



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. 88 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 15 JUNE, 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	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 15 June, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement.
I rise today to announce the approval recently granted by the Oil and Gas Conservation Board of the Department of Energy and Mines to Omega Hydrocarbons Ltd. to construct a gas liquids recovery plant in the Waskada oil field.

Mr. Speaker, this plant is the first plant of its type in Manitoba's history and represents an investment by Omega Hydrocarbons of about \$2.5 million.

About 300 cubic feet of gas is presently produced with each barrel of oil taken from the Waskada field. With production averaging 3,600 barrels per day during March around Waskada, a substantial amount of natural gas is currently being produced. As drilling and exploration continues over the next few months, it is anticipated that these volumes will increase.

Up until now, more than 1 million cubic feet per day of natural gas has been flared and various economic benefits have been lost. However, once operative this plant will be able to process up to 3 million cubic feet per day and be able to recover liquid hydrocarbons from the rich raw gas and market them throughout Western Canada. Current plans are that this facility will be operative by year end.

During the plant's operations various hydrocarbons, such as propane and butane, will be removed and the dry raw gas will be flared. However, the feasibility of injecting these gases back into the producing formations as part of the enhanced recovery process, and for storage and possible future production and sale is currently being studied.

For Manitobans, this plant will mean that we will be making better use of our resources. Waste will be

reduced. There will be increased revenues for various interested parties, including the Government of Manitoba, and emissions to our atmosphere will be significantly reduced.

It is anticipated that other companies involved in the production of oil in the Waskada field will utilize this facility once fully operational.

Prior to commencing operation, the plant will be subject to various environmental controls and standards established by the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition join heartily with the government in welcoming this announcement of development in southwestern Manitoba.

I simply point out to the House, Sir, that this is a good example of the kind of activity which flows from the oil activity, of course, which is taking place in southwestern Manitoba, which in turn was encouraged and brought about by an investment climate which had been created by our government. It is an example of the kind of success which a government may expect to flow from having the proper policies in place to encourage investment and indeed, Sir, to encourage people to make a profit. That is what we have in this case without the investment of any taxpayers' dollars, without the necessity for a Crown corporation. We have this kind of good development taking place in southwestern Manitoba, and we are extremely happy to see this development taking place.

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 30 students of Grade 9 standing from the Hedges Junior High School. The visit of the students is under the direction of Mr. Mayer. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Doctors - extra billing

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and I would ask him whether he can advise the House of his government's reaction to and response to the

announced intention by Federal Health Minister, Monique Begin, to outlaw extra billing by doctors across Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is no secret that the party in principle is against any deterrents or extra billing.

In practice I have said in the past that I agree with this principle but it wasn't certainly an issue here in St. Boniface — (Interjection) — same thing, in Manitoba, because there are roughly 80-85 doctors that opted out and only 50 percent of that approximately that are extra billing. But if the recent action of other governments, if it is the case that this will endanger the plan, well, then we certainly will have no hesitation in supporting the Federal Government in that. If that's the only way to retain the plan, we certainly would support it very strongly.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister concede that he speaks for and his government speaks for Medicare and hospitalization in Manitoba and that is not the business of the Federal Minister and her hysterical outburst in New York - not even delivered to a Canadian audience but delivered in New York - seems to be a repetition? — (Interjection) —

The question was contained in my opening remarks for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Wolseley who appears not to have caught up with the rest of the House yet this afternoon. I asked, would the Minister concede that his responsibilities and his government's responsibilities are to Manitoba - and those are not the responsibilities of the Federal Minister - and that her outburst is somewhat hysterical in view of the record of Manitoba's doctors with respect to staying inside Medicare?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think I'm on record in stating that I regret the change in the policy of the cost-sharing, or the formula. I felt that there should be cost-sharing between the two levels of government.

I'm also on record as stating that when they did away with that policy it weakened the position of the Federal Government, when they stated that there should be block funding, but I'm afraid I would say that if there is such a thing as Canada and a country and if we want to have a minimum of security or health services for our people I think then it is the responsibility of the Federal Government. I'm not saying that I agree with their methods, but I think the Federal Government has a responsibility to protect the plan - the best plan that there is in the world - although it's far from perfect. But I think they've weakened their position when they changed their system of funding.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the national nature of the plan, which is a point on which we do not argue with the Minister, would the Minister communicate to the Federal Minister that statements of this kind, which do not take into account the record of the Manitoba medical profession, only exacerbate a situation insofar as the future of universal Medicare in Canada is concerned, and that the way to approach

this kind of thing, which should be advisedly through consultation with their counterparts in the provinces like this Minister, rather than making draconian threats issued from the sanctity of a city in another country, that this kind of action doesn't aid or help or abet the battle to resolve the Medicare crisis at the present time?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, again, I'm on record and I remember reading a letter that I sent to the Minister a few months ago, where I stated that I felt it was unfortunate they had changed the method of funding. I felt that they would have more difficulty then in imposing their will on the provinces when they've already stated that it would block funding, but I don't quite agree. I've had the same kind of question yesterday. I don't think it would be right for anybody to overreact as soon as you see something - a statement - a public statement.

The Minister is on record as saying that she will expect to meet with the Ministers of Health. I expect that we'll get a call fairly soon to meet with them and I'll certainly put the views of Manitoba on record at this time. I think, in general, she knows where I stand, but I'd like to hear both sides of the story, not base myself and overreact to a public statement in the news media.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister be meeting with, or communicating with the Federal Health Minister on this point at an early date, in view of the alarm and consternation that it has aroused within the Manitoba medical profession and the response from the Manitoba medical profession at this point?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I have already asked staff to prepare a letter for my signature requesting a meeting with the Minister and all the Provincial Ministers as soon as possible.

Abortion clinic - Dr. Morgentaler

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he is able to advise the House whether or not he, or members of his department are taking any action, or plan on taking any action to close the Morgentaler Clinic pending the hearing of the charges.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The matter of the Morgentaler Clinic is before the courts. I have no statement to make in the House about the Morgentaler Clinic.

Fish - mercury contamination

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. It relates to the Minister's

public statement cautioning people against eating more than half a pound of fish per week from a number of southern Manitoba rivers because of the possibility of mercury contamination. There has, today, been a report in the press that indicates that the Minister's caution is perhaps not based on a proper foundation and that, indeed, people would not be put at risk by eating up to a quarter of a pound of this fish on a daily basis. There is considerable concern that has been created by the Minister's statement and by the now contradictory statement made by the federal official.

Can the Minister of the Environment give some sort of assurance, some sort of definitive statement to the public to assure them that they are not at any risk by simply following the practices which people have been following with respect to consuming fish for the past number of decades?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of different opinions as to exactly what is a safe - and I underscore that word - level for the consumption of mercury-contaminated fish would be. It varies almost by jurisdiction, and sometimes it varies within the jurisdiction if it is the Provincial Government that is giving the advice or if it is the Federal Government that is giving the advice.

I can only indicate to you that the levels which we indicated were levels of concern to us and the recommendations which we provided in regard to those levels were based on the World Health Organization recommendations and also the Swedish Expert Working Group recommendations, which preceded them, were compiled by the Department of Health after a review of the literature and a review of the examples of what's happening in other jurisdictions.

In response to the comments which were made by the Federal Government in regard to our caution, I again ask the Department of Health to review their findings and to confirm that indeed they were appropriate. They have done so. They have indicated to me that they stand by their original suggestions that fish containing over one part per million should not be consumed in excess of one-half of a pound per week; and that fish between five parts per million and one part per million are also considered to be contaminated and one should exercise caution in consuming them, although an exact figure has not been put as to what should be consumed.

In the jurisdiction west to us, Saskatchewan, they have what they call "fish for fun" areas and we contacted them yesterday as well to make certain that what we were doing was in accordance with what had been done in other jurisdictions.

They indicated to my departmental staff that when someone contacts them to talk about consuming fish of over five parts per million - or .5 parts per million, excuse me - in muscle tissue, they tell them to fish for fun. They say don't even eat the fish.

A MEMBER: That's terrible. That's terrible.

HON. J. COWAN: Now, that's what Saskatchewan says. We checked with Ontario who has a far more significant

problem in this regard and Ontario has a sliding scale, but they again start at .5 parts per million and they go up to 1.5 parts per million and they base the recommended levels of consumption on the basis of the amount of mercury contamination present in the fish; and above 1.5 parts per million, again, they suggest that you don't consume that fish at all.

Now, I have to point out that the testing which we have done - (Interjection) - Well, the Member for Turtle Mountain I think, asked the question in good faith and wanted a good-faith answer regardless of the comments, gratuitous as they may be from the Member for Pembina, who has a habit of interfering in Ministers trying to provide accurate information. But if they don't require more information, I won't give them more information.

But I do want to tell them that we have, in fact, tested our theses. It has survived that test. We indicated what we felt was a level of concern. Now, I do want to make it clear because the member asked me to give a definitive assurance that people would be in good health and should go on in consuming fish in the same manner they have for decades. I can't give that assurance. What I can indicate to him is that in over a third of the samples which we tested we found levels above .5 parts per million, and that is of concern to us. In over 6 percent of the samples, we found levels in excess of one part per million, and that is of concern to us.

However, there is a legitimate difference of opinion as to how to respond to those levels. I would suggest that people who have questions in this regard contact either my department or the Department of Health for specific data on specific circumstances.

Water - asbestos contamination

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Minister's statements really haven't done anything to calm people's concerns. Perhaps by a comparison, it might clear it up.

The Director of the Manitoba Federation of Labour's Occupational Health Clinic has indicated that the Government of Manitoba and Winnipeg should do something about getting asbestos out of Winnipeg's water before people are piling up dead in the streets. The Minister wouldn't give any assurance that the water was indeed safe to drink. Can he tell the House whether it is safer to drink Winnipeg water or to eat fish from these southern Manitoba rivers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Well, I'm going to resist to respond to the circumstance rather than to be drawn into the sort of nefarious debate which they want to conduct on this issue, because I believe this is an issue of public concern. That is why we released the report; that is why we indicated our concern; that is why we have suggested that individuals, who may be concerned about their consumption of fish, contact either the Department of Health or the Department of Environment

and Workplace Safety and Health for further information. There are no categorical assurances that can be given in this regard and equally so, there are no categorical denials that I believe should be given in this regard.

What we have indicated is what the literature says. The test results we have found, results which they did release by the way when they had them, and we have, by way of that, said that if you have a concern please contact us and we will try to provide to you whatever information we have and we hope that information will enable you as a citizen to be able to make an informed decision as to how you react to this situation. But above everything else, this is information which we have and information which I believe the public has a right to, and we have provided them the access to that information and by doing so I think we have done more to allay any concerns than to create any concerns.

Fish - mercury contamination

MR. B. RANSOM: A final supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Unfortunately, people's fears have not been allayed by his announcement, they have simply been aroused by his announcement. If he thinks that people should know, can I ask the Minister why he does not at least put out information, which will answer some of the people's concerns, to tell the people whether or not it's possible for them to eat two pounds of fish at a meal if they only eat it once a month?

People have the impression from the announcement that the Minister made that if they eat more than one-half pound a week they're in trouble. Will the Minister be putting out a pamphlet, making a release that gives people some kind of information that answers the sort of questions that common sense people ask when they hear an announcement such as the Minister's already made?

HON. J. COWAN: If the Member for Turtle Mountain had better acquainted himself with the release he would have noted that the first sentence of the release - and I read it verbatim - says that, "We have announced the formation of an interdepartmental technical working group to study the presence of mercury in fish in Manitoba waterways, and to recommend programs to ensure Manitoba fishermen are aware of any potential exposures to mercury contaminated fish."

The next to the last — (Interjection) — They say they want the public to hear it, but then they make it extremely difficult for us to be able to provide them answers in this forum, Mr. Speaker. However, I will attempt to do so in spite of their interjections.

The second to last paragraph of the news release said "The Minister said the task of the new working group will be to review and analyze all available data with a view to developing any necessary public notification program. A report from the group is expected to be prepared before the end of the year."

So we are addressing those concerns. We know they're very real concerns. Notwithstanding what has been said in House today, I accept the sincere concern on the part of the Member for Turtle Mountain and some of his colleagues that the information which is

provided is accurate, is correct, and is to the best of our ability informative as to all of the potential hazards, as well as hazards which may be thought to exist but do not exist. That is exactly what we are trying to do with this release, that is exactly what we will try to do with other releases of this nature if they become necessary.

FCC loans

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the financial crisis that still exists on many farms in our province today, a statement came out of Ottawa this week with \$150 million in Farm Credit Corporation funds that were expected to fill the needs of the western farmers for the rest of the year has been dried up in the first two months.

I wonder can the Minister advise the House if he had any meetings with his federal counterpart, or the Minister of Finance, and what we can expect for the western, especially the farmers in this province for the balance of the year for those that need loans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that I raised this matter when I was in Ottawa, and as well I responded to this question that was posed to me by the media indicating our concern.

The honourable member should be aware that the funds that have been indicated are those that have an interest rate subsidy attached to them and that Manitoba's share was quite small in terms of its allocation of that entire \$150 million.

We, of course, are and have been very concerned and felt that the situation is a national crisis situation in terms of being able to supply necessary funding for the farm community. We have and will continue to raise this with the national government as well in terms of funding for MACC; in addition to that, questions dealing with income stability in the livestock and red meat sector as well as other areas, Sir.

MACC loans renewal - interest rate

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister further to yesterday's announcement that he made regarding MACC lower interest rates on existing loans, is the Minister and the government prepared to allow MACC to fill the vacuum that now exists in the farm community as a result of the Farm Credit Corporation pulling out?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, MACC is, in terms of its capability, handling all the applicants that it can in terms of being able to fill the void that is near an impossibility, Sir. The credit needs of Manitoba farmers, as I've indicated on previous occasions, far exceed any

ability of MACC to meet those credit needs, but we certainly are doing our part. As the member knows that the budget of MACC for farm loans was virtually doubled last year and continues to hold and be increased this year.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Agriculture advise me, or the farm community, or the members of this House, what is a farmer supposed to do today that's in need of loans for the balance of the year, six months to go in the year, he can't get any loans at FCC, and he can't qualify at MACC? What's he going to do for the rest of the year?

Suppose the farmer wanted to pay back on this program he offered yesterday and he needs \$10,000 to pay it back, what's he going to do for the capital?

A MEMBER: He's supposed to go to Las Vegas.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that there is possibilities of assistance from our staff to look at many alternatives that may be available to him in terms of before the very difficult time comes when there may have to be a foreclosure. He should consult with actually someone independent of the financial institutions that he is dealing with, because I know some of the advice that farmers have been talked into have led to the foreclosure and the ending of their farm operations. He should get an independent review of the farming operation and there may be some alternate suggestions that can be made to him.

Of course, as to who is going to loan the money, it would depend on the viability of the operation and the ability to repay. I'm certain that even if he went to FCC or MACC and was turned down in the first instance, there is an appeal mechanism so the board of directors can look at it. But all of that would be dependent, Sir, whether there is viability in the farm unit.

CL2-115 water bomber

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Transportation. Is it the intention of the government, through his department, to participate with the Federal Government in the purchase of an additional CL2-115 water bomber as part of the participation of the Federal Government's Special Recoveries Project?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's offer has been under consideration for some period of time. We have not concluded on that issue at this point in time.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Would the Minister find that the Province of Manitoba needs presumably the services of five water bombers, two in addition to the fleet of three that we have now? Do we have sufficient demand to justify that kind of purchase, Mr. Speaker?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I suppose from time to time a case can be made for quite a number of such aircraft, depending on the circumstances - the dryness of the summer if you like, and the incidence of forest fires.

I know that because of a lack of capability, we virtually lost the whole forest area in the area of Swan River just a few years ago, which is going to take 75 or 100 years to replace. I don't know whether additional capacity of water bombers at that time could have stopped that or saved that forest, but I do know that arguments can be made for a better state of readiness than what we have at the present time, although I'm not sure that we are concluding yet, that we are going to require five.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Economic Development, just to sort of follow-up on the water bombers, the fact that Manitoba does own three water bombers - which is the only province in Canada other than Quebec that owns that many - and in view of the fact that we assembled the tail assembly and part of the wing assembly in Manitoba for two years, is the Minister able to give the House an update of her negotiations with the government regarding having the work that was done in Manitoba returned to Manitoba, because the Federal Government is going to purchase more water bombers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that topic has been under ongoing negotiation. Several Ministers have been involved at our end, and at the other end the Minister of Supply and the Minister in the industry side.

The offset issue is not one where we have currently got any agreement, but we have explored the different elements of it. Some initiatives need to be taken by the companies themselves and we've been working with them to ensure that they are as active as possible. We are continuing to negotiate before we make any final decision on whether or not to purchase.

Manitoba Hydro - acquiring of rights-of-way

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. My question has to do with Manitoba Hydro's legitimate need to acquire right-of-way for high voltage transmission lines to the west border.

Has the Minister discussed with Manitoba Hydro officials the number of lines of this type that will be required, or what they project in the future - and by future I mean more than just the present MANDAN line requirements - has he had those kind of discussions with Hydro officials?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I believe the member raised this point at one of the legislative committees at the Legislature. I thought it was a very good point. I took it under advisement. I have not had discussions yet with Hydro officials on it, but I certainly intend to follow up on the suggestion that he made at the legislative committee hearings on Hydro.

MANDAN Interconnection

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's response. A further supplementary question. A growing number of Manitoba farmers, particularly in the Red River Valley, in the Municipalities of Cartier, Macdonald, St. Francois Xavier, and all the way down to the border are concerned about this question. They are currently discussing with Manitoba Hydro the need of the MANDAN line requirements.

The Minister is aware we have one line east on the Anola district, and I would like to ask the Minister whether or not he would not consider it advisable to take a kind of a global look at future requirements for transmission to the U.S. border - and I want to assure the Minister that I support the need for that transmission where we have surplus power - but should we not be looking at a high voltage transmission line corridor that could foresee the needs for 40 or 50 years, rather than looking at it line by line? Would the Minister give me that undertaking that he's prepared to seriously talk to the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro and the Hydro Board and to develop an overall policy in this regard, rather than just look at it line by line?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, that's a constructive suggestion. I certainly would take it up with Hydro people and I certainly would take it up with the Provincial Land Use Committee, who I think has looked at the matter of transmission corridors over the past, oh, four or five years, and I think it's a valid suggestion, worthy of a follow-up.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to leave it at that, but he threw in the word . . . I'm well aware that groups like the land value, the Provincial Land Use Committee studies these matters, but they study them one at a time. They study the question before them. I want to know what Hydro's future requirements in this regard will be and then really it is a matter of overall policy development, whether or not we would not be advised to create a corridor. Manitobans would know and those who had environmental concerns would not locate, or buy property next to it. That's the kind of action I would like the Minister to undertake.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Certainly I would undertake looking at the possibility of determining a possible corridor that might serve Hydro's needs over the next 30 or 40 years. The discussions regarding power sales to the south are proceeding. It's a bit premature to comment on whether one would move before the other. It may turn out that we may not be able to have one particular common point at a border crossing because we are talking about possible sales to Wisconsin, or Minnesota, or Nebraska, and that would mean that the entry points to the United States might be a bit different.

But I certainly say that the suggestion put forward by the member is a constructive one and that I'll look at it.

Lake Winnipegosis - fishing

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I have a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the Minister indicate if Lake Winnipegosis will be closed to commercial fishing during the upcoming summer season?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the fact that there has been some viewpoint exhibited on this question favourable to a closing. However, I don't believe that the lake will be closed to commercial fishing.

Municipal Affairs Committee - reconvened

MR. D. GOURLAY: I thank the Minister for that answer.

I have another question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. For months now we have been asking the Minister of Municipal Affairs as to when he'll be calling the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs to deal with the question of the Assessment Review and the recommendations that were brought forth. During the review of the departmental Estimates, the Minister indicated that the committee would be called by not later than June the 15th. Also he indicated that we would have a draft report in advance of that date. Well, today we observe June 15th, and we have not received the draft report and the committee has not yet been called.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the honourable member has raised the question. I think during the Estimates I indicated that we would hopefully be calling the committee back around the 15th. I am pleased to inform the honourable member that we can meet any time next week, any evening next week. Whenever it's convenient to the two House Leaders, we would be happy to meet next week.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I thank the Minister for that answer, but I would also ask him again as to when the members of the committee can expect a draft report so that we can proceed to do some work when the committee does meet.

HON. A. ADAM: I will have copies available for the members of the committee and the Opposition, either tomorrow or the day after.

Municipal Informat publication

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs as well. Two or three years ago, a publication was started entitled "Municipal Informat" which was intended to provide information to municipal councillors and secretary-treasurers. I note in the present edition that there are at least two items that tend to be more of the political propaganda nature put out by the Information Services, such as dealing with oil activity and the possibility of an oil pipeline in southwestern Manitoba.

Could we have the assurance from the Minister of Municipal Affairs that this publication will not be turned into another propaganda instrument of the government?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I had an opportunity to read the article that was in there. Certainly we don't intend to use that vehicle as a propaganda instrument, such as we have seen under the previous administration - not maybe with that particular document - but certainly in other areas we have seen blatant propaganda advertising on the part of the honourable members opposite.

Kinsmen Pool - Cartwright area

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister of the Environment is aware of a problem that exists outside of Cartwright, Manitoba, where a wading pool, constructed and operated by the Kinsmen Club within some 30 or 40 feet of the river, is under threat of being closed down or the operators prosecuted if they don't meet the standards set out in the regulations under The Health Act. I believe the Minister has been working to try and arrive at some satisfactory compromise in that situation. I wonder if he could advise me whether or not he has been able to achieve a compromise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: I must thank the Member for Turtle Mountain for his continuing interest in this matter. He has spoken to me privately and, of course, we . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. COWAN: We addressed the issue in Estimates. There was a very firm recommendation from staff of both the Department of Health and the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, that we not, in this instance, change the regulation. The regulation was developed under the previous administration and did not provide for a mechanism for ministerial discretion or for a Minister to allow for a community organization such as this to operate not in accordance with the general regulation.

Since that time I have asked my staff, because I have been convinced by the arguments of the Member for Turtle Mountain that this is an anomalous situation and one which does need further review, to work with the organization that is responsible for the particular wading facility to determine if there cannot be a way by which this matter can be effectively resolved. If that is not the case, then I have indicated to them that I would be prepared to review with the Minister of Health the regulation to determine if, in fact, the regulation is not unnecessarily unwieldy in this respect.

His argument and case is a good case. We are pursuing it. We have asked staff to work with the organization and failing resolution at that level, we will attempt to resolve it through looking at the regulation itself once again.

Grasshopper infestation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I have received reports in the last couple of days from certain farmers in the southwest area that there is a critical outbreak of grasshoppers in the areas of the southwest parts of the province. Would he, Mr. Speaker, have his department check into it to confirm that particular situation, because it is fairly critical at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question raised by the honourable member. Certainly we will want to monitor that very closely.

I can advise the honourable member that the present policy within the government is to assist municipalities through the financing of adequate chemicals to deal with the grasshopper infestation in the municipal areas, but the municipalities are the ones to be directly involved in the supply of the chemicals.

We were advised early this spring that there were adequate supplies of the necessary chemicals to deal with any outbreaks, but we certainly will want to have our staff go into the area and assess the situation and make sure that the supply and the needed information for farmers is available for them.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would as well like to inform the Minister before the next question, that the area which we are talking about is substantially larger than what might have been earlier anticipated by a forecast by his department, and in view of the fact that there are funds available to help provide sprays for the municipalities to do the road allowances, my question is to the Minister. Would he reconsider that policy to enlarge that providing of chemicals so that farmers could as well make themselves available to the chemical or available chemical supplies at the government's costs so as to contain it in that area and not expand over a larger area of the province? Would he reconsider that policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the policy that is in place has been in effect for a number of years in terms of making sure of adequate supplies of chemicals. I don't believe that the province has ever been in the position to assist farmers in the supply of chemicals on private lands. However, we'll want to assess the situation to see how severe the outbreak is. As the member knows, conditions in our provinces, originally in the springtime, with the cold spring and moisture conditions, it was envisaged that the outbreak would be less than originally anticipated. However, we'll want to look at the situation.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: I have a committee change on Law Amendments. The Member for Radisson substituting for the Member for St. Johns; and the Member for St. James substituting for the Member for The Pas; and the Member for Selkirk substituting for the Member for Dauphin.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make some changes on the Standing Committee on Law Amendments; and I would like to replace the Member for Virden with the Member for Pembina.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you please call the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading in the following order: Bills 20, 57, 26, 24, 3, 14 and 47.

BILL 20 - THE OCCUPIERS' LIABILITY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 20, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this bill, The Occupiers' Liability Act, was developed from the recommendations of a report from the Manitoba Law Reform Commission in 1980, a fact which was not mentioned by the Attorney-General until I asked him to confirm it. We have reviewed the provisions of the Act with the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission Report. We have some questions, but I think those questions can be dealt

within committee and we're prepared to allow the bill to pass Second Reading and go on to committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL 57 - THE CO-OPERATIVES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Bill No. 57, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it was Bill 57 that you called? Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the bill for the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've had a chance to review the bill. The Minister has indicated in his remarks that the changes made with regard to The Co-operatives Act flow from some changes that were made to The Corporations Act awhile ago. He also has indicated that the changes are of an administrative nature and will, in his words, eliminate unnecessary paperwork and formalities. Mr. Speaker, if that indeed is the case, anything that we can do to eliminate extra paperwork or any duplications elsewhere is something that we would definitely support. So we would pass this bill onto committee and at that point we'll probably have a few more questions with regard to it.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL 26 - THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 26, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for my colleague, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance in introducing this bill said that it was basically a housekeeping bill and made very little further comment on it. I would wish to call to the attention of the Minister of Finance that I don't really consider that the bill is quite as simple as the Minister of Finance would have led the House to believe when he presented it. I would like to draw to his attention that there are a number of concerns which we have with this bill and some

questions that I hope the Minister will answer, and part of the bill, which I hope he will agree to withdraw.

First of all, I would like to deal with the part having to do with the payments of judgments or the payment of claims made against the government, Mr. Speaker. What this bill does is allow the Minister of Finance to make a payment of up to \$5,000 to any person who has a claim against the government, and that the Minister is satisfied on an opinion of a legal officer of the government that if the person sued the government in a court of competent jurisdiction he might reasonably be expected to obtain a judgment against the government, which means, Mr. Speaker, that can accommodate the kind of incident which occurred with the Attorney-General, having allegedly made a statement and the government subsequently making a settlement and the amount of money being paid out.

That, of course, came to the attention of members opposite and to the attention of the public because it was necessary for the government to pass an Order-in-Council approving of that payment. I believe that in this kind of circumstance that every payment made under this sort of provision should be approved by the Executive Council and be passed by Order-in-Council so that it first of all comes to the attention of all the members of the Executive Council; and secondly, is filed and made public.

Now, I can quite appreciate that there may be an argument from the administrative point of view, that says that it's much simpler, simply to have the Minister of Finance make this kind of payment on his own, on the advice of a legal officer. Well, I don't think that this should occur very frequently. I am not aware of it occurring, other than the situation involving the Attorney-General during the past month or two.

So, in the interest of full public information, Mr. Speaker, we would ask the Minister of Finance that this section be withdrawn; that he simply leave in place the provision which is now in place; and allows the government to deal with claims that may be made against them; and allows the public to know how the matter has been dealt with. That's the main concern that we have with this bill and we think it's an important concern, Mr. Speaker.

I also would like the Minister to explain the necessity of the two new provisions in the bill which set out the opportunity for the government to borrow by the issue of provincial securities, and also an entirely new provision allowing the government to provide guarantees up to an aggregate of \$15 million to any person, or corporation, etc., without reference to the Legislature - those are subsequently reported on - but the authorization itself, for loan guarantees up to an aggregate of \$15 million, can be made by the Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we haven't arrived at the point where we consider that that kind of provision, dealing with guarantees of up to \$15 million, is now regarded as simply a housekeeping measure. I believe that it does require some explanation and justification on the part of the Minister.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister can address those issues when he closes debate on this bill, we are prepared to see it go to committee, and I urge the Minister to withdraw the provision allowing for the government to make payments, in effect, in secret to cover claims made against the government.

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

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just dealing with that last issue first, it is my understanding that governments - this government and other governments - have occasionally made precisely these kinds of guarantees in the past, intersessionally, and there is and has been a question as to the authority for it. As I understand the rationale that came through on that one was, that there should be some legislative authority for doing what has been done in the past, so in that sense it is housekeeping, in order to properly provide authority for what has been happening.

With respect to the first issue raised, certainly it's an item that we can reconsider. I should say that the request came from officers of the Attorney-General's Department well before there were any considerations of the specific payment that were referred to. They referred us to the fact that the City of Winnipeg apparently, has a similar clause where a payout of up to \$10,000 can be made under similar circumstances.

I would point out that the legal opinion referred to is that of an officer of the Crown, that the government - not some individual person is liable - but that the government itself is liable, and it was their view that what it would do is to save us money, preventing us from having to go through with legal cases.

Now, the member suggests that there's no reason why it couldn't be done by Order-in-Council and that's something, quite frankly, I don't have an answer for and it's something we have to consider. Maybe that's a good idea. So, that's something that we will take under consideration between now and when it hits committee stage.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 24, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who has 30 minutes remaining.

MR. B. RANSOM: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps in the absence of the Member for Lakeside, you'd call Bill 3 and then revert to Bill 24.

BILL 3 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

MR. SPEAKER: If it meets the pleasure of the House, we'll stand it over and call Bill No. 3. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 3, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think there is much that I can add to the remarks on this bill that hasn't already been covered many many times by my colleagues that have spoken before me on the bill, but I want to add a word on the bill in debate at this time, Mr. Speaker, to add some of my objections to parts of the bill and to indicate that I will not be supporting the legislation unless the Minister is prepared to look at some reasonable amendments to the bill.

I don't think it was necessary to completely withdraw the other legislation that was in place and replace it with a new Act, because if they felt that there were loopholes in the previous legislation, I think there were various ways they could have closed those loopholes without bringing in a completely new bill.

I think of the outset, Mr. Speaker, that land use - the use of our arable land in Manitoba - is by far much more important than the actual control of who owns the property. The aim of good farmers, of course, and good farm land is to be a productive tool to produce food, first of all, and produce a revenue for those that till the soil and work the land. So, I think land use is far more important.

I want to say also, Mr. Speaker, that one of the objectives that the Minister states the bill is purportedly going to help, is to maintain the family farm, or encourage young farmers back into farming where they don't have to compete with foreign ownership, which they claim has driven the price of farm land up.

If that's the intent, Mr. Speaker, of this government, I would make one suggestion to him; that there is probably an easier way that he might encourage young men to enter farming, or farmers that are in farming, to expand their operations if they have a small and unviable operation.

One suggestion I would make to him, Mr. Speaker, would be to encourage the removal of the capital gains tax on the sale of farm land, because if that were to be arranged the land would sell at a much cheaper price than is presently being asked today.

I can quote from experience, Mr. Speaker. In my own particular case, I have a small parcel of land of the old home farm that I am holding onto for, I guess, a lot of sentimental reasons more than anything else, because I'm certainly not making any money on it. In fact, this year I summer-fallowed half of it, because I feel that I might only lose half as much as I might lose if I farmed the whole quarter.

But there is an immigrant family that have bought the other portion of the family farm that are very anxious to obtain my parcel of land. There is another chap to the south of the land that I went to school with that's been farming it for me very, very well for the past few years. He is very anxious to obtain that piece of land also for one of his sons. He has two sons farming with him. If it were possible, Mr. Speaker, to sell that land to either one of them without my concern of paying capital gains on the proceeds, I could probably sell that parcel of land for \$15,000 less than the price that I am going to endeavour to get for it, because I'm going to lose \$15,000 of my sale price right off the bat with capital gains.

So if the Minister could find some way in encouraging the powers that be to remove that, providing the land went to an adjacent farmer or a young farmer who was just trying to get started in farming, I think they would see that would reduce the price of land far more than any attempt to keep out foreign ownership, which they claim has driven the prices of farm land up.

I'm not too sure that has been the case, because we've seen over many, many years, Mr. Speaker, the vast tracts of land that have been owned by non-farming interests or by speculative interests as the members like to refer to it over the years. I have said this before in remarks to previous speeches on this problem of

foreign ownership of land. There are innumerable cases that could be recited where thousands and thousands of acres have been owned by entrepreneurs or non-farming interests, non-resident farmers in many cases also. Over the years through economic conditions or the inability to obtain good management, these farm lands have reverted back to smaller parcels and back to the small family operated farm.

I can remind the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he attended the Centennial celebrations in my home town of Rapid City last week, he had an opportunity to look through some of the history book and recited the man named Ralston who originally settled that area and had many thousands of acres of farm land at his disposal. That never created a problem, Mr. Speaker. That land was eventually divided up into hundreds and hundreds of smaller farms that have now, of course, dwindled to a lesser number of bigger and more successful farms, but the problem of large tracts of land being owned by one individual has never really been a problem for too many years.

I know when my father came to Canada 70 or 80 years ago, he worked for a landlord named Johnny Smith, who owned thousands of acres in the Rapid City area. He owned land at Hayfield, which is down near Souris, and in other parts of Manitoba. It wasn't long before Mr. Smith, who was an older man, passed on and left it to his two sons who were not interested in farming and lived one in Toronto and one somewhere else. Within about two or three years, that land was all sold out to smaller parcels and a good portion of it to my father who had worked for him, and that is how he was enabled to get into farming. So the problem of foreigners or an entrepreneur owning a large parcel of land to me doesn't present a problem.

The economic conditions and the handing it on to other members of families who are not interested in farming will soon see that land goes back into the hands of those who are interested in farming and are interested in tilling the soil and maintaining that way of life. So I can't see that it's really being a problem.

We hear a great number of arguments from the other side, Mr. Speaker, of this great invasion of our land by foreigners which might have been of concern seven, eight years ago, but isn't a problem today. You have heard these statistics before, Mr. Speaker, so I won't go through them all, but from our particular area, foreign ownership has not been a problem. I say, seven or eight years ago there was a little concern, but that took care of itself in short order.

It may have driven up the price a little, but you have the argument on the other side that if the farmer has farmed there all his life, he probably has a right to get the best price that he can get for that land because that is his pension fund. That is his retirement income. He has made no other provisions for his retirement.

But, Mr. Speaker, the non-resident percentages and the foreign ownership of land throughout the province, and statistics have been obtained from our Leader, that runs all the way from - there are one or two down lower in the 70 percent bracket, but the majority of them are 98 percent, 99 percent. There are some at 100 percent of Manitoba-owned farm land.

The one exception, Mr. Speaker, where it is down a little lower is La Broquerie and we know what has happened there. The majority of that land owned by

Italians and Germans is reverting back to the rural municipality now. That was down around 54 percent — (Interjection) — that's right. The land is going back into tax sale this year, Mr. Speaker, because those people found that it wasn't a good investment. They are prepared to take their licking as true entrepreneurs and forget about it. Let the land go back to the municipality, and you know what's going to happen there. It's going to be sold out again to individual landowners and it's not a particular problem.

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke the other night on the seat belt legislation, there were a few catcalls from across the way on my particular stand, saying that I wouldn't support that legislation because my constituents were telling me in large numbers to vote against it. There were some catcalls across there about no guts to make up your own mind, and you're afraid to vote for it. Mr. Speaker, I think I was elected to this Chamber by a great percentage of people in my constituency who think the way I do and who support the views that I have. I support the views that they have, and that's why I have been here for four elections, and probably will be back again. Mr. Speaker, I think that's the job of an elected member, to reflect the views of his constituents and not come in with legislation that we think is good for them.

There are a lot of things that we could do for people. I don't think people should drink, Mr. Speaker, but I am in no position to tell them not to. I might have difficulty with that legislation myself and break the law. I don't think people should smoke and for 14 years I didn't, and I have started again. I don't want some government regulation telling me I can't. We may have to bring in some legislation on that, to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, that maybe eating is not good for some of us. But the respects, the desires and the wishes of the constituents, Mr. Speaker, I think by and large is why we are here, to try and form a consensus that meets with the approval of a great majority of those that elect us here to this Legislative Chamber.

We have done some surveys, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite say, oh, well, you worded the question to get the results you wanted, which I think is a lot of nonsense. I give my constituents far more credit than that. I think they can make up their own mind of what question was asked and how they want to answer it - the same survey had the seat belt in it - and these questionnaires, Mr. Speaker, go all the way from, should foreigners be allowed to own farm land in Manitoba, from 29 percent yes, to 71 percent no, all the way to a reverse picture of that. Should Canadians be allowed to own farm land in Manitoba? - 98 percent, yes. Should Manitobans be allowed to own farm land? - 100 percent, yes. That's not a farming Manitoban, that's a Manitoban, whether he lives in the city or whether he lives in Ste. Rose du Lac or in Minnedosa. That was one survey with hundreds of replies, Mr. Speaker.

There was another one done with 450 replies; 88 percent said Canadians should be allowed to own farm land; 100 percent said Manitobans should be allowed to own; there was 29 percent said that foreigners should be allowed to own farm land. On another one with several hundred replies, 82 percent said Canadians should be allowed to own it; and 98 percent said Manitobans should be allowed to own it.

On my particular survey in my area, Mr. Speaker, 85 percent said Manitobans should be allowed to own any farm land in the country; Canadians should be allowed to own farm land, 89 percent - they are even higher than Manitobans being allowed to own it - and 29 percent said foreigners should be allowed to own farm land.

So, Mr. Speaker, when you go back to the statistics, I think the Minister has been a bit out of touch in jumping on this legislation and bringing in something that is totally out of step with what the people of this province want. We're going to impress that on him until he is prepared to bring in some amendment that we can live with and make this decent legislation that the people of Manitoba want, and not something that he thinks they should have, or maybe the Attorney-General thinks they should have.

I'll quote, Mr. Speaker, from the Manitoba Farm Bureau submission that the Minister has had. The Manitoba Farm Bureau represent a large number of commodity groups and farm groups in Manitoba and I know the Minister meets with them regularly and respects their views. In their brief to him they say, "The vast majority of farmers in Manitoba simply do not want any restrictions on Canadian citizens with respect to the ownership of farm land," and that's true. They have some apprehensions of foreign ownership, but a Canadian is not a foreigner. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker, that we don't seem to be able to get across to the Minister. A Canadian is a Canadian, whether he lives in Manitoba or whether he lives elsewhere. That is not the problem.

There are many many points in this brief, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Minister would do well to spend a little time on going through it a little longer. They have met on many many occasions and Bill 54, that was the previous bill, Mr. Speaker, Bill 54 wasn't all that bad.

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

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Just a minute, on a point of order.

The honourable member just finished saying that he didn't believe anybody should drink and I saw him ask for a drink just now to the Clerk.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, I did, Mr. Speaker, I . . .

HON. R. PENNER: There was a learned judge once that said that water was no drink . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Water is available in this Chamber to any member.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: I haven't quite recovered my voice from the convention yet, Mr. Speaker, I was cheering so loudly down there; and I've taken some precautions to put a bottle of gin in the water cooler, so I may be here for a little while, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Minister to take a long look at some of the submissions that have been put to him by members on this side of the House. The farm brief goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "It would

be naive for anyone to believe that the farming community in Manitoba is of one mind on the issues of what restriction, if any, should be placed on the right of ownership of farm land in Manitoba," and they go on to state that if a farmer is ready to retire, that he should have the opportunity and the right probably to sell that land for the best price that he can get from it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think a few years ago there was a fear of foreign ownership of farm land in this country. I think it was a real one, but I think that has disappeared with the economic conditions that we have. That takes me back to what I was saying to the Minister earlier, that years ago there was thousands and thousands of acres controlled by one individual, whether he was a Manitoban, or a foreigner, or an entrepreneur, and it all took care of itself. The problem all resolved itself.

I go back to the argument, Mr. Speaker, I think it was originally the intent of the Minister to see the price of farm land reduced in Manitoba, and if that happens, Mr. Speaker, if we reduce substantially the price of farm land in Manitoba, the Minister is well aware of what it's going to do to the equity position of many many farmers today who are on pretty shaky ground financially. The great numbers, the only equity they have is in their farm land, in their operation, and if we reduce that equity substantially they'll be in a "0" credit position and probably be in a position where the creditors are going to move in and get them before that land dissipates to the point where they can never recover their investment; and that will be a disaster for the farming community and for the Province of Manitoba.

So if the Minister is bent on reducing the price of farm land, he's on a very very dangerous course, Mr. Speaker, a very slippery slope, as the Member for Roblin reminds me.

A MEMBER: He's always on a slippery slope.

MR. D. BLAKE: The agriculture community - we all know how important it is to our economy - we all want it to prosper and we are not going to do it by keeping people out of farming that are interested in getting into farming, whether it be by leasing land from someone who has the capital to buy it, providing he's a Canadian, and we don't subscribe I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to large foreign investment coming in here and grabbing up all our farm land. We'll maybe subscribe a little more to foreign capital coming in here in other ways than maybe some of the members opposite do, but we have to maintain a strong viable farming community. I don't think this is the way to do it because the economic position and the financial position of farmers today is very very precarious, Mr. Speaker.

I will say, as someone who has been in financing agriculture for the last 30 years or better, that if we reduce the equity position on farmers now, which is largely an investment in land in most cases, if we reduce that substantially, their ability to service the credit they have, or even obtain credit and it was very very difficult this spring for many many of them to obtain enough to put in a crop, and if they don't get a decent year this year with some decent prices, I fear for the economy of our agricultural community, and that's going to be disastrous for all Manitobans, not just those in the farm community.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Minister again, on behalf of my colleagues, to bring in some amendments that we can live with on this bill, so we can move it along to committee and get some representations on it. One of the strongest objections we can possibly make, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister is going to be on the fact that Canadians are going to be eliminated from owning farm land in Manitoba.

We say that's wrong. A Canadian's a Canadian no matter where he lives. He should be allowed to buy farm land elsewhere. I know our neighbors to the west under their previous administration, had some pretty strong restrictions and had divesting rights, and what not. I think before too many more years with the good government that they have in Saskatchewan now, Mr. Speaker, that you will see some relaxation on that because they're open for business out there and they've proven it. — (Interjection) —

Now the Minister says to me, Mr. Speaker, what about Prince Edward Island? Well, God, we can stick Prince Edward Island in Clear Lake in my constituency. You can stick it in Clear Lake in my constituency, that's how big it is. It is mostly shoreland and we know that that's been bought up by U.S. investors and I don't blame them for some restrictions. — (Interjection) — They've got 100,000 people in Prince Edward Island. You can't even begin to compare that with a million people that we've got in Manitoba. They're fine people and they've got a nice little province that should be incorporated maybe into a municipality and attached onto New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia somewhere. But that is no argument, Mr. Speaker, that is no argument at all, to say because Prince Edward Island have it that we should have it.

Mr. Speaker, a Canadian should be allowed to own property in this country and as the former Attorney-General, the Member for St. Norbert pointed out the other day . . .

MR. G. MERCIER: It's constitutional rights.

MR. D. BLAKE: . . . that's right. It may be difficult under the new constitution whether that person is going to be restricted to the point where he's not allowed to own farm land. Now, that is going to be one of the first challenges under the Constitution and I think we're playing with very very dangerous legislation when we bring in legislation that says, no Canadian will own farm land in Manitoba, and find out that in a years time the Supreme Court kicks it all out and you've gone through a hassle, created untold hardships and untold financial problems for people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Minister to take another look at this bill, get some amendments that we can live with and when that happens we will be able to support the bill. But until that happens, Mr. Speaker, there is no way we're going to support the bill on this side of the House and I accordingly advise the Minister of that at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 24 - AN ACT TO
AMEND THE REGISTRY ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House prepared to proceed with Bill 24?

On the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 24, the Honourable Member for Lakeside has 30 minutes remaining.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I feel I've risen about three times to speak on this bill and I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I want to speak on Bill 24. When I say three times, Bill 23, Bill 24, are of course both here because of Bill 3, which my colleague the Member for Minnedosa has just finished speaking on and, Mr. Speaker, you will understand of course why there has to be cross references to these different bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture just left the Chamber momentarily and he, as we've heard before, keeps justifying this bill because of, well, what about Prince Edward Island? Well, there is of course such a massive difference between Prince Edward Island and the rest of the country and particularly Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, the whole thing has to be put in perspective.

In Manitoba the public, the Crown representing the public owns today 72 percent, 74 percent of the land mass of Manitoba and always will. Only 26 percent, 28 percent of Manitoba's land is in private hands. Of that 26 percent, or 28 percent a minutiae point of 1 percent, or half of 1 percent from time to time trades in foreign ownership. For that you are passing this kind of legislation. For that you are putting these kind of bureaucratic hoops for people to jump through as you are doing on the Registry Bill that is now under discussion, Bill 24, and Bill 23.

You just don't — (Interjection) — well treat it with integrity. I'm going to appeal to your politics pretty soon because gosh you're going to need some help. You don't understand from where this whole thing started. We have a unique situation in Manitoba. You've got to remember where this whole land ownership bit started. All the land in Manitoba was owned by one private company 150 years ago, all of it, every acre. Then a second private company, the CPR came along and took a good big chunk of it. Since that time we have steadily evolved where 96 percent, 93 percent, 98 percent, or 100 percent of all land owned by different municipalities is owned by private individual Manitobans.

Now what is wrong with that evolution, what is wrong - and we did that without the assistance of the Kremlin by sending, you know, arms or guerrilla warfare. We didn't have to throw over oligarchy of land owners in this country. We did that by common sense, by evolution of the parliamentary system, by rights and freedoms that we earned, won, and fought for in this country. What are you revolutionaries talking about, what are you talking about? We've won the revolution in Manitoba. You know, we have ownership of land in this country which wasn't the case. You know, you're so busy fighting the jungles of El Salvador, or Colombia, or Cuba or God-knows-where that you haven't taken the time to read the history and of course very few of you understand the people of Manitoba. It is not an issue in Manitoba.

Now I want to just briefly come to the politic of it. Now for goodness sakes, how much nonsense are you guys going to inflict upon yourself? If it was an issue, do you not believe that the Member for Pembina, the Member for Lakeside, the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Member for Emerson, the Member for La Verendrye would be the first ones on their feet, would be doing something about it?

Well but we're here, we're here and we keep on getting elected with greater numbers. Who are you passing legislation for? Well, we know under this particular bill it's to make lawyers richer, that's all. That's the only thing you're going to accomplish with bill. And to make it more difficult for ordinary people to transfer lands. You're going to make it more difficult for me to leave my son a five acre plot to build his home on. You're going to make it harder for every average, rural Manitoban to subdivide his property. — (Interjection) — Yes, you are, and more expensive. You are now passing - Mr. Speaker, you see this is what bothers me - the Honourable Minister of Agriculture doesn't understand it, but worse, he has not explained it to his colleagues. Every land transaction, every land registry, is going to go through another hoop.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a point of order.

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes, the point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member is mixed up. The fact of the matter is, it is his government that passed the land use policies that the province is now working under, and The Planning Act works under and all those subdivisions that he is speaking of. That is misinformation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. That was not a point of order. I thank the Minister for that point of clarification.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, that only confirms my worst fears. We're not talking about land use problem. Mr. Speaker, I said this in earlier speeches. It is difficult and frustrating enough with the present system, partly aided to and contributed to by all governments, including Conservative Governments; largely contributed to by the New Democratic Government during the Schreyer years with their Municipal Planning Act. But, nonetheless, we had a chance to repeal it, or change it. We didn't - fundamentally, it's there. That has nothing to do with the question. All what we're doing now is adding two more pieces of legislation to make it that much more harder to register a piece of land and that much more expensive.

A MEMBER: Every piece of land.

MR. H. ENNS: And every piece of land. Not just the foreign owner - everybody. I happen to - for my own reason, my family reasons - have decided to give my aunt, living in Russia, a portion of my land and when I want to transfer it to my son or someone like that, he will not be able to effect it, unless she is there, or

something like that; unless a lawyer sends appropriate papers to Omsk, in Russia, for her to sign release papers, before my son can have five acres of land that I want to give him to build a home. That's the kind of legislation you're passing and none of you are aware of it.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. H. ENNS: None of you are aware of it, and this happens. The frustrating thing, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister has sold this package on the basis that (a) this is popular in the farm community - the farm community wants this.

A MEMBER: Wrong.

MR. H. ENNS: Okay, we are trying to gently tell them, look it - we're the ones that should be worried about it. Secondly, he has misrepresented the ripple effect of this legislation, that people that are so far removed from, even the whole question of foreign ownership, people that want to move and buy a little piece of property - you know, live out in Birds Hill or in Oak Bank, or something like that - are going to be affected by this legislation, by your farm ownership plan. And it's going to cost them an extra \$10, or \$15, or \$20 for legal fees because of the legislation that we're passing.

Mr. Speaker, I've tried my best. I've tried my best to indicate to the honourable member that it's unnecessary. We went to the expense and it was an expense - we don't have the machinery of the government, you know - bureaucracy and research facilities at hand. We had to pay for the kind of ads and polling that we've done with our constituencies. Do you honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, that we would be taking this position with this kind of confidence without having done our polling? That when we say that 80 percent of the constituents of Lakeside don't support what you're doing, do you honestly think I haven't done my polling on that, or that we haven't done that throughout rural Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Yes.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to argue with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, but there are surely people on his side that understand that polling - not necessarily . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: The ultimate poll.

MR. H. ENNS: They understand the ultimate poll - that's right. I thank the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain for that contribution. All I'm telling you is the course that the present government is on is really unbelievable. It's only regrettable we can't stop them; they have the numbers. One would think, Mr. Speaker, that having the preponderance of farm members on this side - really the agricultural lobby of this House is on this side. We should be lobbying the government for the kind of agricultural legislation that we think is required in our areas. Mr. Speaker, seldom have I seen a government given such an opportunity to get off the

hook politically on an item, as the one that we're giving him.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: We're not worried about the foreign owners. We're worried about that farmer that worked his lifetime on that farm not getting the best price for his farm land and earning for himself a pension plan that he richly deserves. He is not on an automatically indexed public civil servant pension. He hasn't got a guaranteed job that gets himself 26 or 27 percent increases by this kind of government. He sees 10, 15 percent decreases in his commodity prices. The only thing that he's got going for him is appreciation in his land and this is what this government is taking away from him . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's right.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . and you expect the farm community will thank you for it. Well, Mr. Speaker, pass the laws in the true nature they should be passed. No speculation in land; no profit in land; no appreciation in land; but then let's not draw these red herrings across it about foreigners, particularly when you start confusing the issue that people living in Saskatchewan are no different than people living in Pakistan; people living in Ontario are no different than people living in France and Belgium, and I said last night, I don't buy that. My neighbour, my fellow citizen in Saskatchewan, is as much a Canadian as I am. This government, this Socialist NDP Government doesn't think so. He sees no difference between somebody living in Pakistan, somebody living in Ontario, and I don't buy that. I don't buy that, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Manitoba will not buy that when next election comes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

MOTION presented and carried.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. Do the members wish to proceed or do they wish to rise?

BILL 14 - THE ELECTIONS ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 14, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, standing in the name of the Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I take this opportunity, Sir, to make a few comments regarding this bill, Bill 14, An Act to Amend the Elections Act.

Previous persons from both sides of the House, Sir, have spoken in regard to this bill, and I would like to make note of the fact that the Attorney-General and the Member for Springfield, a former Deputy Clerk in this House, have both in their remarks made reference to the bill that was passed in 1980 at that time sponsored by the then Attorney-General, the current Member for St. Norbert. In their comments regarding the bill that was passed in 1980, they were both very complimentary to the Member for St. Norbert for bringing in a most complete bill of which the '81 election was conducted on. The Attorney-General makes reference in his introductory remarks that he is bringing in some minor housekeeping amendments, and that is what Bill 14 is about, Sir.

There are a few areas of Bill 14 that I would like to go on record as having discussed. Hopefully, the Attorney-General will read Hansard and give some thought to some suggestions that I have that I think can make the bill an even better one.

One area that he speaks of is the opening area of the bill, Section 3, where that section is going to be repealed. That, Sir, is the area where a British subject currently residing in Manitoba is given the right to vote. I would hope that current British subjects that have in the past had the opportunity to vote would be given ample time that they could become Canadian citizens and so, therefore, vote in the next general election and, if that isn't sufficient time to gain citizenship, then the general election thereafter.

I am personally one, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that believes that only Canadians should vote in our elections. I have called on many, many homes in the past and I recall persons that have resided in Manitoba and in Canada for periods of time such as 20 and 25 years saying, no, I can't vote in the election, carry on to the next door neighbour's home when you're campaigning. I think in many cases it's dreadful that people will come to Canada, make Canada their home and raise their families over here, and yet they won't take the time to become Canadian citizens.

In most cases if you ask them why they don't, they just say, well I haven't bothered. It is not because I am against becoming a Canadian citizen, it's just that they won't take the time to do so. Therefore, I say, if they're too lazy or they don't want to take the time to become a Canadian citizen, therefore in my opinion they don't have the right to vote.

Another aspect of the bill, Sir, makes reference to the fact that Tuesdays will be the voting day in the future. Therefore, all elections must be held on a Tuesday. Well history tells us that nine of the last 11 elections have taken place on a Tuesday, and one of the reasons why Tuesday is an ideal day, it gives the previous Saturday, a day that can be used as an advanced polling day. I think that the more opportunity that we give voters to take advantage of advanced polling days, the better off we are, because we have a lot of people that do move about. Whether they be travelling for recreation purposes or travelling for business reasons, there are a great number of people that can't be in their constituencies on voting day. Therefore, I would hope that in the future and as it has

been in the past that the five advanced polling days, I think, are sufficient and are good.

One complaint I do have about the advanced polling is the time period of 12 noon to 6:00 p.m. For example, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if it was a June election and with the short summer season that we have here in Manitoba and the construction persons who are at work, they often work from 7:00 in the morning until 7:00 or 8:00 at night, and I would wonder whether the advanced polling time being closed off at 6:00 p.m., particularly for a May or June election, would be giving such persons sufficient time to get in and vote on the advanced poll.

So I would personally like to see that advanced polling time changed to a time such as 8:00 or 9:00. If it couldn't be arranged for all five days to run until 9:00, or if it was felt that running from 12 noon to 9:00 p.m. was a long period of time to have staff sitting at the advanced poll with very few people coming in to vote, I would hope then that perhaps three of the five days could be extended to 9:00 p.m. at night.

I know that in the past elections that I have been involved in, Sir, that advanced polling, particularly on the Saturday prior to election day, has been heavy. It has been common for 500 and 600 persons in both the Crescentwood and the River Heights to vote on the advanced poll. So the advanced polling has been heavy, and therefore the six-hour time period in my opinion is insufficient.

Another section in the bill talks about the marks on the ballot. What I have always hoped that we would go to and maintain is a ballot that is printed with white ink on black paper. If you have such a ballot on black paper, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with white ink and with the white circle for the person to mark their particular preference, the number of errors or unnecessary markings on the ballot are going to be eliminated. If the person puts an X in there or a check mark or a one, they're certainly in keeping with this revised bill, but the revisions here talks about other markings on a ballot. Well with the black paper, you can't have other markings on the ballot. So I would hope that the black ballot would look after other markings, and that it wouldn't need to cause confusion amongst persons who are acting as Deputy Returning Officers and so on.

Another area of concern is the vouching. In the last Manitoba general election, there were over 10,000 persons that had to be vouched at the polls. Much of this does take place in the large urban centres and particularly in the inner-city areas of these centres, because these are the particular areas that people that are transient seem to move to and move from and move on a fairly frequent basis. True enough, the vouching system does cause a problem for somebody who moves into an area, and really doesn't get to know persons within that particular poll that they are going to vote from.

Having just completed the Leadership Convention in Ottawa, one thing that all persons that were delegates down there had to do was show two pieces of identification, one which bore a signature. I think that it would be nothing to ask somebody who wanted to go to the poll and vote, if they care enough to go and vote, to carry, for example, a driver's licence that bears a signature and a second piece of identification to back up the driver's licence. If that person at least had two

pieces of identification, I think that we could keep greater control on whether people were legally voting or were illegally voting.

When we talk about illegal voters that shouldn't have been on the election lists or shouldn't have been permitted to vote at election time, it just brings back to mind the 1973 general election in the Crescentwood constituency in which the winner of that election won by seven votes. The party that came second was able to find, without too much difficulty, 22 persons who voted and voted illegally, who didn't even live within the constituency and were sworn in or vouched for. They weren't sworn in, they were vouched for at the polling stations. Again, where the 22 were found were in the areas that had the highest number of transient movers, people that would come and live in rooming houses and live for short periods of time and move on.

Therefore, I say the Crescentwood by-election of 1975 must have cost the Provincial Government thousands of dollars, and perhaps if we can tighten up the swearing-in procedure and if we're going to do away with the vouching and go to the swearing-in system, I would also like to see the two pieces of identification, one bearing a signature. So when the person swears in, you can match that signature to something. I would think that in many cases that would eliminate persons that haven't got a right to vote.

The bill also makes reference to greater numbers of persons to work elections. From that point of view, I say that can likely do nothing but enhance the running of elections and making them far better.

The other area that we've got to do is get competent people to run elections, so that the vouching or the swearing in of people can be done in an orderly fashion and can be done in a proper manner.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would hope that the Attorney-General has seen fit to bring in this bill this year. Although he mentions that the 1980 bill that was brought in by the former government was a pretty adequate and complete bill, he has found a few faults in his opinion.

I have found a few faults with some of the corrections that he wants to make and one of them, as I mentioned, was the short hours for advanced polling, which I would hope that could be changed. The other one is if he's going to do away with vouching of people, I would ask him to perhaps look at the swearing in of a person or the person swearing an oath to include the two pieces of identification with one bearing a signature. If he would tighten up those two particular areas, I think that it would enhance his bill which, hopefully, in his opinion, is going to enhance a good bill of 1980 that was brought in by our government.

So, with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Attorney-General would take those matters in mind and give some consideration at committee stage of perhaps making those minor changes.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

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

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, the Second Reading of Bill 14.

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

YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Desjardins, Mrs. Dodick, Mr. Doern, Ms. Dolin, Messrs. Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Parasiuk, Penner, Ms. Phillips, Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Messrs. Banman, Blake, Carroll, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Gourlay, Graham, Mrs. Hammond, Messrs. Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Nordman, Mrs. Oleson, Messrs. Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling the next bill, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have a Special Education Class from the McKenzie Junior High School in Dauphin. They are under the direction of Mrs. Orisko, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

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

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING Cont'd

BILL NO. 47 - THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 47, the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to make a contribution to Bill 47 at this time.

Under the present situation, we have with respect to the organization of municipal governments, one could say, I guess, that there is potential for conflict of interest situations that certainly do exist, but I think it's fair to say to date that we have only experienced a few isolated cases that have really gotten any publicity, and I think that there are some checks and balances which tend to overcome the concern of conflict of interest, and I think that I have indicated: No. 1, The media usually

do a pretty good job of jumping on any incidents of potential conflict of interest and they are headlined and usually do get quite a bit of media attention whether they are serious incidents or not.

No. 2, I think elections also tend to correct any isolated incidents of conflict of interest situations that may come up from time to time throughout a number of the municipalities. Certainly the people have the opportunity to choose their council members, and if they feel that they have been involved in some concerns that bother the electors and usually that situation is corrected at the polls.

Of course, the third area that I would like to indicate is that, in my opinion, people that seek public office do so for their interest in the community and they do not seek office for any personal gain. So, I think, in those areas alone it tends to discourage any problems with conflict of interest situations, but there have been a number of instances over recent years.

I can recall, under the previous administration, when I had the privilege of serving as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I recall a couple of incidents that were brought to my attention. They were brought to the attention of the general public through the various media sources. At that time the Attorney-General referred the whole question of conflict of interest to the Law Reform Commission. I believe that the Minister did give some historic background to the reason for bringing in Bill 47 when he gave second reading to the bill back a couple of weeks ago.

Subsequently, the Law Reform Commission brought in their recommendations back in the spring of 1981, and this publication was widely distributed to municipal people. I think it's fair to say that municipal organizations and the council members that they represent tended to support the recommendations that were brought in by the Law Reform Commission.

However, Bill 47 goes quite a bit further than the recommendations that were brought in back a couple of years ago. I would say that the majority of municipal people will certainly not support Bill 47 as it currently is printed. I think that it would have been advisable for the Minister of Municipal Affairs to have spent a little more time consulting with the municipal organizations and the municipal people, to see if a bill is necessary; you know, much more consultation should have been undertaken with the municipal people.

I know that a number of people that I have talked to are primarily concerned with the disclosure aspect of the bill. I know that one letter I have here indicates that, "Council here feels it is much too far-reaching for comfort. They do not wish to have to list their land holdings or financial assets," referring to Bill 47. I know a number of people that I've talked to verbally say that, yes, they felt that the recommendations that were brought in by the Law Reform Commission did deal with their concerns, but the main problem that they have with the bill, of course, is the disclosure aspect.

I would just like to make reference to the Conflict of Interest of Municipal Councillors, the Report on that brought in by the Manitoba Law Reform Commission. On Page 34 the Commission, to quote from them, they say, "The following arguments can be advanced against the introduction of a register of interests for municipal councillors." They go on to list four. I would just like to quote the first two that they have here.

"(1) A register would infringe on the councillor's right to privacy by allowing his colleagues, and the public, access to his confidential financial matters. This is especially true where he is required to register interests held by his family, as well as his own.

"(2) A register might deter potential candidates who could make a valuable contribution to Municipal Government. In smaller communities the few individuals who do seek office should not be unnecessarily discouraged from doing so.

The report goes on to say, and I quote on Page 35, "Given the variations in size of the municipalities in the province, and their divergent needs, we consider that they should, themselves, decide whether their councillors ought to register financial interests. In some municipalities potential candidates might be deterred by financial disclosure requirements; while in others the public interest in such disclosure might outweigh the deterrence factor. We are of the view that those municipalities which desire it should be permitted to pass by-laws requiring registration."

So the Minister has chosen to be much tighter than that. He's brought in a Bill 47 that means that anyone seeking municipal office will have to make a full disclosure of all their landholdings and all their financial assets, not only of their own ownings or holdings, but also of the spouse, and any other members that live in the same household have to disclose all their assets, as well. This register will be maintained by the municipal office in which that person chooses to run, and the register will be open to the inspection of the general public during regular office hours.

Mr. Speaker, I think that you can see that this is going way beyond the interests that people want to serve their communities in the capacity of a municipal councillor. The privacy of their own affairs is certainly not being protected, and the fact that any person can go to the municipal office, during regular office hours, and check, for any reason at all, as to the private affairs of a member who wants to run as a council member.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Land Titles Office, you can get it all.

MR. D. GOURLAY: My colleague, the Member for Arthur, says that you can go to the Land Titles Office. Certainly you can do that and find out the names of those people that have property. Certainly there is no restriction even today from doing that.

So I feel that this is a serious infringement on the privacy of individuals, and I think it's one that the Minister of Municipal Affairs should have spent a little more time with the current municipal organizations, and the people that they represent, to see what the council members really would like to have included.

We know the unions, the UMM and the Urban Association, have expressed some concerns about the conflict of interest situations which I identified at the outset, and they want to do the best possible job they can. They want the public to be assured that there are no misdemeanours going on by council members; but certainly to have to disclose all of the assets and landholdings, we know in the past that there has been very little evidence of any conflict of interest situations happening; that there is certainly a problem in supporting Bill 47 the way it is currently written.

I would just like to suggest to the Minister, I know that he is planning, or is at least scheduled to participate in the Union of Manitoba Municipalities June meetings, their regional meetings, which get under way next week, and I believe they have something like seven meetings throughout the province. This is certainly a good forum for the Minister to discuss Bill 47 with the council people from throughout Manitoba.

Now, this Bill 47 includes all of the municipalities in the province, including the City of Winnipeg and the Local Government Districts which comes under a separate Act, but it covers all the municipalities throughout Manitoba.

It has been pointed out, most problems with the conflict-of-interest situation probably tends to be with the larger municipalities, is that the Law Reform Commission had indicated that the municipalities should be empowered to introduce by-laws to complete a register, if that's their wish.

But I would, in making these remarks to the Legislature, suggest to the Minister that he take the full opportunity to discuss this further with the municipalities the next couple of weeks when he'll be out visiting with them and having the opportunity to discuss many issues with them, and I know that a number of council members that I have talked to would like to discuss this further with the Minister because they have some serious concerns about Bill 47 at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, as well, want to put a few comments on the record dealing with Bill 47 and the way in which this government, first of all, start from the premise that all municipal councillors are dishonest, are not worthy of their jobs, are individuals who don't have the confidence of the electorate in their small towns or in their rural municipalities, that's the premise that the Minister of Municipal Affairs starts from.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, if that's not the case, then why are we looking at this legislation before this Legislative Assembly. I want to go on record as saying that this Minister of Municipal Affairs thinks that all the Municipal Councillors, and all the Mayors and Reeves of Manitoba are dishonest and he has to bring legislation before this Assembly to make them honest. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why this legislation is here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs on a point of order.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has just put on the record a statement to the effect that this Minister of Municipal Affairs believes that all Mayors and Reeves are dishonest. I would ask him to withdraw that.

MR. R. DOERN: Some of his best friends are mayors.

HON. A. ADAM: The member should be ashamed of himself. I know that maybe he doesn't feel that he has

that much integrity or dignity, but he's making comments way below his office.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. No honourable member in this House should impute motives to another member. Each member is entitled to put his own opinion forward of his own understanding of what the situation is.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I indicated that I believed that that's why this Minister was putting it forward, it's my thoughts and want to express it here in this Assembly.

For some 114, or some 100-and-some years, Mr. Speaker, the electing officials of the Province of Manitoba have been able to carry on the affairs of public service without coming into question by any government, Mr. Speaker; and we get an NDP Government and then they have to come in and say those people aren't worthy of doing their jobs unless we have legislation in place to make them honest.

Well, I disagree fullheartedly with that, Mr. Speaker, wholeheartedly with that and want to suggest to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that he consider withdrawing this kind of legislation.

Why do we need Bill 47, Mr. Speaker? What is the record of the municipal councillors, mayors and reeves in Manitoba? What is their record over the past? — (Interjection) — Hard working - that's right. The Member for Sturgeon Creek says, hard-working, dedicated individuals who put their lives aside, Mr. Speaker, their personal lives, to look after orderly government and the betterment of their communities. That, Mr. Speaker, is what we're talking about here today, people who are dedicated, people who are not dishonest, but dedicated to running the municipal affairs of rural and these urban centres that we're talking about. Now, trying, Mr. Speaker, to eliminate them, eliminate them because they've been worth something, because they have accumulated, or because they're proud of their enterprises and may now say, why should I be involved in public life, because I have to open all of my assets to the public.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what Manitoba is all about. That isn't what built Manitoba. I have known many many reeves, councillors and mayors, Mr. Speaker, that have probably dedicated more of their time and their life to the municipal work, than they have to their own work activities on their farms or businesses. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and it wasn't with the thought that they were going to gain personally; they didn't need a government to tell them whether they were doing right or wrong; they had a conscience, Mr. Speaker.

I think what we have seen here is a government now trying to discourage those kinds of people from getting into elected offices to look after the affairs of our communities. Is that what we want, Mr. Speaker? Is that what the New Democratic Party want? Do they want to discourage our top-rated men and women from getting involved in the municipal affairs of our province, because that's what they're doing. That's what they're doing, you can mark my words, Mr. Speaker. And to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who did not talk to the rural communities and to the municipal councillors before introducing this legislation, he'll find out in the

next two weeks what they think about his Bill 47 and the legislation that he is proposing; he'll find out that there aren't very many of them that want it at all.

A MEMBER: Nobody wants it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Nobody wants it; nobody needs it, Mr. Speaker, because they aren't dishonest people; they're honest, hard-working, dedicated people. I'll tell you something else, Mr. Speaker, through you to the members opposite, how many places do we now have to beg people to run. It's not a matter of becoming elected against one another or many people challenging jobs. No, you have to appoint them. By appointment is how a lot of the jobs are now filled in rural communities, because of the hassle of working for some of the people, like the Minister of Municipal Affairs may think that they are.

You see, that isn't what made Manitoba what it is, and it isn't what's going to make Manitoba what it's going to be. Let the electorate decide, Mr. Speaker, who should be in those positions. Yes, Mr. Speaker, if someone takes advantage of their job as an elected official, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, if that happens, at the next election the public will correct that and correct it very quickly with the marking of an X on their ballot. It doesn't need legislative authority to do it; just free democratic process keeps the honesty in people. And I would hope that every member opposite would think very seriously before they would impose this kind of heavy-handed legislative rules overtop of democracy, because that's what they're doing, Mr. Speaker. They're doing away with the democratic process, which has kept this country honest and the people in it doing a very honest and hardworking job. I don't like it. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's a disgrace to see the government put forward this kind of legislation on people who, in all good faith, enter public life.

Mr. Speaker, we're really not talking about conflict of interest at all. We're talking about disclosure. That's what they're talking about. They're talking about disclosure, and you know, that's one thing we've been able to maintain throughout our province, throughout our country, ever since it began, that if you had some private interests, some private property, or some private shares, or wealth, you know, it's nobody's business really. It's nobody's business, but if they want to make it their business, as my colleague, the former Minister of Municipal Affairs said, as far as property is concerned, they can go to the Land Titles Office. They can do a search of the property and find out what any individual owns. That's public knowledge right now - public knowledge right now. If they want to find out who owns a corporation, they can go to the Corporations Branch and find out who the registered corporate owners of certain companies are. That's available, Mr. Speaker. We don't need this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because all the safety mechanisms are in place.

First of all, we're dealing with honest people and I'll go on the record any day, any day to back most councillors in this country, that they wouldn't - if they had knowledge, any knowledge of a possible conflict, they would walk away from it, Mr. Speaker, and say that they didn't want any part of it, as I know that every

member of this Legislature, to my knowledge, would do the same thing. We have to start, not from the premise of dishonesty - we have to start from the premise of honesty and I think the majority of people in Manitoba are honest, and particularly, those people who put their names forward to represent the public when it comes to municipal activities and the spending of public money, which is held in trust.

As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, the real test, the real acid test for municipal people, councillors and reeves, comes every time there's an election. And if there's any appearance, in any way, shape, or form that some wrongdoing has taken place, then the electorate will correct that and that's why this process is the way it has been.

A bigger question that I have, Mr. Speaker, is who am I going to have as elected councillors, mayors and reeves, in my community from here on in? If an individual has been fairly successful and has appreciated the privacy, to some degree, of their business activity, now has to fully disclose to every snoop that wants to raise a little bit of dirt in the community, walks into the central registry and makes a big stink about it, or advertise their wealth, or whatever; you're not going to get many people do it. So what are we going to get for people putting their names forward? Yes, Mr. Speaker, we'll probably get a few people who have been able to manage getting through life with very little. Maybe a person who may be unemployed, or on welfare, looking for something to do . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: An NDP supporter.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . people who haven't been able to grasp the opportunities that this country has given them and build up a wealth for the future, or a retirement fund. Those people who have built up and created wealth and productivity are normally the people who have taken on the jobs of official elected service, Mr. Speaker. Those are the people that have traditionally carried on the extra work of councils, but they aren't going to do it anymore, Mr. Speaker.

This Minister of Municipal Affairs will go down in history as having discouraged our good men and women from carrying on elected jobs that they have done, Mr. Speaker, for very little reward. In fact, the opposite, Mr. Speaker. They've done it because they have sacrificed nights of meetings, whether it be on road committees, whether it be on weed boards, or whether it be on all those things that it demands of a person on councils. But we're not going to have people put their names forward because they're going to say, why should I list my assets to the public, when I, in good honesty, am not going to do anything to start with, to take advantage of the public taxpayers. I came into it to better that community, but all at once, I'm suspect. I'm suspect and the Minister of Municipal Affairs says that I'm suspect, because he's introducing Bill No. 47.

He's telling me that I'm suspect. That isn't what we have been used to in this country and it won't wash, Mr. Speaker, and he will find out when he goes to the municipal meetings, because I think he will find out - he'll get some answers that he wasn't expecting he was going to get.

So I think my main concern, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the tradition of Manitoba, the tradition of the election of people for municipal jobs, the fact that we've had some of the highest quality people in place, looking after my and your affairs, and there hasn't been, but a very few, if any, real hard cases of conflict of interest within municipal bodies. That's what I'm trying to say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Minister. That it isn't needed. It isn't needed. There hasn't been an identified need and if there has been, I would ask him to make those cases known to this Assembly. Why would we pass such heavy-handed legislation if he can't lay hard evidence before us? Because he's discouraging good men and women. He's discouraging them by introducing such legislation to the point where we'll have nobody, of any credibility, running for those jobs, for those offices, to look after the road systems, to look after the systems of - I indicate, in particular - rural Manitoba, where we have weed boards, or those responsible jobs.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet knows very well that over the last - he has many friends, I'm sure, that are in councils, elected people. Does he need this legislation to make sure that they're honest? Does he really need it to make sure that his friends who are elected to council are honest, or does he not trust the electorate of Lac du Bonnet? Does he not trust the electorate to put those people there in good faith? Does he need that? No, he doesn't need it. He can't say that he does.

Does the Minister of Municipal Affairs, from the town of Neepawa, from the Town of Ste. Rose, from the municipalities up there - are they all dishonest people? Is that why he's introducing it? Is he saying, I don't trust you? I don't trust you people. I'm going to make sure that you don't do anything wrong, because I'm bringing in conflict-of-interest rules that are going to make you walk a tight, narrow path. No, Mr. Speaker, his friends aren't dishonest people. They don't need this kind of legislation, because if they do do something wrong, the next election, the people in everyone's constituency that's sitting in this House, are smart enough to replace them and they will, Mr. Speaker, and that's why I'm opposed to this legislation and I don't think he's wise in passing it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30, the honourable member will have 25 minutes remaining when this bill next comes before the House.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

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

RES. NO. 14 - UNPOLLUTED WATER SOURCE FOR WINNIPEG

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 14, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, the resolution is open.

The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak to this resolution concerning the preservation of the quality of water

supply for the City of Winnipeg. Having been a resident of this city for many, many years and a consumer of that water for an equal number of years, I am personally interested in the commitment to this issue.

I am proud of my government's record in preserving and protecting this excellent water supply. I am proud of that record because, notwithstanding the implications or the inferences of the original wording of the resolution, this government stands committed to the protection of that water supply. It has always expressed that commitment in the clearest terms and has taken strong action whenever there was a threat to the water.

In the first instance, I want to address some of the opening remarks of the Member for Tuxedo when he first spoke to the resolution. His stated purpose in introducing his resolution was to force the Ministers of Environment and Urban Affairs to firmly state their commitments to the protection of that water supply so as to reassure the City of Winnipeg and its residents. Now I indicate that is his stated purpose because it is not proper to impute motives to other members in this Chamber, and what he said was, on Page 3089, of this year's Hansard, he stated "So in the past there has always been that lack, in my view, of a firm direct response with respect to the position of the Provincial Government."

So if we cannot address that motive, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to examine the only possible premise behind the introduction of this resolution. The Member for Tuxedo indicated, in his opinion in the past, the government has been less than firm and categorical - and I just read out the quote where he indicated that. He says that the government has not indicated its firm opinion as to where it stands in respect to the result of the water supply from the development of the cottage lots on Shoal Lake.

Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to him, he did indicate that he felt the Minister of Environment was, in his opinion, more committal in his recent statements; he was more specific in his criticism when he said the Minister's equivocation came as a result of their tendency to address the issue of economic development, at the same time as addressing the issue of the protection of water supply. Those are the crux of his remarks during his introduction.

In the first case he is just plain wrong. Both the Minister of Environment and the Minister of Urban Affairs have been consistent and categorical in their expressions on this issue. The Minister of Urban Affairs, on Page 3034, of this year's Hansard, indicated when he was replying to the Member for St. Norbert. In his query the Member for St. Norbert asked: "Does the Minister support the concerns of the City of Winnipeg?" The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs replied: "Yes, Mr. Chairman, the province supports the position of the City of Winnipeg with respect to doing all that is possible to protect the City of Winnipeg's water supply." He went on further to say: "I believe that the position of the province has been clear throughout the discussions that have taken place, going back to shortly after this government first came into power; both the actions of the Department of Urban Affairs and the actions of the Department of Environment, and the Ministers have worked toward ensuring that the City of Winnipeg water supply be maintained in a safe condition."

Last year on May 26, 1982, during his Estimates, the Minister of Environment stated, and I quote, "I can give the member the assurance that we are going to everything that is within the power and the purview of the Provincial Government to ensure that the water quality of the water supply for the City of Winnipeg is protected." This year, Mr. Speaker, on May 12th, the Minister of the Environment stated, "We will do whatever is possible to protect the City of Winnipeg water supply. We've stated that in the past and we'll continue to state that." Now the Member for Tuxedo, himself, agrees that this year the Minister of Environment gave him the categorical assurances he desired. He also suggested that this was the first time the Minister of the Environment had so stated. Obviously the record, as I read it, shows the Member for Tuxedo was only half right. The Minister was indeed authoritative, consistent and categorical this year. The fact is he was saying the same thing, in this same way, last year. Furthermore, I have his assurance that he would be no less vigilant in his stance in the future.

Again, on the second concept of the Member for Tuxedo's comments, he was once again only half right. He is, indeed, correct that there was a continued effort by this government to acknowledge that there were economic circumstances that motivated Shoal Lake Indian Band No. 40 to undertake the development of their proposal for cottage lot development. We believe that you cannot just deny them their right to develop those lots because of a potential impact on the water supply of the City of Winnipeg without also addressing the circumstances. It would be folly to expect to be able to adequately protect the water supply without acknowledging, not only the symptoms, but the disease.

On May 24th of this year, the Minister of Urban Affairs, again in replying to a question from the Member for St. Norbert, stated, "The province does, however, recognize the concern of Band No. 40 with respect to its quest for some form of economic activity which would allow the Band members to have gainful employment, or some type of economic development, to fill in the void that was created when the Ontario Government, a number of years ago, cancelled a commercial fishing licence for Band No. 40. We have attempted in the discussions to assist the Band in seeking those areas, also, but the province's position has been clear. It's been clear to the city; it's been clear to the Band; and it has been clear to the Federal Government that the province's major concern is the protection of the City of Winnipeg water supply." Again, and I reiterate, he said, "The province's major concern is the protection of the City of Winnipeg water supply."

It is obvious that the fact that our government addresses both issues at the same time is beneficial and proper; so, while the members opposite are correct in their recollections, they are entirely wrong in their analysis of that strategy. In essence, therefore, the situation is as follows: firstly, the Province of Manitoba has shown its commitment to the preservation and protection of the City of Winnipeg water supply.

Secondly, they recognize that we must deal both with any immediate threats, such as, the proposal for cottage lot development; and long-term threats, such as, economic circumstances that give rise to such proposals.

Thirdly, this government's Ministers have been clear and categorical in their assurances of that commitment to the City of Winnipeg water supply.

Lastly, because the Shoal Lake drainage basin does not lie solely within the jurisdiction of one government, and because there are several levels of government affected by any decision on its use, we have sincerely sought to bring the different parties together for the purpose of information-sharing and consensus-building. This includes the City of Winnipeg, the Shoal Lake Indian Band No. 40, the Federal Government, and Province of Ontario, and we will continue to do that.

Perhaps it was best said by the Minister of Environment when he stated on May 12th of this year, and I quote, "Now I want to make a couple of things clear in the first instance:

1. The matter of sewage disposal and garbage disposal on Indian Reserves is a federal responsibility.

2. The City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba and I hope the Indian Band at Shoal Lake and the Federal Government are committed to protecting the City of Winnipeg's water supply by the most efficient and best means possible.

3. The province is prepared to work with the parties and, in fact, has worked with the parties and will continue to work with the parties to co-ordinate activities."

It is with that sense of history and pride in the strong stance this government has taken in fulfilling its responsibility to protect the City of Winnipeg's water supply that I shall be moving an amendment to this resolution. While it is a minor amendment unto itself, I recommend it to you for two reasons.

First, it removes the implied partisan attack contained in the original wording. This issue is one that transcends partisanship. It's too important to all of us for that sort of treatment. Secondly and more important, it is a more accurate reflection of the history of this issue.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for The Pas:

THAT the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, Resolution No. 14, be amended by inserting after the word "Manitoba" in the fourth paragraph thereof, the following:

"Continue to work with City of Winnipeg, the Government of Canada and the Shoal Lake Indian Band No. 40 to."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When my colleague, the Member for Tuxedo, introduced this resolution back on the 25th day of May, he was trying to get across a few important points, and one of them was that Shoal Lake is the only developed source of essential water services for the people of the City of Winnipeg, and I think this is important to know because I will go into some of the history as to why Shoal Lake was selected as the source of water supply for the City of Winnipeg, in a moment.

He goes on to mention that development on Shoal Lake could increase the risk to Winnipeg water supply and then he talks about the consideration of the 350-lot cottage development, but he concluded his resolution by saying that the Province of Manitoba protects the

right of the people of Winnipeg to an unpolluted water source without unnecessary cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

The previous speaker comes along and he wants to take out the wording, "Protect the right," and add in, "Continue to work with the City of Winnipeg, the Government of Canada and Shoal Lake Indian Band No. 40." I would think that the Member for Tuxedo, in proposing this resolution, what he wanted to do was bring the urgency of this matter before the Government of the Province of Manitoba and before all members of this Chamber so that some discussion on this subject could take place within this Chamber and would hope that the Province of Manitoba would play an important role in working with the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Ontario as well as the Indian Band.

I really find that the amendment is rather unnecessary; it's not really changing things very much, but so be it if the honourable member wishes to amend what I would think was a motherhood-type resolution, but I'll leave that for the Member for Tuxedo, the mover of the resolution, to deal with at a later time.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, when I was on the City of Winnipeg Council and in discussion one day with Mr. Bill Hurst, and Bill Hurst said to me that likely the greatest decision that the politicians and the people of the City of Winnipeg have ever made in the 100-plus years that the City of Winnipeg has been incorporated was the decision to build this aqueduct. It was a major decision at that time and the people of Winnipeg did support it and the population of Winnipeg at that time was less than 100,000 people and they proposed at that time, after some study, that an aqueduct be constructed that could supply a water source to the citizens of the City of Winnipeg and that the City of Winnipeg, some day, would be over half a million people, so this goes back some years.

In giving some detail on the history leading up to the decision to go the aqueduct route, in 1880 Winnipeg got its water from wells and it was delivered to the homes by barrel at that time, and in 1882, with a small population of 22,000 people in the City of Winnipeg, the pumping system was erected, pumping water from the Assiniboine River, at that time, which was an insufficient supply of water; they still had to use the well system and the delivery system by barrel, but that was the first time that treatment plants were established in trying to purify the Assiniboine River water, to some degree, at that time.

In 1900, Mr. Speaker, at that time, the engineers decided to drill some wells out at Stony Mountain and have water piped to the City of Winnipeg, and that was tried, and the drawback to the Stony Mountain water was the lime content within the water, so the lime content didn't make it a very desirable quality of water. In 1910, when Winnipeg really saw an influx of new citizens and so on, the pipeline water from Stony Mountain, being in its impure condition, wasn't going to be a sufficient supply of water for the people of Winnipeg so, at that time, the city fathers decided that it was time to start looking for another source of water supply.

They looked at the possibility of artesian wells north of the City of Winnipeg in a study. They looked at the Winnipeg River as it flows from the Lake of the Woods into Lake Winnipeg as a source of supply. One of the

drawbacks to the Winnipeg River was that there was a pollution problem that they could foresee because there was access to the water system by persons as well as that a distance factor was important because they had to draw the water in that case approximately 100 miles.

Lake Winnipeg was looked at, but it was rejected because of the high silt content, and although Lake Winnipeg is not that far away from Winnipeg when you speak of the transportation aspects of it, but the lake water has that high silt content. The Red River was looked at, and we all know today what the Red River is like, and the purification methods would have been astronomical.

So the Greater Winnipeg Commission was commissioned and, in 1919, a vote was taken place in the City of Winnipeg, at which time some 64 percent of the persons who cast votes in that municipal election voted in favour of constructing an aqueduct between Shoal Lake, Ontario and the City of Winnipeg, which is some 96 miles in length. The original cost of the aqueduct was some \$13.5 million and then an additional \$4.5 million was spent on building a railway system so that workers could commute between Winnipeg and Shoal Lake, and the reason for a railway system was twofold: One was it was a means of keeping persons who really had no business being at Shoal Lake out of there; as well as with the railway system, the city could recapture some of their investment by getting into the gravel business and hauling gravel from that particular area near Shoal Lake.

As I say, this public referendum did pass and the construction of the aqueduct was proceeded with. The aqueduct has the capacity of carrying 85 million gallons per day, and that capacity with our reservoirs or holding tanks, as one might refer to them, means that the City of Winnipeg can keep a source of water for some two to three days on hand.

In the early days of the aqueduct, the water was pumped to the City of Winnipeg and the reservoir that was used at that time was what is known today as the McPhillips Reservoir over on McPhillips and Logan. Since then the City of Winnipeg has found that the supply of water has increased substantially and two other reservoirs were constructed at Waverley Street in the Fort Garry-River Heights area, and more recently the new aqueduct at Deacon, east of the city. The building of these reservoirs gives the City of Winnipeg the capacity to hold fresh clean water which is something that very few other cities enjoy.

The City of Regina, for example, gets its water from Buffalo Pond some 40 miles to the northwest of the city, and that water is transported to the City of Regina through open ditches. With open ditches, you have the problem of high evaporation and you also have the problem of pollution that can get into the water system from the various agricultural animals that graze alongside the open ditching. A recent study with the City of Regina was that it would cost them \$40 million to build an aqueduct or a pipeline from Buffalo Pond to the City of Regina, and the city council in Regina, along with the province, have not yet acted upon whether they would go ahead with that.

The odd and funny part about it, Mr. Speaker, is that recently the Government of Saskatchewan and the citizens of Saskatoon were prepared to spend \$40

million to build an arena in Saskatoon to house a national hockey league franchise, and yet they won't spend the same equivalent amount of money to give the two cities, twin cities of Moose Jaw and Regina, a good, clean, safe supply of water. Someone to the side here has said that they're going to go ahead and do it. Well, hopefully they will, because I think that a good, clean supply of water is the most important commodity for any community, and Winnipeg is very fortunate that they have had the use since 1919 of Shoal Lake's water and have had the foresight to build an aqueduct which at the time it was built was considered to have a life span of some 50 years, and now we're into the 64th year of that aqueduct and it hasn't cost the city a lot in the way of maintenance dollars.

This aqueduct, it's interesting to note, is triangular in shape and is some eight feet across. Once a year they lower the water to a level that they can put a crew into the aqueduct in a canoe, and they, with proper lighting, can go through the aqueduct and inspect it for leaks and other problem areas. Years ago, they used to even empty the water out of the aqueduct and had a crew of people walk through it and do the inspection, but with Winnipeg's current population and demand for water supply, the City Water Department doesn't feel that they can ever drain it completely. So Winnipeg has been well served by this aqueduct and the lifespan of the aqueduct has been increased considerably. I believe that Winnipeg's in a fortunate position to have such a good water supply and that it is in the interests of the citizens of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba to do everything in its power to keep pollutants from getting at the source of water supply. All the environmental studies that have taken place are important, and it's most important that if a development is proceeded with, that the sewage from the development isn't permitted to get into the water basin close to the opening of the aqueduct.

Another interesting aspect which one must take into account when you consider the foresight that was shown by the community leaders back in the 1910-1919 era was, in going to Shoal Lake, we had another advantage was that the difference in elevation between Shoal Lake and the City of Winnipeg is just under 300 feet, so the only time that a lift pump is really necessary is when the water level in Shoal Lake is at a low peak, which currently it is at a low peak as it is all the way through the Lake of the Woods right now.

Winnipeg has an excellent source of water supply and it's considered by many - and my colleague, the Member for Tuxedo, made reference in his remarks some weeks ago that the University of Manitoba's Engineering Faculty make use of the water for experiments and have gone on record as saying that it has the finest quality of water of any city in Canada. It's often been said that Regina likely has the worst. I know that persons, who I have talked to that have visited Regina or lived there, say that if you have a cup of tea that often the cup will be stained around the top where the level of tea sat at.

Some other cities in Western Canada draw their water from a river basin that is nearby; such as Calgary getting it from the Bow River, Edmonton from the North Saskatchewan, and Saskatoon from the Saskatchewan. Here in Manitoba, as the Member for Tuxedo made

reference to, both the City of Brandon and the City of Selkirk draw from the river that runs by; Brandon's case being the Assiniboine and Selkirk being the Red.

The transportation costs of such water in the cases of Brandon and Selkirk are very minimal, but the treatment costs are expensive as well as the quality of water is nowhere near what the City of Winnipeg has even though our initial capital cost was something under \$20 million, the replacement cost today would be five times that at least. You'd be looking at over \$100 million today if we had to go a similar distance and erect another aqueduct.

So I think that every member in this House would agree that protecting our source of water supply is most important and that this government as well as members on all sides of the House, and particularly we members that are from urban Winnipeg should take this as a very serious question and do everything in our power to see that the development, if it is proceeded with, that precautions are taken that the Winnipeg supply is not damaged because as I have pointed out there are other cities that don't enjoy the privilege of having the same quality of water.

The capital investment has been in place for some 64 years. The maintenance costs are minimal and the great advantage to date has been that the water has not been polluted because humans have not had an opportunity to get in there and cause pollution concerns. Any development that does take place nearby I think has to be monitored very very closely.

Some of the concerns that the city talks about are the facts that persons in the past haven't had access to Shoal Lake and would a development enhance access in there. Naturally if you've got 350 cottage lots, you're going to be inviting 350 families-plus into the Shoal Lake area and to be using the lake area for recreation purposes at least. If they use the lake for sewage purposes, then they're going to cause a lot of damage to the lake water's quality. So naturally the people should be very very concerned about the water source and the quality of the water source.

Sir, I have just mentioned a few of the things that I know about the aqueduct and what I've learned from the water systems and sources of water that other prairie cities have. We, as I have said and I'm repeating myself, in Winnipeg are privileged to have this source of fresh water and it's important that we maintain it and take an interest and do everything in our power to see that it isn't polluted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The resolution that was brought in a couple of weeks ago now by the Member for Tuxedo, I quite frankly can appreciate his sincerity, the sincerity of members opposite. They're bringing forward this resolution dealing with the protection of one of the greatest water supplies that any city in North America has today in our aqueduct which supplies such a high quality drinking water, potable water, through from the Lake of Woods, Shoal Lake specifically, through to the City of Winnipeg to service our population of over 600,000 people, over 60 percent of the total Province of Manitoba. To service this great city with the best possible water supply was

really a visionary, to say the very least, a visionary view of the early leaders of the City of Winnipeg just after the turn of the century and moving up until the year 1919, as the Member for River Heights just gave in his very good historic review of the creation and development of that waterworks.

When one has a water supply system that is sourced at a relatively unpolluted water supply, one does not take the risks of having that water supply source polluted. One must recognize that in today's world where there are very few river systems left on our continent near to or adjacent to large metropolitan centres, that one just does not have a resource that is as valuable as our resource is of Shoal Lake and not work at our utmost to try and protect that, so that you don't end up down the road putting in hundreds of millions of dollars worth of expenditures trying to mechanically clean up what has been polluted.

If you have a water source that is already already relatively unpolluted, you work at the maintenance of that unpolluted site. You don't allow developments of one sort or another to come along, get built in the area; be they mines; be they gold mines; be they mines of one form or another with the tailings ponds eventually leading through to that water supply; be they cottage developments or urban developments, one has to work so that those projects if they do go ahead, go ahead so as not to interfere in the slightest with the quality of water that one draws to supply a city of a population of some 600,000.

Other cities don't have this opportunity; very few other cities in Canada. The Member for River Heights just went through the other prairie cities in particular, of their sources. The only near prairie city that has a source of water that doesn't need a great deal of treatment and I think it needs a great deal more now than it did 20 years ago, is Calgary. The City of Vancouver has probably the best water supply of any in the whole world in tapping mountain streams that are located within their own city boundaries. We, in Winnipeg do not have that, mountains in our back yard, but we do have some miles distant from our city boundaries, a water supply that is almost the equal of that water supply. That is going in the shield country. As everybody here knows, shield country water in general is probably the purest form of ground water that one is going to find on the planet Earth outside of mountain streams. Unfortunately we're almost a couple of thousand miles from mountain streams, from where they cease being mountain streams.

It is odd, sometimes you hear references in the United States toward the water supply or the diversion of water with the Garrison Diversion Project when people try to say that water is the crystal blue water that comes off the Rocky Mountains. This is what Senator Andrews told us last year when we were down there, that you guys, you Canadians know that crystal clear water coming off the mountains, we want that same water. We have that through the Missouri system. Well, we have that same water coming through the Assiniboine River and it's anything but crystal clear by the time the water that originated in the Rocky Mountains ends up coming through the City of Winnipeg. So obviously that water source is not one that can be accessed to provide a city of the size of ours, after going through literally thousands of miles of meandering, through

many instances of clay-based regions, picking up the silts and what not along the way, that one no longer has a water source that can be tapped without enormous costs going into the treatment of that water supply.

The water we drink here, the water I drink right now as a matter of fact, was probably pumped a couple of days ago from Shoal Lake, passed through our various reservoirs in the city and on through our watermains throughout the city. It's really rare and very precious; we only really recognize how rare and precious our water supply is when it is, in fact, potentially threatened. So, in giving accolades to the visionaries who were the early leaders of the City of Winnipeg during an era when the City of Winnipeg was the fastest growing city in all of North America, in the first couple of decades of the city we even surpassed cities such as Chicago as a growth centre in the whole North American Continent. Not only did that lead to decisions of building massive street systems within the city itself, but also of people recognizing the need, as the city was growing topsy-turvy at the time, that needed the water supply and they went on to a truly marvelous project in developing that.

Not all the City of Winnipeg got benefit of that. The Member for River Heights made mention of the McPhillips Reservoir. Well, even though the McPhillips Reservoir was part of the original scheme in developing the water supply, a community just a mile from that never got service with water till the mid '50s. Last year, in my Throne Speech, I remember referring to the Village of Brooklands, then a part of Rosser Municipality, did not have and was not connected to the water supply system that serviced the rest of Winnipeg until, I believe the year was 1956. Prior to that time they had a couple of standpipes and people would take their buckets or whatever to fill up with water and to carry home. A number of my constituents have told me of the days of carrying water from the standpipes through to the community, from the well that serviced the community or the wells that serviced the community.

Even though the City of Winnipeg has had the water supply piped through to it since the '20s, some parts of the city, and some of the oldest parts of the city, have not had that privilege and they, perhaps, especially the old-timers in that area, recognize and appreciate the value of our water supply more so than people that are living in parts of the city that have been serviced ever since the aqueduct system came through.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the point of the Band's actions, the City of Winnipeg's actions, the Federal Government and the Provincial Government's actions in response to the Band's threats of developing a cottage site, to their threats last winter of taking a truckload of garbage and dumping it at the mouth of our water supply system, of taking of their own, or building a sewage lagoon on the edge of their property closest to the entrance of our water supply, to the aqueduct entrance. I think these actions are most irresponsible, in my way of thinking, on the action and tactics being brought forward by the reserve. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I can recognize their frustrations of having a reserve on a corner of land and on a lake that is used by the City of Winnipeg with no form of potential for that community to develop because of the restrictions on developments that can take place near the City of Winnipeg's aqueduct.

Equally, I don't think that it is fair or that it is proper for us as residents of Manitoba and residents of the City of Winnipeg, the consumers of that water numbering some 600,000, that we should be held ransom for our water; that a group should be, through legal efforts or one sort of bluff or another, and I don't think that they are all bluffs because if they are ever carried out, their threats, if they were carried out, the consequences to the City of Winnipeg would be - I don't think you can count them simply in dollars. The dollars are very important especially in a tough time like today, but the dollars aren't as important as the symbolic efforts of basically creating our starting mark could be considered a form of environmental warfare between a small Band of people and a large city.

So we have to recognize at the same time that these people do have the right to look towards, and into the future, towards some form of economic development, and in the amendment that has been brought forward today by the Member for Concordia, shows our understanding and our recognition, and shows a sense of understanding that is not really put into the resolution, as the resolution proposed, and the Member for Tuxedo who brought it forward, I think, for political reasons rather than really out of the sensitivity for the situation, the sensitivity of our water supply, when he knew very well that the Government of Manitoba was working continuously along with the City of Winnipeg, the Government of Canada and the Shoal Lake Band No. 40 to be able to come up with some form of a compromise situation which would permit the Band some economic development opportunities and yet at the same time not have any impact on our water supply. Those are the sorts of negotiations that are ongoing currently; those are the efforts that we are putting forward responsibly, I believe, as a government.

What has the backing in some instances of this in the Federal Government with their FEAR, the Federal Environmental Assessment and Review process that they go through, and that puts and will put and will continue to put very stiff restrictions on what is feasible to be developed in that water supply. Mr. Speaker, one has, and one must recognize, that in true negotiations there has to be some faith exhibited on both sides. You cannot go into negotiations and claim that a group of people or that a settlement and those people have no rights.

The Band undeniably does have rights to be able to expect some economic return on their lands, to be able to develop on their lands or lands adjacent to them, if there is to be a transfer of lands which could be a possibility that may come out of the negotiations, is some form of transfer of land so that they could undertake their developments if they really feel they can make any money off of developing land and leasing off for cottaging, that that may take place in another area of Lake of the Woods, close by then, but without having the problems that are imminent with a development so close to the aqueduct.

The future of Winnipeg's water supply is certainly in question here. The future viability of the maintenance of a very clean water supply is at question here, as well, if there is permitted a development to go ahead in that area. Because a group of people, through the land selection process that designated Indian Reserves, happen to have been located next to a resource that

was later found to be of critical importance to a growing city some 100 miles away, the Band certainly, I think, one can understand and expect of the Band for them to carry themselves with some recognition of the responsibilities that they have toward us, as residents of the City of Winnipeg; the same as we, of the City of Winnipeg, must show and recognize the responsibilities that we have toward the people of Band No. 40, the Shoal Lake Band.

We should be making our efforts and continuing our efforts outside of the immediate area, as well, to make sure that the cottages and the developments and towns and villages that are located - or settlements might better be the term used - along the chain of lakes that lead into Shoal Lake that comprise the most western part, at least, of the Lake of the Woods area, in recognizing that in the past most of the pit privies, most of the septic fields that have been developed on the shield country are not adequate. We've run into this problem and it's been documented time and time again in areas in Ontario, in areas in Manitoba, as well.

Within the Whiteshell Provincial Park there were problems on some lakes because of sewage runoff from poorly built pit privies, from poorly built septic fields, and I would expect, over time, that the people, with tests and what-not that are conducted in the areas, will be required to improve their sewage facilities; for no one, I think, has the right to add to, or to contribute to, or simply to pollute our water source, be it a potable water source or be it a non-potable water source.

I think, taking that one step further, that we in the City of Winnipeg have a great responsibility to the people downstream from us, be they in Lockport or be they in Selkirk, or to the communities along Lake Winnipeg that we, in the City of Winnipeg, should be treating and dumping our sewage, in some instances, in a relatively untreated fashion and, in other instances, only with secondary treatment, instead of making a long-term commitment that in time we, in the City of Winnipeg, will respect our responsibilities in moving toward tertiary treatment of our water.

Mr. Speaker, with those words, I would like to say that I'm not really upset at the Member for Tuxedo having introduced this resolution into the House. I think that the amendment that has been made by the Member for Concordia is one that adds to the resolution, rather than subtracts from the resolution. It adds a recognition and a responsibility that we, in the city, have; that the province has; that the Government of Canada; and that the Shoal Lake Indian Band has toward working together to solve the conflicts of interest over the water use, on one side, and over the land use on the other side, of the Band versus the City of Winnipeg.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a pleasure to have taken some time and to address this issue which is of such importance to the residents of the City of Winnipeg. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to speak on this resolution. The members opposite seem to be a little sensitive to the particular resolution that was brought forward, and felt that they

had to bring an amendment in when, I think, that the resolution, as brought forward by the Member for Tuxedo, was very adequate. Maybe the Member for Inkster considered it political; certainly it was to the extent that we really were not feeling, those of us that are on this side of the House, that this present government was doing enough to represent the citizens of Winnipeg when it came to our water supply. To add the words, "To work with the City of Winnipeg, the Government of Canada, and the Shoal Lake Indian Band," that sort of thing should have been taken for granted but, unfortunately, it hasn't been and it has turned into a matter of concern.

The people in Winnipeg, and myself, have always taken our water supply for granted. It's been one of our natural resources. I think, in Manitoba, when we think of our natural resource we have always thought of Hydro, but our water supply is one of our great natural resources, and one that we expected that this government would have taken, and would have supported the City of Winnipeg with just every fibre of their being. Instead, what we find is that the city has continually had to work almost against the province to try and protect our water supply.

I've been very disappointed in the attitude that the government had taken up to this time. Now I understand that a couple of weeks ago the Minister of the Environment came out and said that the bottom line, finally, they said, is the water supply must be protected. That is all anyone has been asking for, that the water supply must be protected. We were not getting the feeling that was going to happen, and I think that it was very important to the people in the City of Winnipeg, and in Manitoba, that we feel that the government was working actively with the city; not just consulting with everyone else but, when it came down to the last and to the bottom line, it was the city that they were going to agree with, and consultation hasn't seemed to have been this government's high point. Quite frankly, I don't trust their ability in negotiations, and I think that the City of Winnipeg, first of all, had to come out with a pamphlet. Now, why on earth would they do that at the cost to the citizens of this province, and the city, of \$23,000, if they felt they had the support of the province? There would be no need for that.

It said, "Winnipeg's water supply needs protection." The headings: "The health of 600,000 people depends on a safe water supply." Another heading: "Our system is a good one, for the moment. New pressures are posing new dangers. Development on Indian Bay, in immediate danger. We must protect our water supply; we must do it now. What should be done?"

Then, in the paragraph, "What should be done?" it says: "The city cannot act alone." Now this does not give the impression that they have been feeling they were getting much support from the province; and, "Are you concerned?" I want to tell you that I really feel that this government, certainly, is not adverse to helping the Winnipeg water supply, but they've been going about it in a very strange manner and round about. As far back as December 7, 1982, there was an editorial and it said, "An alert Provincial Government would long ago have recognized the explosive potential of the pure water issue and made itself the firm frontline defender of the drinking water. The Provincial Government Manitobans have, however, has taken a

variety of obscure or equivocal positions which seem to reflect a desire to conciliate the Indian Band and to punish the city. The Federal Government in its failure to conduct the environmental review has shown a matching indifference to the quality of Winnipeg drinking water. If the city's mail-in survey impresses upon provincial and federal authorities the inadequacy of their policy, it will have served a useful purpose."

I think when 30,000 replies came in, I think that was probably the time that the province started to move a little bit towards the city's feeling. The Member for Concordia suggests the province's Ministers have been clear in their support of our water supply. But this past editorial and one that - there was an article in the Winnipeg Free Press February 26th, and the Shoal Lake Band was asking the Provincial Government to bypass the city in negotiations. The Minister said and I quote, "I would be reluctant to proceed without the city unless there were compelling reasons." That's what Kostyra said. I find it hard to believe that he would be reluctant. I would think that the — (Interjection) — it's right here, it can go on the record if you like. I think that the Minister would have been standing up and shouting and saying, he would not be proceeding under any circumstance without the city. That was not the case at that particular time. So it leaves us with the feeling that this was the reason for this particular resolution. It wasn't out of just a political reason but a reason that our water supply was at threat because this government wanted to do nothing but negotiate, negotiate, negotiate until we wouldn't have a water supply.

There is just no way we can fool around while everyone is being very political and wants to show how wonderful they are at negotiating and understanding. What we needed was a clear commitment to our water supply. I think that this is one of the reasons that the resolution was so important to the Member for Tuxedo. It is understandable, we understand that the Indian Band should have rights. Of course they should have, but not if it's about to jeopardize our water supply. What is at stake is the protection of one of the best water supplies in our country.

I think as Canadians and I know as a Canadian that I have taken it very much for granted and when we look down in the States, especially when I lived in the East, that a number of years ago, the supply of water in the States was a great concern. The Great Lakes were polluted. Everyone was talking about cleaning up their rivers and the bays and we just had a great supply here in Canada. They were getting very nervous in the east that possibly at one time they were going to ask us to sell our water down in the States. The big conversation at that time was to protect our water supply at all costs.

Here we have a supply that our forefathers had the foresight to build an aqueduct that would protect and give us clean water with very very little treatment and we have a province who hasn't stood up on their hind legs and said, look protect at all cost.

The City of Winnipeg has recommended an onsite sewage disposal system that the Federal Government build on the reserve. I would hope that the province would be backing them up on this and not be recommending the road which will bring in tourists and a chance of cottage development which is not needed at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 5:30, when this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have 10 minutes remaining.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: Committee change on Law Amendments. The Member for The Pas will substitute for the Member for Transcona.

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