustrate the Leader of the Opposition who wants to make his major contributions in respect to these bills. What kind of co-operation, Mr. Chairman? We merely want to advance this bill, this resolution, to at least get the bill before the House which is customary, Mr. Chairman.

HON. S. LYON: Too bad.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says too bad. It is too bad when we can't get a reasonable measure of co-operation from the opposition. The Member for Turtle Mountain laughs. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is not a laughing matter. They want us, for their own political reasons, to do what we don't think is reasonable. We ask only that they indicate and co-operate with us to the extent that is reasonable, Mr. Chairman.

They can spend many many hours, should they choose, in various steps of this resolution and the bill; that's up to them to decide. Let me indicate, Mr. Chairman, if that is their intent we will certainly accommodate them because there'll be many many New Democrats on this side of the House that will want to expose the kind of false argument that they present when they attack our program, and yet vote for it, Mr. Chairman. That kind of conduct is completely false.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have some difficulty with the positions being taken by the Minister of Natural Resources, the Acting Government House Leader because a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, when some resolutions were introduced and the House resolved itself into a committee, and they resolved themselves into Committee of Ways and Means, we passed those resolutions without debate. We had the Minister, the Acting Government House Leader, stand up right after that and criticize us for not debating. Today the Minister brings in a resolution and we decide to debate it, and he criticizes us for debating it now. Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult to fathom just how that Minister's thinking is going.

Since he chose to put on the record . . .

HON. S. LYON: It's been off track since infancy.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . a part of the exchange that took place between he and I earlier this afternoon, Mr.

Chairman, then I guess I have to put the rest of that on the record, is that when the Acting Government House Leader came and wanted to deal with this question this afternoon I asked him when it had to be passed, and he said by tomorrow night. So I suggested that he pass it tomorrow, Mr. Chairman. That, of course, being something in the government's favour that if they would introduce it tomorrow then the maximum amount that they could expect the opposition to debate it would be one day. Surely that would make sense . . .

HON. S. LYON: No longer though, no longer.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . Mr. Chairman, to any rational person looking at what the opposition is doing, and if you can do it in one day then it's far better to do then than to do it in two.

I said that my Leader was prepared to finish his speaking on Bill 48 and Bill 55, and reference to the Order Paper will show, Mr. Chairman, that my Leader was in the process of speaking on both of those bills, so it isn't as if those bills were simply standing in his name, he actually had begun to address those bills and hadn't completed them. It would have been an excellent opportunity to deal with those.

There are a number of second readings on the Order Paper, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure the Minister of Education, who has unfortunately been under the weather in recent days; we welcome her back and wish her well, she would have welcomed the opportunity to have introduced her bills, first of all, this afternoon. Then, had the Government House Leader called this resolution at a quarter after four this afternoon or waited, as I suggested, until tomorrow he could have saved a lot of time, but he didn't do that, Mr. Chairman, so be it.

Since he's the Acting Minister of Finance, Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister. On Page 134 of the Estimates Book, Mr. Chairman, Resolution No. 145, there is \$72,200,000 dedicated to the Jobs Fund. I wonder if the Acting Minister of Finance could tell us, then, since they need more money at this point, Mr. Chairman, how much money has been committed of that \$72,200,000; an estimate of how much money would have actually flowed of that \$72,200,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I indicated that, in the absence of the Minister of Finance, that I would endeavour to respond to questions or, if I didn't have the answers, of course, I will take the questions under advisement and they'll be answered in due course.

I believe maybe the Attorney-General can give particularization to some response to that question. I know that, to my knowledge, the monies in the Jobs Fund have been committed. The amounts actually expended at this date I would have to take as notice. Maybe the Honourable Attorney-General can amplify on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes. In response to the question, and I'm not going to attempt to give it in the dollars and cents, but I can give it close enough, I think, to

give the Member for Turtle Mountain an appreciation of where we stand with the Jobs Fund as of this date, as of July 15th, both with respect to the budgetary and non-budgetary amounts that together make up the Jobs Fund. In fact, in terms of commitment, the total amount has been committed. In terms, however, of cash flow, the anticipated cash flow as of now for fiscal '83-'84 is somewhat below that figure. The anticipated cash flow is approximately somewhere between \$25 million and \$35 million below the \$200 million as of this date. That is because some of the projects included in the Jobs Fund are two-, and in some instances, three-year projects. That is the present status of the Jobs Fund. I hope that answers the question. If not, I'll take a supplementary of course.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I have a further question then and perhaps the Attorney-General can answer it. If not, he can perhaps get an answer. I really think it's unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance would introduce this resolution and then stalk out of the House and not be here while the resolution is dealt with.

Bill 30 was introduced in the House recently, entitled An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the same (2), and in that bill there is a section which says that the money raised under authority of this act for the Jobs Fund in Schedule A, shall be raised for total requirements for the Jobs Fund and not for any particular specific purpose.

I have expressed some concern about that in the past, that money from Schedule A, which is to be self-sustaining capital, should not find its way into the position where it becomes a cost on the general appropriation expenditures of government. I've been assured that will not be the case, and indeed the earlier capital bill specified that \$20 million for the Jobs Fund was specifically for the Home Insulation Loan Program; we passed that bill earlier this Session. Now we are being asked to pass a bill which says that notwithstanding that in Schedule A to The Loan Act 1983, there is a specific purpose designated under Jobs Fund, namely Insulation Loan Program, money raised under the authority of the act for the Jobs Fund shall be raised for the total requirements for the Jobs Fund and not for any particular specific purpose. Here we have a situation where the House this Session already passed a capital loan bill for a specific purpose, Insulation Loan Program. Now we're being asked to pass a bill that says, never mind what you did earlier; it's not going to be spent on the Insulation Program necessarily, it's going to be spent for any purpose.

I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether or not some of the money which is committed under Schedule A can, in fact, find its way into the general expenditures of the Jobs Fund.

HON. R. PENNER: First of all, with respect to the general words which are used again in the Interim Supply bill and repeat the words which were previously used - or at least the words in Bill 30 - and which are repeated with respect to the fact that what has been created is a pool, in general, rather than something that is the sum of very specifically designated parts.

The reason of that, of course, was - and still is - that the Jobs Fund is an ongoing process pursuant to which specific issues are addressed and analyzed in, I must say, a very careful, a very thorough way; go through a committee process; they go through a lot of hoops; a lot of analysis before a commitment is made and it would have been impossible and indeed I think we would have been open to criticism to have attempted to designate expenditures under specific headings without the kind of analysis for which, as a government, as a Treasury Bench, we must bear responsibility.

With respect to the second part, it is not the case as far as I am aware and I believe this to be so, that any of the monies specified in Schedule A find their way into the aggregate sum of the Jobs Fund, if I appreciated your question properly.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, I hope that's the case, Mr. Chairman, and if that's so then perhaps the government, when we come to deal with this bill then, will be prepared to entertain an amendment which will say that, in general terms, for instance, shall be raised for total requirements of the Jobs Fund as they relate to self-sustaining items in accordance with The Financial Administration Act, and then there would be no concern. My concern at the moment is that money which is borrowed on the strength of the government's borrowing record for purposes that are to be self-sustaining can find its way into the general expenditures of government and so if the Attorney-General can give some assurance that that will be the case and that they might even entertain amendments to that effect, I think the situation would be much more acceptable.

HON. R. PENNER: I'll just, very briefly, repeat what I have said. In looking over Schedule A and trusting to memory - which perhaps I ought not to do, but they say that age cannot not wither nor custom stale my infinite variety - I am not aware of any — (Interjection) — Cleopatra? Perhaps.

But in any event, having in mind the allocations to specifics in the Jobs Fund, there is nothing that comes to my mind at the moment that indicates any transfer from Schedule A to Jobs Fund. In fact, the only area where there's a parallelism and not a duplication is with respect to the Manitoba Water Services Board where there are some projects which are Addendums to, and not the same as, the Manitoba Water Services Board, in terms of assisting, for example, certain areas where the ability of a municipality to loan has been exhausted in terms of the particular requirements there, and yet they want to fund a particular project, that is badly needed. One or two of those, I recall for example, with respect to Flin Flon, have been specifically allocated from the Jobs Fund, but that hasn't been done by way of a transfer from the Water Services Board allotment to the Jobs Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm certain that the Acting Government House Leader did not expect to introduce this item of business today and have it pass quietly and swiftly into the night and earn

early and easy acceptance from this side of the House. For that reason, my House Leader had proposed to the Acting Government House Leader that this item not be introduced till tomorrow. That would have confined the opposition criticism to a period of time, one day shorter than now is the case. But the Honourable Member for St. James, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources has given us the opportunity to identify weaknesses in the government's program and to comment on them today, so it's my intention to take a few minutes to enjoy that invitation and participate in it, Mr. Chairman.

We're looking at a request for \$300 million in spending approval for this government and just a few brief weeks ago we passed the overall package of spending Estimates for fiscal year '83-84 amounting to something slightly in excess of \$3 billion requested. A great deal has happened, Sir, since those Estimates were passed and a great deal, unfortunately, has not happened. What has not happened is that there has been activity and initiative in the economy of this province generating jobs and generating growth. I say that that has been what has not happened and that was what was entirely necessary, if this province was going to be able to sustain the kind of spending program to which the government came to the opposition during the Estimates process and requested that \$3 billion approval.

With respect to the departments for which I have particular responsibility in opposition, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Health and the Department of Community Services and Corrections, we're looking at a total '83-84 requested expenditure of approximately \$1.3 billion; \$1 billion for Health, \$300 million for Community Services and that, Sir, is very close to 40 percent of the total government spending request for the year. In those areas there have been dismaying things happen since individual departmental Estimates were passed with my approval and the approval of my colleagues when we were in committee stage reviewing those individual departmental Estimates earlier this Session.

I want to spend a minute or two identifying those disappointments and those dismaying developments. But before I do that, let me reiterate what I said a moment ago about the overall package and the overall program and the fact that a great deal has not happened in terms of essential initiative and activity for this province since the total Estimates package was passed. What we have needed and continue to need, Mr. Chairman, is a climate and an atmosphere in this province that will help generate investment, that will produce jobs and that will create economic growth. Nothing in the time that we have been in Session in this Legislature in 1983, and certainly nothing in the time since the basic Estimates package was passed has occurred, Sir, to give us any confidence or any reassurance or any hope that that kind of future is in the making or that that kind of present is in the making for our province. As a consequence it is very difficult for us on this side of the House to offer approval of the Interim Supply request that's in front of us from the government at this present time, without pinning them down as to some of their shortcomings and some of their immediate intentions for addressing provincial difficulties.

If the Acting Government House Leader and his colleagues expected that we would offer blithe and glib passage to this request for approximately 10 percent of that \$3 billion overall spending sum then, Sir, they indeed have a second thought coming, because we cannot easily offer support for this request for that kind of spending authority when we see nothing on their part, nothing coming from them to provide Manitobans with hope and encouragement as to our economic and social well-being in the months and in the years immediately upon us.

They've got a billboard up around town, Mr. Chairman, which everybody in this Chamber has seen and which reads: "Jobs don't just happen, they're created." Mr. Chairman, that has been a lesson that we, the Progressive Conservative Party on this side of the Chamber have been trying to impress upon this government from the day that they were unfortunately elected to office, that you cannot enjoy economic activity and career opportunities simply by paying lip service to it, simply by wishing it to happen or simply by assuming that somebody is going to go out and make it happen. You cannot, furthermore, anticipate or expect that kind of situation, that kind of environment when you deliberately undertake policies and programs aimed at stifling the very kind of initiative, effort and energy that produces jobs.

That, Sir, has been the single, individual, major failing of this government among the many failings that they have chalked up in the 18 to 20 months that they have been in office and, heaven knows, they have displayed and demonstrated a great many failings. But rather than get into that whole litany, I want to focus for these few minutes available to me this afternoon, on that single most important major failing, Sir, and that item, as I say, has been the fact that that government over there has embarked upon policies and programs which, whether they know it or not - and I suspect in many instances they do know it - but whether they know it or not, have impacted directly upon initiative, investment and economic activity in this province and have impacted directly in a very harmful and a very damaging way by their ineptness, by their incompetence, by their insensitivity and by their lack of understanding of the engine that makes the economy move and that supports the required social programs in society, they have turned off investment and energy and input and they have damaged our economy very very severely. They've damaged it so greatly, Sir, that it is going to take considerable faith and considerable effort and considerable time for Manitobans to recover from the current state of economic malaise that they have created.

So, Sir, that's the individual and most important major failing, as I see it, over and above all the other failings of this government. And here they come this afternoon requesting easy passage, requesting an easy ride from the opposition on 10 percent of the overall spending appropriation that they desire for this year; requesting, in other words, further endorsement of the programs that they put before this Legislature when they brought in their \$3 billion total Estimates package several months ago.

We have a right, Sir, to ask them at this point in time in light of the eventual support that they've got for those Estimates requests, what are you doing to deserve

the support that you've got? What are you doing to demonstrate that you deserve the spending program that has been endorsed? What are you doing to justify the request this afternoon for 10 percent approval on that spending authority, to permit you to meet your Interim Supply requirements? The answer comes back in a hollow and a mocking way, Sir, nothing.

They have done nothing to move this province into a position whereby there is hope and inspiration and activity on the part of Manitobans. They have done nothing to move this province into a position where our agricultural community, so important to our overall economy, is strong and vibrant, and can be hopeful. They have done nothing to move our province into a position where the small businessman, the small private businessman or businesswoman, the entrepreneurial sector, has any reason for investment or expansion or enhanced activity. They have done nothing for the thousands of students in this province who can look forward at the present time to the bleakest of career and job opportunity outlooks. They've done nothing for those students who have found that in the circumstances it's better to go back to university and take additional courses than to walk the streets looking for jobs in this province, where no jobs are available.

Sir, we've had a classic example in the last few days, this very week in this Chamber of their incompetence and their misunderstanding of that message that is inscribed on their billboard at the present time, the message that says "Jobs don't just happen, they are created." That classic example was conveyed to us in the questions raised in the House this week by my colleagues on behalf of the heavy construction industry in this province, which is in deep deep economic trouble at the present time, as a result of the blindness and the stubbornness of that government opposite.

The heavy construction industry, Sir, is an industry that is vital to the vibrancy and the economic health of any western industrialized society, and certainly vital by demonstration over the years and over the decades to the economic health of our province. Today, Sir, that industry in our province is in deep despair, in deep gloom, and in deep decline. Why, Sir? Because those people opposite, those people comprising the government in office at the present time in this province have no understanding, no comprehension of the vital role that an industry such as that plays in maintaining and supporting and reinforcing economic activity in a jurisdiction, whether it be a municipal community or a provincial jurisdiction. They have no understanding of the basic engine that an industry like that provides to the central economy of a province, and less understanding of the spinoff impact and support that an industry like that provides, in terms of jobs and economic opportunity, and economic activity.

They believe that creating a people park somewhere and bringing in a Mariachi Band is job creation, when they've got thousands of heavy construction workers out of work, heavy construction personnel out of work. Some 50 percent or more of the machinery and the manpower and womanpower in the heavy construction industry in Manitoba today, Sir, is unemployed. So when you look at that billboard of theirs that says "Jobs don't just happen, they are created," it makes one weep, Mr. Chairman. It doesn't make one — (interjection) — It doesn't make one laugh, it makes

one weep. They don't have to create jobs, Mr. Chairman, all they have to do is recognize them and appreciate them. All they have to do is continue the basic fundamental foundation for thousands of jobs that has always existed in this province. It doesn't take any great amount of imagination or creativity or innovation to create jobs that are based on a fundamental economic activity that has always been here, i.e. highway construction, sewer and water construction, projects of that kind that occupy gainfully so many thousands of men and women in Manitoba year after year, except in the year 1983.

It is ludicrous and sad, Mr. Chairman, to look at that slogan on that billboard of theirs. What do they mean that jobs have to be created, or jobs are created? We know that jobs are created, but I don't know what they mean by it when they have stifled an industry like the heavy construction industry, to name just one. They've stifled industrial and economic activity on a broad and tragic scale in this province since the day they unfortunately got their hands on the administration of this province, but I cite the heavy construction industry in particular because there is an opportunity for them to produce thousands of jobs - thousands of jobs - immediately in Manitoba without any talent for creativity on their part, without any effort and innovation on their part, without any manifestation of imagination on their part. All they have to do is do what we have always done in this province, and what provinces across this country have always done and that is, maintain our road and street system; that is let highway contracts in the summertime and street and sewer contracts in the city in the summertime, to maintain the infrastructure that is so necessary in our province, and to keep - just by way of coincidence - to keep thousands and thousands of people at work, not only directly in the industry, but in spinoff and supply industries.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is sad beyond description, and certainly sad beyond the element of the ludicrous, to look at that billboard message of theirs about jobs having to be created. The jobs are there, if they will simply turn from some of those foolish abstractions of theirs where they are wasting so many thousands of dollars, and apply the money necessary to maintain the essential economic services that have always been maintained in this province, prior to their administration. The jobs would be there. The foundation and the underpinning for those jobs has always been there. All they have to do is continue to let contracts, to build highways.

Mr. Chairman, when they come and ask us for approval of 10 percent of this \$3 billion spending program that they have sought and on which they received approval during the Estimates process this afternoon, they should be under no illusions that they are going to get easy passage from those of us who feel deeply for the thousands of Manitobans, not only in the heavy construction industry, but the thousands of Manitobans who are waiting and praying for them to do something about the economic malaise to which they've reduced this province in the past 18 months.

There are many things, Sir, that I could say about disappointments and dismays that have occurred to me, that have come my way as official opposition critic in the field of Community Services and in the field of Health since those Estimates were passed a few weeks

ago. But, Sir, in the time available this afternoon I cannot go into them in detail.

It's certainly my intention, however, to identify some of those disappointments and some of those shortcomings the next time we are discussing this particular item if I don't have a chance to cover them in any detail this afternoon, Mr. Chairman. My primary point was to address the economic situation, generally, and to demand that this government, when they come in here asking for approval on Interim Supply from us, to demand of this government that they do something about that sad, tragic and dismal economic situation to which they have reduced all of us.

We have unemployment in this province, Mr. Chairman, continuing at a very serious level. The fact that we are second lowest in unemployment levels in Canada seems to be of some peculiar and perverse satisfaction to the First Minister and to his colleagues opposite. They take great pride in the fact that, instead of being third lowest in unemployment among provinces in Canada now, latest statistics and charts show Manitoba to have the second lowest level of unemployment. That, Sir, is like saying that it was better to go to sea on the Andrea Doria than on the Titanic, that's all, because fewer lives were lost when the Andrea Doria went down than were lost when the Titanic went down. That doesn't make it something to take some great pride in; that doesn't make it some measure of satisfaction for those 52,000 Manitobas who are unemployed and for those many thousands of university and community college students who would be unemployed were it not for the fact that they have gone back to their educational institutions because there's no point in pursuing non-existent targets in the job market.

There has been no improvement in the climate or the outlook for those 52,000 unemployed Manitobans; there has been no improvement in the climate or the outlook for those university and community college and technical college students who want careers and opportunities here; there has been no improvement in the climate for those who might otherwise invest in entrepreneurial activities, whether of an urban business nature or an agricultural nature; there has been no improvement in the climate for job creation or economic growth, Mr. Chairman, and yet those members opposite breeze in here and ask us for an easy ride on 10 percent of their spending program. Well, they're not going to get it, Mr. Chairman, they're not going to get an easy ride, they're not going to get it without suffering the sting and the slings of the resentment and the disappointment of Manitobans generally, expressed and articulated through members on this side of the House. That is our job, to remind those people opposite how they have failed 1 million Manitobans. It is our job to remind them how they have failed this society of ours; how they have demonstrated a dishonesty in respect to the electoral campaign process; how they have failed to meet those election promises that they made, that they covered the province with in the autumn of 1981. So we'll have much more to say about that as debate on this item continues, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for River East.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: If I might, with leave, just make an announcement with respect to House business? The Standing Committee on Regulations and Orders which met last night to hear delegations on a number of bills related to family matters, not having heard all of the delegations, will meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the committee room to continue hearing delegations and, if possible, to begin clause-by-clause on the bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The first item on the agenda for Private Members' Hour, Private Members' Resolutions.

On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, and the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Concordia.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek has seven minutes remaining.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, when I last was speaking on this resolution I was making a very emphatic point that there should be nothing stand in the way, or there should be nothing done that would jeopardize the water supply of the City of Winnipeg in any way, shape or form. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned also that when I was a councillor in the City of St. James-Assiniboia I was, at one time, part of a Greater Winnipeg Water District Committee, and then there was the Metro Winnipeg Water District Committee, and the rule that both committees lived by was that nothing, under any circumstance, would harm the City of Winnipeg water supply.

The resolution we have before us, put forward by the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, says exactly that; and then we have it amended on the basis that we should have more discussion about what is happening at Shoal Lake at the present time. Mr. Speaker, there is room for discussion, I would suggest but, as I said to the Minister of Urban Affairs, the discussion should be surrounded by an attitude from the Government of Manitoba that says, yes, you can consider your cottage developments, you can consider your schools, but nothing will be considered or approved by us, nor would we recommend the City of Winnipeg approving them

unless there is an environmental study that shows very clearly that the water supply of the City of Winnipeg will not be affected.

If you don't go into the negotiations with that attitude, I'm afraid that the City of Winnipeg water supply could be in jeopardy; and that's not the attitude that this government is going into the negotiations on. They're going into the negotiations and they're saying, well, it's up to the Federal Government, it's up to the city to come to an agreement and they don't really believe that there is very much that they can do to stop the situation, but they are saying that there can be negotiation. There can be no negotiation unless the terms of negotiation are laid down ahead of time and that, as I've said for the third time today, nothing can be done in Shoal Lake to jeopardize the water supply of the City of Winnipeg. So why all the fooling around?

Mr. Speaker, it seems that there's a group of people that the government has decided that they should negotiate with or talk to about it, on the basis that . . . Well, of what basis are they talking? What is there to talk about? If there are going to be discussions on roads, if there's going to have to be a sewage treatment plant put in so the school can go there, this government should be saying, yes, the Federal Government has to go ahead and do it at the present time and it can only be done if the proper studies are available to show us that we will not have any problems with the City of Winnipeg water supply; that's not happening. Every day that the government is backing off the negotiations and every day that the government is saying we have to talk, every day goes by there is something else comes forward that is creating a problem that might not be solved easily in the near future.

In other words, if the problems are not looked at and taken care of at the present time, they're going to get worse; they're not going to get any better. Mr. Speaker, I don't have to keep repeating what I said at the beginning and what I said in the first 14 minutes of the time that I had on this resolution, that this government is not carrying their load; they are not taking their responsibility seriously about the protection of the City of Winnipeg water supply.

Mr. Speaker, I hear laughs from the other side. I also hear, I will eat those words, and the last time I was speaking the Minister of Urban Affairs asked me a question. He said, would you be opposed to a cottage development in that area? And I said - in fact, I'm probably pretty sure I know what they're referring to - I will tell anybody that I am opposed if it has any effect with the water supply of Winnipeg. I am very opposed and I will tell anybody. I know what the members, I'm sure, are referring to. I will tell anybody that unless there is an environmental study on anything that happens on Shoal Lake to prove or show that the Winnipeg water supply will not be affected, I'm opposed to it. I can't understand, Mr. Speaker, why the honourable members opposite don't feel the same way.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard, we do, from the Minister of Housing but they don't show it; they haven't done anything. They have said that it's between Winnipeg and the Federal Government. What part of government, Mr. Speaker, creates the City of Winnipeg and creates The City of Winnipeg Act, and if the City of Winnipeg doesn't have support from that government when they are dealing with elements, that maybe cross our borders

and do cross our borders in this particular case, don't have support from the Government of Manitoba when they're making their case, to make sure that the investment that was put in by the forefathers of this province and of this city to create one of the best water supplies in North America, has served us for years and will serve us for many more years with a water supply that many people would love to have, Mr. Speaker. If they can't expect support from their province while they're in these negotiations, who can they expect support from?

If Winnipeg has to deal with the Federal Government, isn't that a logical place for the government to help? Isn't that a logical place for the Ministers of this government to support the City of Winnipeg? Mr. Speaker, I say that this government has not been doing their job to make sure that the City of Winnipeg water supply is protected, as it always has been.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In addressing the amendment that has been proposed by the Member for Concordia, we have to examine what the amendments says and what its intent is and the only addition to the resolution in the amendment is really the words, that the Provincial Government continue to work with the City, the Indian Band No. 40 and the Government of Canada in a co-operative manner - and I'm editorializing - to ensure that the City of Winnipeg's water supply is protected.

Of course, the point in question is whether or not the province has been doing everything in its power to work co-operatively with the other parties to the area of concern, that is, the City, Indian Band No. 40 and the Federal Government to ensure that there is indeed full assurance of protection beyond any question of doubt, non-degradation of the city's water supply.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that that full assurance has always been there. We went through the incidents of discussion between the Minister of Environment and myself and he did put on the record earlier this year in the Estimates process, that full assurance. He put it on the record; he said twice — (Interjection) — the Minister says he put it on the record two years ago but that, Sir, I do not believe. At that time, the Minister was waffling a bit and he kept bringing in the other side of the coin and that is the concern and the interest on behalf of the legitimate, economic development interests of the Shoal Lake Indian Band No. 40 and I think he tempered that full assurance to the city to the extent that the city itself was unsure. So unsure that the city took, what I called, the unprecedented step of spending \$28,000 putting together a pamphlet which they sent to every household in City of Winnipeg demonstrating their concern, and informing the citizens of Winnipeg just what was the basis of their concern and how they felt the City of Winnipeg's water supply might be threatened by the potential - in fact would be threatened - by the potential of the development of the 350 cottage lots on Shoal Lake by Indian Band No. 40.

Well, as I say, both the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Urban Affairs, took great pains

during the course of discussion on this particular resolution to ensure that they had given every assurance to the City of Winnipeg of their support and co-operation. Well, Mr. Speaker, we were prepared to take them at their word. On the other hand, just yesterday, we had an article from the Winnipeg Free Press in which Chief Herb Redsky of Shoal Lake Indian Band No. 40 asserted that there was an agreement, on the part of the Provincial Government, to support the construction of a road across the peninsula to allow for the disposal of treated domestic sewage into a site that had been selected.

Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg is opposed to the construction of that road. They always have been, and they have said so on many occasions, both to our government when we were in office, and to this government, I know. The reason that they are opposed to the construction of that road is that it will allow, not only access to that sewage disposal site but, indeed, access from the rest of the developed areas of the province into that whole area; open it up, in effect, for the cottage lot development; introduce many more people, tourists, cottagers and others into the area by virtue of that access road. So, that road is not able, without some very significant measures, is not able to be used only for the access to the sewage disposal site but, in fact, would be then used by others who wanted to have access to Shoal Lake for purposes of developing and utilizing the cottage lots in the area and, indeed, for all recreational purposes.

So one can understand the cities legitimate concern for not allowing that road to proceed. Yet, it appears, according to Chief Redsky, it appears as though the province does not stand firm with the city on that particular measure. In fact, as I say, in a letter apparently written to the Premier - the Premier yesterday said that he had not yet received that letter - the Chief indicated that it was his view that the province was in favour of that particular road being constructed.

He refers to a letter that has been written to one, David Saunders, the Deputy-Minister of Urban Affairs, from the Ontario Regional Director of Indian Affairs, calling for the province to take necessary action to get the Band a right-of-way over the city property to a proposed permanent sewage disposal site. He says, and I quote, "I have no other alternative than to request the province to use their powers to compel the city to provide such access, should they maintain their present position."

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, if that is allowed to happen, then that is basically the thin edge of the wedge; that's the beginning of the end to the protection of the integrity and the quality of the water supply of the City of Winnipeg because, as much as there are concerns about the present possibilities for pollution, and members opposite have talked about the various ones. The Member for River East, in his own experience as a cottager in that area, has talked about his concern for the potential of further mining development and the chemicals that might be used in mining processing in the area; others have talked about the concern that they have had with respect to the sewage that emanates from the present Shoal Lake Indian Band No. 40 and, in fact, the solid waste disposal problems that currently exist, and we've heard about those.

But when you introduce 350 cottage lots into the area, Mr. Speaker, and when you provide access to the

general public that will be able to take them off the Trans Canada Highway and into Shoal Lake so that you now have the potential for thousands of cottagers and guests and tourists and people going in and using that; and the potential for power boats going back and forth, and oil slicks, and gasoline spills, and all of those things on the lake, which is the water supply, the one and only water supply for the City of Winnipeg which, in its current, almost pristine form, is largely not treated, it's not filtered, as I said earlier, the only thing that's done to it is that it's chlorinated and fluoridated.

But if we allow for the access of all of these people for recreational purposes to the Shoal Lake we have a totally different kettle of fish. We have a situation, Mr. Speaker, in which no one will be able to guarantee that water supply will remain intact, and that it's quality will be of the sort that we can use without treatment in future, and we now will have a serious problem that is a long-term problem and is one that, not only cannot be faced without some serious consequences and some major investment of capital, but it changes the picture entirely.

So, despite the fact that we had assurances from two Ministers that they were on the side of the city and that they had guaranteed the city their support in preserving the integrity of their water supply, we now have new evidence, just as recently as yesterday that the waffling that occurred before over whether or not the province preferred to support the Indian Band in its legitimate economic development intentions as they said; is now even further compounded by the fact that we have some indication that the province may have given their assurances or indication of support for putting a road in which would open it all up for access to many thousands of people who now would indeed threaten the quality and integrity of the water supply of the City of Winnipeg.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned. We have every right to be concerned. I do not believe that the addition of the wording as proposed by the Honourable Member for Concordia, that is that the province continue to work with and co-operate with the city is valid, because it appears to me, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: If they would only do that.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that they have not been working in co-operation with all of the parties to the agreement. In fact, although they've given lip service to their support for the city, they have been dealing behind the city's back with the Federal Government and Shoal Lake Indian Band without the best interests of the city in mind because when they agreed, as it appears as though they may have, Mr. Speaker, to put through that road, they are now treading upon a very very serious endeavour which will have very serious and detrimental consequences to the interests of the City of Winnipeg.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is valid and right that we approve the addition of those words because I do not believe it has been demonstrated that this government has been working co-operatively with the City of Winnipeg as well as all the other partners to this particular concern in coming forth with plans that will protect the city's water supply. We have had a fair

indication in the past that all of the partners to this particular endeavour are not as sincere, nor are they as firm as the City of Winnipeg is in their intentions to protect the water supply, because during the course of last winter in order to highlight the dispute that was occurring amongst the various partners to this agreement, Mr. Speaker, we had the Band itself dumping garbage, solid waste, on the ice of the lake adjacent to the intake to the water supply. That garbage, of course, had the potential to pollute the water supply and the lake itself. We had indications that the Band was prepared to dump their raw sewage, their untreated sewage, into the lake again to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with the process and their dissatisfaction with the frustrations they were having in achieving their, what they called, legitimate economic development goals in developing the cottage lots.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that kind of action is irresponsible, that that kind of action should not be supported by anybody who's involved in this whole process, much less the Provincial Government and the Minister of the Environment whose duty it is to protect the interests of the City of Winnipeg in their needs for a domestic water supply that is totally unpolluted and untreated at this point in time and not requiring any future endeavours in order to ensure that it is sufficient to meet the needs of the City of Winnipeg.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that not all the partners have carried on in an honest, straightforward and conscientious manner, their activities because when one partner escalates, shall we say, the battle that they're trying to create over this water supply in Shoal Lake to the extent of dumping raw sewage and/or solid waste in the lake to try and make a point with the other partners to the agreement that is attempting to be reached, I think that we are dealing with responsible people and I think that we have not had the kind of support for the city in this action. I believe that the Minister of the Environment had a duty and a responsibility to come forward and take the toughest stand possible saying we will not tolerate it. Rather he said, well, we're in discussion with the band and we're in discussion with the city and we're in discussion with the Federal Government and we think we can resolve and iron out these problems. He didn't say we won't tolerate this; we will not tolerate any degradation to the water supply; he said, we'll talk, we'll discuss. That's why this resolution is before the House, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I don't believe that the words that were being proposed to be added in the amendment by the Member for Concordia, say strongly enough the commitment that this Legislature has to take and this government has to take to protect against any possible damage, any possible degradation to that water supply of the City of Winnipeg.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to members opposite that we will not be supporting the amendment, because we do not believe the amendment carries forward the spirit and the intent of the resolution; rather it tries to downplay it and say, well, the province has been involved in discussions and the province has acted as a mediator and has participated and co-operated. But it hasn't stepped forward and said we will not tolerate any actions that may in any way jeopardize the city's water supply and that, Mr. Speaker, is the position that has to be taken and that is the position that we, on this

side, want to take and want to see the government join us in taking, so that the city will know that it doesn't have to go forward and carry its own case to the people of Winnipeg; it doesn't have to escalate it by bringing forth another pamphlet or another information campaign or a public series of meetings, so that members and residents of the city will be aware of the concern that they had.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for River East in his presentation mentioned the gold mines, and the cyanide flats and all of those things and it brought to mind the action that we took when we were in government. We took an unprecedented step of bringing the Ontario Government into an agreement with our government that said that they would undertake to assure that everything that would be necessary in order to protect the water supply of the City of Winnipeg in Shoal Lake, even though it took place, whatever that was, within the Province of Ontario, they would assure us that they would act as our agents and take exactly all those actions that we needed to take as an Environment Ministry in order to assure the protection of the city's water supply.

I don't know what this government has done. I don't see any landmark decisions or any endeavours that have been taken, other than constantly getting involved in a series of meetings and assuring us that they are discussing, they are listening, they are monitoring, they are doing all of those things - but no action, Mr. Speaker. I say that if the Member for River East is as concerned as he said he was about the possible effects from the mineral claims in the area, from the mining endeavours in the area, he should ensure that his Minister of the Environment is prepared to take the kind of action that we did in saying to the Ontario Government, we need your support, we want you to understand the problem that we face and we want your assurance that you will act as our agents in protecting beyond any doubt the city's water supply.

So, we say, Mr. Speaker, that we're not prepared to support the amendment that, in fact, we want the resolution to go as it was proposed because it is unequivocal; it assures that we all are talking in the same wavelength, that we are prepared to do whatever necessary and assure all of the citizens of Winnipeg and, indeed, their representatives in City Hall that we will stand fast together with them to ensure that the water supply is protected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak in favour of the amendment and make a contribution, and in this regard, I'm sure that no one in this Assembly is against clean water. Water is certainly essential to all of life processes. Of all the planets in the known universe, the earth is the only one that is endowed with the abundant supply of water, and water is essential to the maintenance of all terrestrial life. Water is a participant in virtually every process in plant and animal organism.

It was said that the Lord God had made the firmament and separated the water which is above the firmament from the water which is under the firmament. The water under the firmament, of course, include the springs

which gush forth in the valley and they flow between the hills and they give drink to every beast in the field.

God causes the grass to grow for the cattle and the plants for man to cultivate, that he may bring forth food from the earth, and wine to gladden the heart of men, oil to make his face shine and bread to strengthen his heart. The water above the firmament, of course, refers to the precipitation above the clouds, and it comes back as rain or snow coming down from the heavenly firmament, watering the earth, making the earth bring forth and sprout and giving seed to the sower and bread to the eater.

Water is useful for us, not only to quench our thirst for drink — (Interjection) — We are so fortunate in this North American continent to live in a place where there is plenty of fresh water. There are other places in the world where water is more precious than gold. If you ask a person from the Middle East what is paradise like, he will tell you that it is a place where there is plenty of fresh water. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to make sure that this resource is well taken care of; that it can be made useful for the satisfaction of our human needs. We need water not only to drink.

We need water in order to clean ourselves, to wash our bodies, to wash our face, our hands, our feet. We need our water to irrigate our gardens, our fields, our farms, our orchards. We need water in order to have cooling systems in our factories in the manufacture of our industrial products. We need water to fight even the fire in our cities, and water is also useful for certain other ceremonial purposes, such as Christian Baptism.

How do we match the resources of water with the human needs and requirements that we need? — (Interjection) — The fish need it too, said the Member for Arthur, but they need clean water. By designing water supply systems we will be able to match our sources of supply of water with our human requirements.

A long time ago in the old Chinese civilization, it was said they have been able to sink wells more than 15,000 feet below the surface of the earth. The Greeks made extensive use of tunnels, in masonry conduits, and clay pipes to bring their spring waters from their mountains to their city states. The Romans were successful in building fully developed aqueducts such as the famous Aqua Appia, discharging into a large cistern, so that they can distribute their water to their public fountains, to their public baths, and to the use of people in their public buildings.

But it was during the 17th and the 18th Century that in large cities like London and Paris, we developed the steam pumps that were installed and aqueducts that were built and we began to lay down iron pipes in order to make a system of distribution of water for the need of the people.

Mother Nature, indeed, has been co-operating through its natural cycle so that men can avail of the utility and usefulness of water for human uses. Water is always in continuous circulation from the surface water of our streams, our lakes, and our rivers. There is always a customary evaporation of water, so that water is held up in the atmosphere until it returns back to the earth in the form of precipitation, such as rain or snow. In the process of the flow of water and continuous flow of water, it gives us also certain powers like our hydro electric power, the power of electricity

in our rivers, and it gives utility to our industrial civilization.

Yet, due to the imperfect distribution of this resource, this valuable resource of water, people everywhere are almost in other places of the world continually facing water shortages. Even in our cities, there are times in the heat of summer because we water our garden and our lawns so much, there might be some low flow of water, and there may be some short period of time when there is an interruption in service of water. There are times when people have been complaining when there are excavations going on in the road and they have no water to drink, they have no water to cook. It's only when we miss the continuous supply of water which we have always assumed to be continuous, that we appreciate the value of water as a resource in our life.

Nevertheless, there are certain health problems associated with water. The rivers are the carriers of certain pathogenic bacteria and viruses that cause human diseases like typhoid fever, or dysentery, or cholera. By and large, because of the advances in our medical technology, we have already succeeded in making an effective control of this spread of this epidemic and these diseases. In addition to bacteria, water can also carry certain toxic substances like arsenic, cadmium, chromium or lead. In addition, radioactive substances in our acid rains can also produce certain radioactive substances like alpha, beta, and gamma radiations, pollutants that we use, detergents that we use, the artificial insecticides that we use in our fields, in our chemical fertilizers can also pollute the streams and water supply in our cities. — (Interjection) —

In all of this we have to balance the need to control the epidemic, like the one that we're facing now as the result of mosquitoes, as well as the need for a clean supply of water. It is always a balancing act, Mr. Speaker, what value we shall uphold in our society.

When we do run out of water, we will realize that all of us have a responsibility to ensure a clear, adequate supply of clean water, that we all the responsibility to conserve our water resources. We have also the responsibility to equitably distribute the water through the network of our water supply systems. Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, when we do run out of water, let me conclude with this verse, "Pure water is the best gift that anyone can bring, but who am I to have the best of everything. Let princes rebel at the pump, let the peers with ponds make free; whiskey or wine or even beer is good enough for me."

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was quite interesting to hear the Member for Burrows give us his comments on the need and the uses of good, clean water and why we should preserve the kind of water supply that we have. But the one thing that he didn't deal with, Mr. Speaker, was the incompetence and the lack of direction and the irresponsible manner in which this government is handling this particular issue, but when one looks at all the other issues and the other policy matters, one is not surprised.

They have not followed a path of common sense. They have not taken a responsible leadership role in preserving what is so basic to this city and to the people of this part of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the whole process of having to stand here and debate in a Private Members' Hour this kind of very basic thing of preserving top quality water - I might say, Mr. Speaker, unlimited top quality water - for over half the population of Manitoba shouldn't have to be even in question in this Chamber, shouldn't even have to be in question, but we have a government who do not believe in the common-sense approach to anything. They spend more of their time trying to foster up or to muster up, Mr. Speaker, some environmental problem in which they have no control at all, no responsibility at all, to bring before this Assembly, to waste the time - and I say, waste the time - of the members of this Assembly, rather than dealing with the very basic issues of maintaining a pure and constant water supply for the City of Winnipeg.

One does not have to look very far to the west or to the east, Mr. Speaker, to see cities - not cities as large as Winnipeg - where there are large numbers of people. I use the City of Regina and Moose Jaw, for example. Mr. Speaker, they would give everything they have to have the kind of water supply that this province has for its major cities. They will have to spend millions and millions of dollars to bring, by canal, water from the Diefenbaker Lake into the City of Moose Jaw and Regina, so that the people there in the summertime can in fact drink the water. It is not to be taken for granted, as these people are. And why would anyone ever think of allowing the development along a lake where the people of this province get their water and have done for years?

Mr. Speaker, they have tried to amend what is a good resolution to say we have to continue to negotiate and work in good faith. Actions speak louder than words, Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. Why would they even think of putting into jeopardy our water supply? The people who are running the Province of Manitoba are an incompetent group of people who, where in a common-sense approach, should carry on but they haven't done so.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, they are without common sense; they are without principle; they are without direction. They are without a leader and it won't be long until they're without power because it's going to be our job to make sure that they are sitting on the outside looking in, because of the irresponsible way in which they've handled all the matters within this Province of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: No leadership whatsoever.

MR. J. DOWNEY: No leadership whatsoever. But what are they doing in real matters of concern?

Last year, within the period of six weeks, there were two raw sewage spills in the City of Minot, out of the City of Minot into the Souris River. There was hardly any attention paid by the Minister of Environment to that very serious problem. The people of the Town of Souris, which I represent, Mr. Speaker, draw their water directly from the river and treat it and put it into their taps for their homes. But we could hardly bring to the

attention of this government or get any response from the Minister of Environment of this government the problem that was being created. They had no intention, or moved very slowly, to do anything about the serious problem; so it's understandable the inaction that they're taking on this particular resolution and the lack of support for it. They have proven and they've shown that they really don't care when it comes to the people of Manitoba. What they are caring about is the politics and how they are portrayed, Mr. Speaker. They're the biggest political players that this province has seen in a long time, but they will pay the price because you can't play politics with the health and the security of fresh water for the people of this province, and they'll pay the price. They will pay the price by losing the next election and the people of Winnipeg are going to tell them that when it comes to the polls.

Sure, they don't have to pay attention to the people of Souris or southwest because there aren't enough votes there for them to care about and it's held by a Conservative member, so they really say why should we care? But they better pay attention to the people of Winnipeg because a lot of their support comes from this particular area, and if they continue to handle it in the manner in which they've handled it, then they'll in fact pay the price, and we will work to that end that the price they pay will be sitting outside of this Chamber and the Progressive Conservative Party will be here to act responsibly in conserving good, top quality water for these people of Greater Winnipeg.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, is it city people we're talking about. I travel in and out of the west side of the city when I'm travelling back and forth to my constituency and a lot of the people from just outside of the City of Winnipeg and in the Red River Valley where they have trouble to get good well water draw water from an outlet just outside the Perimeter Highway. They truck their water and put it in reservoirs to use in their homes. Do you want to put that in jeopardy? Where would they get water from if you were to spoil the reservoir, the resource that we have?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to this government, I would suggest to the Premier, who has been very very weak in being the leader of this province, not only been weak but he's played all kinds of games to portray himself as being something that he isn't and he's being found out, I would come out with a statement, as the Premier of this province, to say that there is no way that we can endanger the water for the people of this city, no way at all. It should be totally enclosed and looked after forever and a day. Because if we destroy it, if they allow it to be destroyed, where will they replace it and at what cost, Mr. Speaker? The cost would be outrageous; millions of dollars to replace the kind of resource, if in fact it could be done. That's the larger question. We hear of the cities in Central Canada where they had problems with the pollution of their lakes. What is it costing to try and return those lakes to their normal stage? We hear the great members opposite hollering about acid rain. They're running all over the country complaining about acid rain and at the same time they're allowing the City of Winnipeg's water, or could allow the City of Winnipeg's water quality to deteriorate. What are they talking about, running all over, concerned about the testing of an unarmed Cruise missile, Mr. Speaker? Why, Mr. Speaker? Because they

love to play politics; but get them into an arena within their jurisdiction and they can't handle it. They can't handle it.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they come to their senses because, in fact, when it comes to such basic things as preserving our quality of life, there is an area in which they have to take a responsibility. Certainly, they have to have the Environmental Branch that carries on a responsible role, but you know right now, Mr. Speaker, we're seeing the Environmental Branch going around, rather than paying attention to what this government is doing and paying attention to such issues as this water problem in the Shoal Lake area, they're running around causing problems for the City of Brandon where, in fact, there is a lot of industry and the water of the Assiniboine is used both for the City of Brandon for industrial use and, as well, the sewage goes back out into it after it's treated.

At this particular point, there is such a harassment been coming to that city that a lot of the industries that are there don't know how sure their investment is, because if there's continued pressure placed on those investors and the taxpayers of the City of Brandon, then, in fact, you may see massive industry leaving that particular community.

What are we lacking? We're lacking a common-sense balance by government. Where are their common set of standards? Where are their common policies? They don't have one, Mr. Speaker. They haven't got a common sense of direction. Shouldn't all the people of Manitoba be preserved and given equal rights and equal ground rules to work from? Yes, Mr. Speaker, but they're not. These people are playing around with the quality of water, allowing it to deteriorate or possibly deteriorate for the City of Winnipeg and the people who use it. Yet, on the other side of it, Mr. Speaker, they're applying unfair rules to try and clean up the environment. Where is there common sense of standards, Mr. Speaker? Where do they have any common sense? — (Interjection)—

Well, the Member for Flin Flon, I can tell you at one time I thought had a little bit of reason to him, but I really now know because he first of all joined the NDP Party. That blew any common-sense approach to life that he had, and his contributions since then, I'm sure, have further indicated to the people of Manitoba that he is going the wrong way rather than the right way. He's the Minister of Housing. Does he not want to see the people who invest in a house and property in this city that they are assured of long-term water supply? Well, why doesn't he speak out in Cabinet? Why doesn't the Minister of Natural Resources speak out in Cabinet? What are the policy guidelines for other lakes in Manitoba?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: They're studying it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin-Russell is quite correct. What are they doing? They're studying it. Well, they'll study it to the point where we're in jeopardy as a province who has had a record of top quality water for their communities of over half the province of this province.

I suggest to them, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment that they introduced is an irresponsible action when it

comes to such an important matter. I want to compliment my colleague who brought forward this resolution. By the way, as I said in the opening comments, it should never have had to be brought here to start with. It's so basic and so straightforward and straight full of common sense that it shouldn't even have to be put before this government. But I leave nothing to chance, Mr. Speaker, with the kind of people we have governing this province. We put nothing to chance.

You would almost have to put in here a resolution that the sun gets up in the east and sets in the west, or they may try and turn that around, Mr. Speaker; things that would automatically be taken for granted by every citizen of this city, and the citizens of this province wouldn't expect us to be standing here debating the preservation of the quality of water on Shoal Lake.

I, therefore, would suggest that they would drop their silly ideas and all those silly things that they're doing in the amendment and support what is a good resolution and get on with the job of doing those things that are government's responsibility and quit playing cheap politics with people's lives and security of water in this province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I find it extremely interesting on this very important resolution for rural members in this Legislature to have to stand in their place and plead with this two-bit government over here to preserve the fresh water supply that has served this city historically for some 80 years and more. Mr. Speaker, it's annoying to a member like me who knows of what an important resource and what a valid resource fresh water is to any person, even today in the heat of this Chamber, and the heat of those people who are outside cooling themselves. Water is what they're all looking for, Mr. Speaker, fresh water.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we have a government, led by the Honourable Premier Howard Pawley and all these academics that he's got dragged around behind him here, saying on the simple matter of preserving the water supply for this capital city of our province, they're going to study it. They're going to study it. Now I could just imagine, Mr. Speaker, as I stand here this afternoon, if they can't study the water problem of Shoal Lake any better than he can stand the problems that this province faces, I say God bless the people of Winnipeg, because the way they're managing the affairs of this province, how they're so widely divided on many issues, I know the study is just a smoke screen, Mr. Speaker, to me. I don't think it needs to be studied at all. I think it's a fact.

I think it should be enshrined in stone, Mr. Speaker, that that water supply be guarded forever for the people of this province. There's no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that those people that saw fit in those days, those pioneers of this province and this great country of ours, Canada, who saw fit to build that resource, one of the most treasured resources we have in this country, and build the aqueduct to provide the city and

its people, that's one of the least things that we should be studying.

Those were great people, Mr. Speaker. Those were the pioneers that built this country, and for this gang over here to say that they're going to study the problem now. They're going to study it; they're going to meet in their little caucus room there and they'll likely come out divided like we have one over here already, and there's another one ready to move. I suspect they're divided on this issue, the simple thing of water, divided.

Mr. Speaker, they can't come to a consensus; so what they have done, they have brought an amendment in. An amendment - now could you believe that - to a simple thing like water; fresh water, Shoal Lake water that the people of this great city want, deserve, they earned, it's there; what's all the study about? What is all the study about?

I've heard the honourable members opposite comment on things that are some problems out there. If there is a problem out there with the band there, are you telling me, Mr. Speaker; is this government telling me that there's no way that a band at Shoal Lake can have a plant put in there to look after their sewage? We're talking about building plants all over this province to look after the wastes of people. Is there some reason why this Minister of the Environment can't deal with that matter at Shoal Lake? There must be, because he said he's going to study it. He's going to study it. Now, isn't that funny? A matter of fresh water, and it's been there for 100 years and more, flowing into this city in an aqueduct and there's a problem. Some people want to build a park out there, they want to build a school; and the Minister of the Environment says I can't build an environment plant to deal with the waste and the sewage, I have to study it.

Mr. Speaker, it's a foregone conclusion that any member in this Legislature that will deny the people of this city and this capital city of our province the rights and the heritage of the fresh water that flows from Shoal Lake into the city shouldn't be in this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it should have to be even studied, I think it's a fact. That's the least we can do as legislators is guarantee the people in this city a heritage of fresh water forever. As long as there's water in Shoal Lake, Mr. Speaker, we have the jurisdiction here and we have a right to guarantee them that they will have the luxury of turning their tap on and put a glass under . . .

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

HON. J. COWAN: Would the member would accept a question?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: When I'm finished. Mr. Speaker, it concerns me and, as I said earlier, I know the problem. They are badly split over there; I see they're badly divided and they can't form a consensus. So in the meantime the people in the City of Winnipeg are going to suffer and they're going to wonder if their fresh water is going to be taken away next year, this year, or the year after. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have 15 minutes remaining.

The time being 5:30, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).