

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 17 June, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 7 of the Legislative Assembly Management Commission, I'd like to table the Annual Report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1986.

Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 30 students from Grade 9 from the Lockport School under the direction of Sheila White. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MTS - availability of overview of internal audit to Member for Pembina

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Madam Speaker, in Public Accounts, the Minister of Finance indicated that he would review an overview by the Provincial Auditor, which was provided to himself, and presumably the former Minister of MTS, regarding their concerns or their ideas on an internal audit that was done by the Telephone System on the MTX involvement in Saudi Arabia; can the Minister indicate, since we're having the Public Utilities Committee convening tomorrow to discuss MTS-MTX, whether that overview will be made available to myself today?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I can confirm that I did take that question as notice last week when we met in Public Accounts. It is not normal for those Internal Audit Reports of the Provincial Auditor to be made public. The Provincial Auditor, under his act, has the provisions to publicly - through his

Annual Report - refer any items that have not been dealt with, by virtue of his internal audit, to either corporations or departments, and he also has the right that if he feels that something is extraordinary, in terms of concern, to report it directly to the Legislature.

However, given the amount of detailed review of the matters of MTX, I understand that the Minister responsible for MTS is prepared, without prejudice, to provide that audit to the members.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, not being a lawyer, what does prepared to give us that internal audit overview "without prejudice" mean?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I indicated, by my background to the answer, that the normal practice for those internal audits is for them to be dealt with by the corporations or the departments responsible. So, in terms of that practice, it's without prejudice to that practice.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then just so we understand completely, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Telephone System, will the Minister have that either available to me this afternoon or tomorrow at committee?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. G. DOER: Yes, Madam Speaker.

Business development - Min. to listen to concerns of business community

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, to the Acting Minister of Business Development, we on this side of the House have been condemning the government for their policies as to how they affect business. The President of the Chamber of Commerce, Dorothy Dobbie, has said the business community in Manitoba is very frustrated with this government because they're not listening to what they're saying.

Madam Speaker, they're even prepared to go so far as to picket the Legislature to try to get the attention of this government. Will the Minister encourage the Minister of Business Development to sit down with the business community and listen to their concerns and their frustrations?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I know that sometimes when we consult, and I was Minister of Business Development and Tourism, and I do know

that the consultation that goes on between all government departments, but particularly Business Development and Tourism, and Industry Trade and Technology, that in fact there is listening going on.

And the budgets of this province have reflected that fact consistently over the years. We have been sensitive to the fact, Madam Speaker, that in some areas this province has tax regimes which are at or near national levels, and that is a problem for concern.

But, Madam Speaker, there is another side to consultation, and I heard yesterday the President of the Chamber of Commerce talking about The Natural Gas Corporation Act and disclaiming the fact that this was not good for Manitoba; and I remind members opposite and I remind the President of the Chamber of Commerce that Manitoba enjoys the lowest hydro rates, the lowest telephone rates, and the lowest automobile insurance rates in this province because of public corporations. Madam Speaker, that is good for business.

Bill No. 61 - will Minister withdraw

MR. E. CONNERY: While the Minister says that they are listening, obviously they're not acting, because the business community is not happy.

Will the Minister have some influence on his caucus, as far as Bill No. 61, Final Offer Selection goes, because the business community is opposed to it; the labour community is opposed to it; everybody seems to be opposed to it except this government and Bernie Christophe, who they're trying to bail out. Will the Minister use his influence to try to have this bill removed?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, certainly this government is prepared to listen, and I have expressions of concern by the Chamber of Commerce and by certain, not all, representatives of labour; and we are fortunate enough in this province to have a committee structure in between Second and Third Reading so that the public can come and make representation to government, so that we can not only listen to their concerns, but get the specifics, because while I've heard some general expressions of concerns I am not sure we've had an opportunity to discuss the specifics. The committee is the place where that happens and I know that the Chamber of Commerce will be bringing forward their specific concerns, and perhaps some recognition of the positive aspects of the bill at committee stage.

Events Magazine - when to be made public

MR. E. CONNERY: A final question to the same Minister, Madam Speaker, which will show the incompetence of this government and the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. They have what they call their "Events Magazine" which lists all the events in Manitoba.

The Summer Events Magazine comes out and lists the events from the 1st of May on. Can the Minister tell us when they're finally going to make it public so that the people of Manitoba will know what's going on in this province because we do have a lot of good

events, but people cannot plan ahead because the magazine isn't out. Is this the competency of this government?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I unfortunately could not read the title from the piece of paper that the member was waving so frantically around, but I would certainly be willing to take as notice the question of whether publications are presented in the most timely fashion. I do know that the department has already produced a whole series of publications, and the members shouldn't try and leave on the record the suggestion that that is the sum and total of the advertising program of the Department of Business Development and Tourism. In fact, there are dozens of publications, most of which are already in the hands of those people who are doing their planning.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie with a final Supplementary.

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, for the Minister - it's the summer coming events . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, he wanted to know, he wasn't sure what the listing was and I wanted to make sure that when he took it as notice, Madam Speaker, because they have such a hard time in being competent, I didn't want to leave the slightest opportunity for them to make a mistake. Thank you.

Investment Saving Certificate Program - how far along toward target

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.- (Interjection)- Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris has the floor. The Honourable Member for Portage did not have a question.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Finance.

A little over a week ago the Minister of Finance announced the provincial bond issue called the Investment Savings Certificate and Madam Speaker, at that time, when the Minister didn't have the courtesy to make that announcement in the House, we were led to believe that the Minister indicated that he hoped that \$20 million would be raised in the issue of those bonds. Can the Minister report to the House today as to how well along that target is being reached as far as the raising of \$20 million?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, first of all, to correct the member, the announcement was made in the House on Budget night. It very clearly was made that we were going to proceed along that line, so that assertion is incorrect.

It also appears, Madam Speaker, that I may be somewhat, dare I say, conservative in my estimate on how well these bonds will be, because I've had indications from the investment community and the financial community in Manitoba that it should do much

better than my estimates, but at this point, since they are not formally on sale, I have nothing to report.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, that begs a question. The Minister says they're not formally on sale. I know of many investment dealers who are indeed offering them for sale. What does the Minister mean when he says they are not formally on sale?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Well, the dealers and that obviously are letting their clients know about the sale, but it will officially be available at the beginning of next week.

Investment Savings Certificate Program - why such a conservative estimate

MR. C. MANNESS: Can the Minister tell us, in the final supplementary to the Minister, Madam Speaker.

Can the Minister indicate why he has placed such a conservative estimate of \$20 million on what he hopes may be raised, given that the Province of Alberta raised over \$900 million in a very short period of time, using more or less the same instrument?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I guess because I'm a cautious Finance Minister, Madam Speaker.

Psychiatric treatment for eating disorders - government action to alleviate waiting list

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health.

Madam Speaker, the Health Sciences Centre is the only hospital in the Province of Manitoba which is presently providing treatment to patients suffering from severe eating disorders, such as, anorexia nervosa or bulimia, that they suffer from two particular difficulties at the present time; one is that their staff psychiatrist who only gives half-time to the area will be indeed leaving at the end of July, and they only have six beds to treat such patients.

Can the Minister tell us what this government is doing to alleviate a waiting list of between 80 and 100 patients who are searching for this particular treatment help?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I want to make it quite clear that I don't consider that these discussions - fine there is information being given, but these discussions and assuring of policy - should be done during this period. These discussions are going on continually, every day with the different hospitals. We work with the board and we don't intend to just react to whatever is in the news media and so on. I think that would be very unfair.

So, this discussion is going on, there are people that want us to increase the coverage that we have on

hospitalization and medicare. We're looking at priorities and if there is any change, and we're discussing this with the hospitals, we'll make the announcement. But I think the last thing we want to do is react to people that are not going through the proper channels, that are going directly to the news media. This would be blackmail and I don't want to start that.

Psychiatric treatment for eating disorders - patients not hampered by closure of beds

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A supplementary question to the same Minister.

Madam Speaker, can the Minister assure the House that patients who are presently looking for treatment will not be hampered in that treatment by the closure of six beds as of July?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, if there is any change at all, I will be discussing it with the commission and make a statement at that time.

CGE industrial benefits package - when can we expect expenditure

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry.

On March 26, 1985, the Premier tabled an announcement regarding the industrial benefits package for CGE Memo of Understanding. These industrial benefits would come to Manitoba because CGE received the generator contract without tender. The first indication, "investment at a minimum of \$10 million in long-term viable operations in Manitoba by the end of 1991."

Madam Speaker, it's been two years since the announcement. When can we expect some announcements as to the expenditure of these funds in Manitoba by CGE?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, certainly before the time called for in the agreement. As the member indicates there is an agreement between us and CGE. That agreement, we expect, will be honoured by CGE and by the Province of Manitoba. There are negotiations ongoing with respect to some specific items that CGE might be interested in investing in and, as the member knows, CGE has already publicly announced some investments in the province.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, they have announced part of their economic program for northern Native people is the only announcement that I have seen. One other part of it is creation of a minimum of 100 new full-time jobs in one of Manitoba's high technology industries between '85 and 1991. What are the discussions regarding this part of the agreement?

MR. D. ORCHARD: They're non-existent.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry Trade and Technology.

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

I'm very pleased that the member is raising these issues because it indicates, once again, the benefits that we have negotiated for Manitoba with respect to Limestone. The agreement itself, as the member indicates, calls for these things happening between the start-up of Limestone in 1991; as the member knows there's still some four years left to go until we arrive at that time. During this period CGE will be required to have those jobs in place which will mean, for Manitoba, Madam Speaker, not only that we got a good deal on the price involved for Limestone. And as the member knows when he was in government there were negotiations when they were talking in terms of starting up hydro-electric developments in terms of a direct non-tendered contract with CGE.

Those kinds of discussions had gone on with the Schreyer Government and, indeed, they went on with this particular government, but only under this government were there discussions and, indeed, an actual agreement with respect to offsets, and we're very pleased with that.

HVDC Research Centre and Manitoba Micro-Electronic Centre - how far along are these projects

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, if there was something concrete going on you may rest assured the Minister would have told us, but obviously there isn't something concrete going on. I wonder, for the third, about this other part of the agreement, "funding of two research products at a level of \$100,000 each; one of which will be conducted by the Manitoba High Voltage Direct Current HVDC Research Centre at the University of Manitoba, and the other by the Manitoba Micro-Electronic Centre." There is no date in the agreement regarding those projects, can the Minister tell us how far ahead those are at the present time?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Madam Speaker, as I indicated to the member previously there have been discussions going on, there's the Micro-Electronic Centre at the University of Manitoba which the member may not be aware of has been funded. The Hydro people have been providing assistance and these things are happening.

What the member should recognize is the fact that over this period of time we have had strong economic growth in Manitoba. We have had good statistics in terms of employment growth, in terms of housing growth, in terms of job growth, in terms of one of the strongest growths in terms of business formation in this country, so we're very pleased with the progress we're making to now.

CGE contract - Min. to negotiate

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Madam Speaker, the Minister obviously isn't giving us any answers. My question to

him this time would be, with manufacturing investment down in this province, and private investment down in this province, can he do something to negotiate this contract with CGE so that jobs will be created in the Province of Manitoba as soon as possible?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Madam Speaker, as the member knows, during our term in office, the population of this province has grown by some 50,000. While they were in office, in fact, there were fewer people left in Manitoba the day they left office than the day they entered office. And in three of the last five years, Madam Speaker, in three of the last five years, private investments in Manitoba has grown at a rate of from two to three times the national . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member Emerson.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Emerson dike - request extension in northwest corner

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson has the floor.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

The Town of Emerson has not had the privilege of being properly diked for flood protection over the many years. While the negotiations have taken place, especially on the American side, it is my understanding that an agreement has been reached there. The Mayor and Council have requested the Provincial and Federal Government to extend the dike in the northwest corner of the town to include 40 acres for future development.

Can the Minister indicate whether he would support the request for the extension of the dike in the northwest corner of the town?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This matter has been brought to our attention, in fact, the Member of Parliament for the area approached us on the same matter, and we indicated that, of course, our concern had to be with the funding arrangements for that particular extension.

The Federal Government, as a participant, has indicated that they are not prepared to fund the extension and it would be impossible for us to proceed without that input. I've indicated that I am prepared to meet with the Town of Emerson, but I think that meeting should take place with some federal representatives present, because clearly it involves the three levels of government.

So at this stage, no, there is no provision for the extra funding to extend the diking.

Emerson dike - when project to proceed

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

The Minister has indicated in his correspondence to me that \$280,000 will be spent for diking on the international side of the Town of Emerson. Can the Minister indicate when this project will be proceeded with?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I would have to check specifically what the timing of it would be for this year, but my understanding was that there was to have been some work on a portion of that this year. But I will check specifically and report back to the member and the House.

Provincial campground and lot rates as gazetted - are they the same as of Jan. '86

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister. I have a new question.

In the Manitoba Gazette of June 13, 1987, a whole series of increases in rates for the campgrounds and lots, etc., were gazetted, and we just received that.

Can the Minister indicate whether these are new increases, again, or whether these are increases that were in effect since the beginning of the year? Can the Minister maybe indicate, as well, whether fees can be increased before they have been gazetted?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I want to point out to the member that these are the same schedule of fees that were shared with the members opposite during the course of my Estimates. The timing of these is, and I'm sure the members opposite will recall, that there have been occasions on which fees for specific activities, whether they be for hunting purposes, there have been occasions on which the fees have, in fact, been collected prior to the fees being gazetted. But if that was a problem, in this particular instance, it's not unique to this government, it has been a problem for the Opposition when they were in government, as well.

Provincial campground and lot rates - legality of if not gazetted

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary to the same Minister.

Can the Minister indicate whether those increases are legal, if they have not been gazetted properly?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, Madam Speaker we feel that we are . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, could I rephrase my question if there's a problem?

MADAM SPEAKER: I'd appreciate it, so that it isn't seeking either an interpretation of a statute or an opinion.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister, by what authority can his department increase fees before they have them properly documented and gazetted?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I would just respond in saying that the precedent of previous governments provides us with a basis for proceeding as we have this year.

Universities costs increased - terms of compensation package

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education.

The Minister of Finance, in his Budget, raised a number of charges to the universities, namely, an increase in electrical charges, payroll costs, and other items, and it affected the budgets of the universities, in particular, the University of Manitoba, by some \$2 million, removing it from their current budget.

The Minister of Education, during Estimates, indicated that he would be announcing in the future, a program to possibly compensate the universities for this. Has the Minister now made that decision to compensate and, if so, what are the terms of that compensation package?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Madam Speaker, I regret, actually, the delay in making the announcement. There is a submission coming forward and I hope to be able to make an announcement within the next two weeks, of the results of the review.

MR. C. BIRT: A supplementary question to the Minister on the same matter.

Will the Minister be making that announcement in the House?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, a decision has not been made on how that announcement will take place. Obviously, the universities have already been in discussion with the Universities Grants Commission and are aware, more or less, of the directions that are being considered. If the member would like an announcement in the House, I can certainly undertake to make that kind of announcement here.

Universities - details of funding

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, a question that was raised during the Budget that some \$20 million would be made available for the universities, and the Minister made reference to it during Estimates, I would ask the Minister when he'll be announcing the details and specifics of this \$20 million program, which I believe some of the funding has already been provided to the universities, but when will he be making the full details of this package available?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, that will be in due course.

Inter-City Gas - R.M.'s made aware of takeover by province

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Can the Minister indicate to the House whether he has written all the R.M.'s in the Province of Manitoba, trying to get support for the ICG takeover?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I had received correspondence from the city, from some municipalities expressing concern about high prices for natural gas. I had sent them a letter on this matter over a month ago, and I did send the municipalities of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg information pertaining to the policy announced by the Premier of Manitoba with respect to Manitoba's move to lower natural gas prices by some \$50 million and save people of Manitoba \$50 million, residential families \$150 a year, Madam Speaker, and small businesses, \$1600 per year. We think that's very good news for the people of Manitoba and we would want the municipalities of Manitoba who had expressed concerns about this to know about it.

Inter-City Gas - long-term plan for servicing rural communities

MR. H. PANKRATZ: What is the long-range plan as to servicing these rural communities? Could the Minister indicate in this House what his long-range plan would be towards that?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to deal with this matter because we have not had much in the way of servicing of communities in rural Manitoba over the last 25 years, if one compares the natural gas distribution system in Manitoba as opposed to the natural gas distribution system in Saskatchewan which has been owned by the people of Saskatchewan and provides natural gas distribution to a far greater number of rural communities than is the case in Manitoba.

We have indicated, and the Premier's indicated this in the policy announcement, that it is the intent of the government to assess the situation and determine where it's feasible to extend natural gas distribution to more Manitoba communities. We believe that Manitobans want that, Madam Speaker, and we certainly will be proceeding with the policy of determining where that's feasible.

Inter-City Gas - 5-year plan re financial situation

MR. H. PANKRATZ: My final question to the Minister. The Minister indicates that there will be a \$50 million saving. So obviously there must be a study or some

kind of a financial plan in place. Would the Minister be willing to table in this House a five-year plan as to the financial situation of Inter-City Gas?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, when this matter comes before the House, The Loan Act material will be provided, but I'm surprised that the Member for La Verendrye has not gone through the numbers and determined that if in fact Manitoba residential families, pensioners, other people, small businesses, and commercial enterprises are paying \$3 commodity, \$3 per thousand cubic feet, as the commodity cost and the government is proceeding with measures that reduce the commodity cost of gas to \$1.80 to \$2.00, that presents savings of \$50 million and I'm surprised that members on the other side - not all members on the other side - but members on the other side aren't fighting to make sure that that takes place and aren't acting unanimously to ensure that the people of Manitoba get that \$50 million savings which they deserve.

Inter-City Gas - tabling of study

MR. H. PANKRATZ: My final, final question to the same Minister.

Obviously he must have a study in place and I would please recommend to him to table that in the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: That's not a question. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you. I have a question for the Attorney-General, Madam Speaker.

I believe the Attorney-General meets regularly with the head of the RCMP and the Chief of the City of Winnipeg Police Force. I wonder if he could assure us that organized crime is not involved in any activity in Manitoba. I don't believe he heard it . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

If honourable members want to have a private discussion while other members participate in question period, they can do so elsewhere.

Organized crime - not involved in activities in province

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert has the floor.

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

I wanted to ask the Attorney-General if, as a result of his regular meetings with the head of the RCMP and the City of Winnipeg Police Department, he can assure us and residents of this province that organized crime is not involved in any activities within the province.

HON. R. PENNER: I have no indication that organized crime in the sense which I presume the Member for St. Norbert is using it, is involved in Manitoba. Any crime involving the participation of more than one person has an element of organization about it. We have had car theft rings investigated successfully by

the RCMP, and in that respect I should point out and commend the RCMP for having established a province-wide auto theft unit; so there's elements of organized crime in that sense.

It would appear, although my department is not directly involved in the prosecution, that many of the drug cases which have been prosecuted in the courts have elements of organization about them. But there's been no evidence, to my knowledge, that even here where one might expect some connections, there's been no suggestion that there have been infiltration into Manitoba of some of the so-called prime families from the United States. So there's no evidence of that kind that I have.

Motor vehicle deaths - increase 1986 over 1985

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Transportation.

Whereas motor vehicle death occupancies are dropping nationally, Madam Speaker, it appears that this trend is not being duplicated in the Province of Manitoba. I would ask the Minister of Transportation if he could repeat for the record the measure by which deaths, motor vehicle occupancy deaths, have increased '86 over '85, and also the same measure for injuries, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, we have discussed this during the Estimates process and the member has the figures.

What is clear is that there has been an increase in accidents and deaths in many provinces across Canada and so his statement that they have declined in other areas of the country is not correct.

In addition to that, the point that I made very clearly during Estimates to the member was that the increase in the number of deaths and injuries was largely to people who were not wearing seat belts at the time that the accident occurred. In most cases, this was the fact; and it is clear that seat belts have decreased the number of injuries insofar as those that are wearing those seat belts.

What we have to do of course is continue our efforts to educate the public and ensure that the public is aware of the benefits that occur to them by wearing seat belts because it does protect them from serious injuries and deaths, and that's very clear in the information we have.

Seat belt deaths - reason for increase

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, given that the Minister in committee indicated that road deaths had increased by some 30 in number, '86 over '85; and given that injuries had increased roughly by 800; and, Madam Speaker, bearing in mind that seat belt usage had

jumped from 10 percent or 11 percent to 60 percent, could the Minister again tell us why this phenomenon has occurred, given that when the debate was raging over seat belts, the government indicated that deaths would decrease by 30 percent and that injuries would fall 50 percent?

A MEMBER: It's not happened; they've gone up.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, I indicated clearly to the member that approximately 70 percent of those injuries and deaths occurred to people who were not wearing seat belts at the time that they occurred. That is the significant factor.

The truth of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that there has been an increase in the number of miles driven, more people on the roads, and of course therefore more exposure. And, as well, with the economy as it has been, in an upturn in Manitoba and more people being able to enjoy and get out and travel because there was more disposable income, Madam Speaker, there has been more people driving with an upturn in the economy.

But the fact is that there's still a great distance to go and we have to continue efforts to improve these statistics in the future and we will be making every effort to do that.

I should also mention to the member, Madam Speaker, that a snapshot, a statistical snapshot is not necessarily going to provide an accurate comparison and the member, during Estimates, agreed with my assessment of that. He also stated that that is true. These can vary from year to year because it is just a snapshot in comparing from one year to the next. There has to be a long term trend that has to be considered along with other variables before making definitive statements on these figures.

MR. C. MANNESS: Madam Speaker, given the long term trend over three years, since the advent of the seat belt law, there have been increases in deaths since the base when there were virtually no seat belt useage in this province.

Can, again, the Minister try to rationalize why deaths are increasing? And furthermore, can the Minister indicate whether an internal study has been done, looking into the causes of the increases in seat belt related deaths and secondly, in the area of injuries?

MADAM SPEAKER: The first part of the question is repetitive. The second part of the question is in order.

The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I think, Madam Speaker, what the member has not given to the House, the member has not indicated there has been a decline since the high year that he referred to in injuries and deaths and that point should be made as well. There are variables. It's up and down, varies from year to year. There will be some more information coming in this debate. Obviously when the member's resolution comes up, he has taken a stand that he is against seat belts, Madam Speaker. I think that means that very clearly he is against the savings to the medicare system and he is also against protecting people . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

As the Honourable Minister well knows, he's not to impute motives.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, I feel badly that the Minister had to engage in a personal attack. Again, I ask my final question.

Has there been an internal report done as to what has happened over the last two years with respect to deaths and injuries since the incorporation, since the development of the seat belt law?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Madam Speaker, I did indicate to the member that Dr. Mulligan was doing a study at the University of Manitoba. We have preliminary draft reports that have been completed. However, the final form is not completed and then released, it has to be released both federally and provincially because it is an initiative that is undertaken under the subagreements, and hopefully as soon as Mr. Crosbie is ready to release the information, we will be prepared to do that. I think the report does illuminate a great deal the factors involved insofar as the effectiveness of seat belts, and it in no way indicates, Madam Speaker, in preliminary information I have seen, that seat belts have not been effective as the member is certainly asserting in this House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: May I inform honourable members that we had 35 students from Grade 2 from the Regent Park School under the direction of Mrs. Mislow and Mrs. Kroeker. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of the Environment and I'm sorry that they had to leave before we could welcome them to the Legislature this afternoon.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture Heritage and Recreation.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I'd like to declare a conflict of interest.

I was away last week when Bill 68 was introduced and I would like to inform the House that my husband, Ron Wasylycia-Leis is the Data Centre Manager for Inter-City Gas, and as a result I will be absenting myself from all discussion, debate and votes on Bill 68. However, I understand that I will not be required to leave question period when the matter is raised.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker. It's my understanding that there will be Private Members' Hour

today and, previous to that, would you please call the Debate on Second Readings as they appear in the Order Paper on pages 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, starting with Bill No. 14 and working your way through to Bill 69, inclusive.

MADAM SPEAKER: Debate on Second Reading, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 14, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 25, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING BILL NO. 26 - THE ENVIRONMENT ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of the Environment, Bill No. 26, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Madam Speaker, have I been recognized? I'm not sure.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa, yes.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to make a few comments on this environment bill. The Environment Act, the new environment legislation, Bill No. 26 in the province, can be a positive step forward with the implication for all Manitobans.

Manitoba has the opportunity to assume a leading role in the environmental protection of Canada. The changing times requires an ongoing review of the act and changes and additions as new products and new problems arise.

Madam Speaker, I would just like to state and read what environment means as stated in the act. Environment means (a) air, land and water; or (b) plant and animal life, including humans.

I would like to speak a little bit about the water aspect, Madam Speaker. This act falls short of correcting the changing values and the changing problems that are reflective of a changing society, particularly the environmental protection of the quality of water which we receive from Shoal Lake.

More than two-thirds of the population of Manitoba, all in the City of Winnipeg, consume clean, clear water from Indian Bay, and this act should address the problem, first and foremost and, Madam Speaker, now.

A colleague will be going into more detail concerning the environmental protection of our drinking water, but

I would just like to read at this point what it says about water in the act: " 'water' includes flowing or standing water on or below the surface of the earth and ice formed thereon."

We're talking about an area that I'm assuming that there's been some indication, when we talk about the ice, and I think there might be some reference to the area at Churchill, the Port of Churchill, which I know that we all have a special feeling, but there's nothing to give us any indication of any environmental protection because I would think that there would be some dredging of channels into the Port of Churchill, which would be changing the environment in that particular area, so that we can have a greater industry in the shipping of grain out of Churchill.

I don't know whether this has been taken into consideration, but there are no plans if it will come into being, and I think that there should be something that we could have in the future of the protection of the area in Churchill, particularly in the dredging of channels up there, which in fact could mean greater activity up in that area and a greater future for the area up in Churchill. I know that I would be getting some support when it comes to some of the members of the House, particularly the Member for Churchill. We've discussed this on many occasions. There's nothing in the act, so we can proceed and give the area of Churchill the protection that it does require.

Madam Speaker, the Minister must listen to the advice of the people of the Province of Manitoba, not just those close at hand. He's got to have hearings and there is something in the bill which says that hearings will be held. But who better can tell the Minister of the protection that is required for our environment? The time for monitoring and checking the feasibility and looking into all of these things that delay the Minister taking action have to be set aside. The Minister must get up and take action now.

This bill is a start, Madam Speaker, and I hope the Minister is listening because I do agree that this bill is a start, but it doesn't go far enough yet. The intent of the act is to develop and maintain an environmental management system in Manitoba to ensure that the environment is maintained in the same high quality for all Manitobans today and for future generations. Let Manitoba be a leader to all of Canada and to all our neighbours.

I made mention of public consultation and I would just make a few remarks about that, Madam Speaker, where this is a good aspect of the bill, if in fact it is followed. But it's at the discretion of the Minister to have public consultations. It should be laid down more specifically, because this is where the advice from the professionals, the people who know, will come to the Minister, without him having to pay anything. It's not from staff; it's just from everybody who wants to contribute to the development and the environmental protection.

I was surprised, somewhat, Madam Speaker, when I was at an environmental meeting where the public were making presentations and I listened to some of the briefs and some of the recommendations. I guess the thing that surprised me was that even though this act calls for public consultation, the first people to speak at the meetings that I was at were people who represented the province.

It seemed that they were staff of the Minister's Department of Environment and they were making recommendations to the Clean Environment Commission. It struck me as being odd, where the government was making recommendations at these public hearings to the Clean Environment Commission, who in turn would be making recommendations back to the government. What were they trying to prove? If recommendations were to be made, let them be made, but why take up the time of these public hearings?

Madam Speaker, I am concerned about the far-reaching and extraordinary powers that the director and the environmental officers will have. Sometimes these powers lead to insensitivity and lack of common sense.

I guess some people, and I guess I've got to include myself, sometimes become a little bit too officious. This environment act doesn't protect against the director and the environmental officers if they do become too officious. There's got to be some common sense that comes in with all of these bills. I hope the Minister will be monitoring the actions of his director and his environmental officers. I think he will be, but I'm just giving him some suggestions on my part so that this environmental act will come about and be of some consequence.

I am concerned that the Minister, through this act, will be reducing the responsibilities of the City of Winnipeg. You know, you don't turn your back on experience, experience in pollution control, Madam Speaker. The technology of design and the operation of large pollution control systems - the expertise is with the City of Winnipeg. Here we are reducing that expertise so that the province will have complete control of all environmental matters in this regard. I hope that the province will take advantage of the expertise of the City of Winnipeg and use this expertise and experience. I hope the Minister will be prepared to accept this expertise.

Madam Speaker, the new law includes a licensing process and substantial fines to offenders. I hope that these substantial fines will be enough to make sure that people who deliberately break the law when it comes to the environment will be fearful enough of the large fines that they will withhold dumping materials and deliberately breaking the law. I think that in this regard the Minister is coming along on the right foot. I think that as times change the fines will have to change and the Minister must be kept right abreast of the value of a dollar so that if the fines have to be adjusted the Minister will adjust these fines as we go along.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

The licensing under the Class 1, 2 and 3 developments comes under the director's jurisdiction, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and doesn't allow or make the provision of citizen groups to initiate court action in environmental manners. There is legislation before the Assembly of Ontario now debating this aspect of citizen participation. We don't have any of that in our particular bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I hope the Minister might consider bringing in an amendment at committee and at Third Reading so that we can take this aspect into consideration.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I should be looking up more often just to make sure that it is my friend, the Deputy

Speaker, in the Chair, so that I don't keep making this mistake. We have some rural members, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who will be expressing their concerns for the farm community and will be making their concerns known in regard to this bill. We do have some environmental problems that are rural in nature and I think this bill will adjust to them, but I would have to have it from the Minister absolutely giving us some assurance that it won't take away from the well-being of our rural members, the farming community, the mainstay of our Province of Manitoba and they will be speaking on Third Reading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there's no mention of some of the problems that we have with the environment, acid rain, which I know is an international problem. We can't put jurisdiction over our American friends, but there are negotiations going on and there have to be some negotiations.

I know that the Minister is attending a conference that will have something to do with acid rain. I believe that the conference starts tomorrow and I know that the Minister is the chairman of this particular conference. Maybe he can come back with some answers concerning acid rain and incorporate it into this environmental bill.

I know that the Minister has got a concern on mosquito control, which is part of the environment, the air part of the environment - looking after mosquito control gives him a problem. We've got to protect the future. I would hope that something could be done - whether it comes under regulations. I would hope that these regulations would also come into being in the very, very next short time, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We have had some discussion on radon and the Minister has stated that it's not too great a danger. There are some differences of opinion as to whether there's a danger of radon gas and I would hope that this would be adjusted in the environment bill also and that might come under the regulation.

So it appears, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that before we can proceed too far, and we're just going off on sort of one foot and bouncing on the other because we don't have the regulations yet to go with the bill, and the Minister is going to say, well, you know, regulations don't normally come in with the bill. But I think it would be to the advantage of everybody, particularly those who want to support this bill, who want to see that the environment of the Province of Manitoba is protected, that these regulations are given before we pass the bill into Committee and into Third Reading.

I really don't have too much more to say but, by and large, I am in support of the bill. It doesn't go quite far enough. I have some reservations about it. But it's been a long time in coming, and I'm glad that the Minister has taken some action wherein, rather than sitting on his chair, he has gotten up and taken some action. I know that it's been a long time in coming and I do appreciate it to some extent with some reservations, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

With that, I would thank you for listening to my remarks. I hope the Minister would take it to heart so that, if there are some adjustments, particularly on the water supply for the City of Winnipeg and some of the problems that I mentioned concerning Churchill. I hope he would take that into consideration and make some adjustments in Committee stage and at Third Reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: I move, seconded by the Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of the Environment, Bill No. 28, standing in the name of the Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stand. Agreed? (Agreed)
On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Bill No. 35, standing in the name of the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stand. Agreed and so ordered.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 38, standing in the name of the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stand. Agreed and so ordered.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 40, standing in the name of the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stand. Agreed and so ordered.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 41.

MR. G. FINDLAY: Stand, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 42.

MR. G. MERCIER: Stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 46.

MR. G. MERCIER: Stand.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Stand.

BILL NO. 47 - THE HUMAN RIGHTS CODE

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General, Bill No. 47, standing in the name of the Member for Assiniboia.

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I understand that the Member for Assiniboia would have no objection if other members spoke to the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill 47 with some trepidation because the position of those who speak in opposition to this bill find themselves very quickly labelled by others as being uncaring, or indeed oppressive, undemocratic. I choose these words from mail that I have received in the last several weeks . . .

A MEMBER: Months.

MR. H. ENNS: Several months - by those who are urging support for the bill. I find it therefore somewhat ironic and I want to support my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, who spoke earlier on this bill and who I believe made an extremely valid point that issues of the kind presented to us in this bill have in the main, by tradition in this Chamber, allowed for what we refer to as a conscience item for individual members and I decry the fact that the Government Whip is on government members and on an issue of this kind that the government in its wisdom did not see the appropriateness for allowing individual members to speak their conscience with respect to the matter before us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm well aware that Bill 47 of course is a rewriting of the entire human rights legislation that we have in Manitoba. I do not wish my opposition to a specific section of the bill to be interpreted as speaking out against human rights per se. Although, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take the opportunity to question this kind of legislation. Has it accomplished what it's set out to do, to do away with bigotry, discrimination, lack of respect for our fellow citizens?

I'm reminded, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of a comment that my friend, the Member for Morris, from time to time reminds us all in this Chamber. Specifically when referring to legislation covering our own conflict-of-interest legislation, that we can pass all the kinds of legislation that we wish in this area but we cannot legislate integrity or honesty. I make the same claim that we cannot really legislate the kind of care, the kind of compassion, that we could show to all our fellow citizens regardless of race, colour, creed, or whatever other definition of minority status is applicable from time to time.

I find when I read the daily newspapers the past year, since the introduction of this kind of legislation, not just here in Manitoba but throughout the country, I'm not satisfied that we have really raised the level of understanding to have defused the tensions that sometimes erupt between different groupings of peoples within our society. But I make that as a comment only; I just raise the question. I suppose that there are indeed practical individual instances where the legislation being in place has prevented blatant and outright discrimination and to that extent of course is worthwhile.

The issue that is, of course, troubling many of us in the Opposition, and I dare say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, many, many thousands of Manitobans, is the major addition, the inclusion of sexual orientation in Bill 47, that causes us some difficulty.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, a government, certainly in the introduction of the bill, other proponents of the measure,

stress the fact again and again that enacting this kind of legislation does not necessarily constitute support for or against the practice of homosexuality. In other words, they present it and ask us to react to it in a passive way, not challenging us to pass judgment on the practice that is being specifically covered by the inclusion of this measure in the act.

Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't take issue with or read motives or intent to impute motives to those who take that position. I accept those statements as given. But what do those people, and what do I do as a committed Christian? And I'm immodest enough to say along with the vast majority of fellow citizens who profess adherence to that faith, how do they respond to this legislation?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the homosexual community is not an identifiable community. When we are talking about passing legislation to prevent discrimination against other minorities, the term usually employed is visible minorities because of race or because of color. Homosexuals, as such, are currently provided all the protection of the law that anybody else receives in our society. It is therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the practice of homosexuality that is at issue. That is what's bothering me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and bothering many, many thousands of other Manitobans.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard from different religious leaders on this subject matter and it should not surprise anybody that there is a variance of opinion. The opinion that is perhaps the most precise and clear is that of His Holiness the Pope, in speaking on behalf of the Catholic Church and the Catholic community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the position of that religious organization is very clear. It was restated, for the benefit of all members, by Archbishop Adam Exner just recently and was widely quoted in our local news media. Mr. Deputy Speaker, organizations, such as the Anglican Church, have let their views be known, and in my judgment have allowed their views to be somewhat distorted.

Allow me to read, just briefly, from a position paper statement regarding the question of homosexual orientation by the Anglican Church, dated 1979, somewhat dated, but the debate is ongoing.- (Interjection)-79, Anglican Church. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can profess to the same beliefs, as expressed in this document, when it says, "We believe, as Christians, that homosexual persons, as children of God, have full and equal claim with all other persons upon the love and acceptance, concern and pastoral care of the church. The gospel of Jesus Christ compels Christians to guard against all forms of human injustice and to affirm that all persons are brothers and sisters for whom Christ died.

"It is clear from Holy Scripture that only the sexual union of male and female can find expression within the covenant of holy matrimony. In the heart of biblical teaching about creation, we discover insights into the nature and purpose of sexuality rooted in God's creative purposes is the fulfillment and completion of male and female in each other, together with the appropriate function of sexuality.

"Thus, the church confines its nuptial blessings to heterosexual marriages and we cannot authorize our clergy to bless homosexual unions. We are aware that some homosexuals develop for themselves relationships

of mutual support, help and comfort, about which the church must show an appropriate concern. Such relationships, though, must not be confused with holy matrimony and the church must do nothing which appears to support any such suggestion."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my own community of Mennonite churches, bounded by the conference, known and referred to as the general conference, of which I believe the Minister of Trade and Technology is an active member, has recently passed resolutions confirming the traditional position, if you like, of that church and that conference with respect to the practice of homosexuality.

We have in our constituency, in the community of Stonewall, a very active New Life Baptist Church and community. Pastor Ozirney, who deserves a great deal of credit for the enthusiasm with which that congregation thrives in that community of Stonewall, has, I believe, communicated directly with the government through the Premier's office, and to me, expressing his deep concern about that church's position with respect to the practice of homosexuality.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know that the Attorney-General and others who will take issue with the comments that I am making by saying that is not the intention of this legislation or of this government to interfere overtly in the internal affairs of these church organizations, I would like to take them at their word, although I see no specific indication of that in the bill.

I'm aware that the practice has been such that the Human Rights Commission in Manitoba and elsewhere, for instance, has not taken action against a church organization for refusing to hire somebody for reasons of sex. For instance, the ordination of women into the priesthood or into the clergy, to the best of my knowledge, no human rights tribunal has interfered in what they perceive to be internal church business and have allowed the churches to evolve their position, and it is an evolving position, as many of these social questions and positions no doubt will change.

I make these references to the position of different church organizations, major church organizations, because there are reasons, very strong reasons, for myself and for others to have a very deep and strong conviction of the sinfulness of the immorality and indeed the breaking of God's law by practising homosexuality.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, just as from time to time in our secular world leadership can sometimes be out of touch with the body they are constituted to serve, and there are leaders in our religious organizations that are not always in step and always in tune with the very community that they are providing leadership for, but that does not change, in my opinion, how the vast majority of Christians feel about this issue and about this practice, and it's principally in that way that I wish to state my objections to this bill, as a Christian, and how this bill can make me do things or compel me to do things that, as a Christian, I have difficulty with, and it can happen in a thousand ways.

If I hold that belief that I just stated, that I quoted from, and I'm not taking issue with those who want to take issue with that belief - that can be debated and is being debated - but I can find myself in any number of situations like sitting on a board of trustees on a local organization that has a responsibility for hiring people, and I come to that meeting as a person who

is going to approve or not approve of somebody's application, and I come to it with the convictions that I have about the suitability, the qualifications of individuals that this private or public organization that I am an active member of, or that I want to belong to, that I am prepared to volunteer my time and services to, and if I want to express convictions of those people who entrusted me to that position of authority to carry out their wishes and do so in a way that contravenes the bill that's being proposed, you make an offender of me.

You make an offender of me for maintaining the convictions that I readily admit and I'm not always all that proud of, or that I not always maintain the covenant that I have made with my God, but I say it to you and I put it on the public record: I am opposed to legislation that I can see will make me transgress a higher law that I have committed myself to.

I'm an owner of a building, of a housing unit, raising my family, as I firstly want to do as an individual, but also to ensure, as all parents would want to, that the best influences, appropriate influences, normal influences - if you wish me to use that term that upsets some people - prevailed and are exercised in my living environment, and I find myself in a position that we have some extra space, maybe an extra room or in a duplex, and it's rented out to a party that would appear to be an acceptable renter, but then later on I find out that person is practising a lifestyle that is not acceptable to me, as I read the legislation, I am not permitted to take offence at that, and I become the lawbreaker for merely carrying out some very deeply held convictions that I have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those who indicate that passing of this kind of legislation denotes no special status on our homosexual community, well, perhaps they're right, but where the wrong is, the kind of onus they put on those of us who have strong convictions that are contrary to that kind of human behaviour, that kind of human action.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't see this provision in any specific way furthering the rights of the very community that it's meant to do so. We have had very ambivalent statements from the Attorney-General and from others with respect to how broad the implications of this section will be.

To what extent will this section acknowledge homosexual unions? To what extent will this section, in the future, broaden the request to so acknowledge the practices that to many, many Manitobans are not acceptable, and to many, many religious people are in fact abominable?

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I regret that the government has shown fit to introduce this particular section into its overall human rights code. It will, in my judgment, do precisely the reverse that is expected of it. There is nothing in my heart that wants me to go out of my way to persecute, to discriminate or to harass a person who has a sexual orientation that in my view is not correct biblically, genetically or morally.

We live in a pluralistic society, and I don't want to harass, hurt and oppress these people, but in introducing this kind of legislation, you will encourage and create a higher visibility of that practice, and I will tell you: As much as you attempt to do so, you will not change the majority of human nature's reaction

towards it. In that way, there will be more confrontation with that community, there will be more ugly incidents with that community, and there will be less understanding and less sensitivity towards the reasons, whatever they may be, that put a relatively small minority of our citizens in that category.- (Interjection)- I won't be around, but that often happens with the kind of legislation that we pass. In fact, again, just this afternoon in the question period, I mean we . . . I'll wait till the jury's out when the Minister of Transportation screws up his courage and starts showing us some reports, but if, in fact, that information is correct, that we have not materially affected the death rate with respect to the introduction of other legislation dealing with seat belts, it should not surprise us when I make the claim that, all too often, legislation that we introduce does not bring about desired results.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in conclusion, let me simply state that I object to the fact that any opposition made in the vein that I have made it, will of course be extremely labelled, in the media as small narrow-minded religious bigotry, knee-jerk reaction to a lifestyle that we're not comfortable with.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, whatever they wish to do and however they wish to label it, I am satisfied that I speak on behalf of, initially in the first instance, a very substantial majority of my constituents in the range of 95-96 percent, who actually took time to answer a survey question in this regard.

I reject totally, by the way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the claim that is made by the community, that 10 percent of the population is gay or lesbian; that is a fabrication totally unsupported, but it serves a purpose of creating an illusion of the need for serving a greater number of people. I suspect the actual numbers to be dramatically lower, in the 1 - 1.5 percent range.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I spoke for a period as a Christian, let me speak for a moment as a cattleman. These accidents of nature occur, these accidents of nature and I call them that, occur - let me now not speak as a Christian, let me speak of animals. I will speak of some, what we would refer to, condescendingly as lower animals, cattle, that I'm familiar with. If you put together, as we do, several hundred or a thousand cattle beasts in a feedlot, occasionally we come across one that is sexually disorientated. If we don't take him out of the pen he will be ridden out of the pen, he will be killed in that pen.- (Interjection)-

Absolutely not, and that's why we evolved to a higher form of understanding, compassion, care and love. But I reject absolutely and totally, to suggest that that becomes a lifestyle that is comparable to the lifestyle that was God-ordained if you like, genetically the only one explainable, and one for very understandable reasons, governments should be concerned about, with respect to maintaining the societies, the communities that we develop and build up, if you accept the fact that family is a basic building block upon which communities are built, upon which resources are developed, upon which provinces and countries can flourish.

Anybody suggesting otherwise hasn't really thought through the consequences of pursuing that to its ultimate. If it's simply another lifestyle, a generation decides to revert to that lifestyle in totality, we have no following generation. do we?

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are very real and strong and acceptable reasons - reasons that I believe a very large number of Manitobans support - my position, the position of the Opposition or those who are speaking in opposition to inclusion of this passage in this bill.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill 47.

I've read the bill through and I assure the members that I'm opposed to discrimination and there's sectors in here that I think are very strong and should be here and I want it on the record that I oppose very strongly, discrimination. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to address the one area of sexual orientation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is very difficult for me to address this subject because I have personal friends of mine that are homosexual. And I know some of the trauma that they go through, some of the problems that they have with their sex orientation and the lifestyle that they have to go through is not a good lifestyle. So I have some real emotion and some real sympathy for these people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we also employ a large number of workers on our farm and we have had homosexual workers, both gay and lesbians and we knew they were. And, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they were not discriminated against and no one is allowed to discriminate against them on our farm. But, I can say that the individual did cause some problems because of his actions with some of the workers, but he was not fired for these actions and it was discussed with him, some little pressure put on to keep his sexual orientation away from the work environment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I look through the bill and on page 9 where it discusses discrimination, "differential treatment of an individual on the basis of the individual's actual or presumed membership in or association with some class or group of persons rather than on the basis of personal merit." Later on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll explain why I have some difficulty with the personal merit part of that sector because personal merit alone in some instances, I don't think will suffice.

We discussed the merits, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on one and it says, "implicit in the above principle is the right of all individuals to be treated in all matters solely on the basis of their personal merits and to be accorded equality of opportunity with all other individuals." Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the previous speaker mentioned many good points, what about the rights of others and the beliefs of others? Do they not have some merit also in this whole discrimination?

There was one other in the bill that I thought was kind of interesting and it's called the meaning of sexual orientation. And it says, "sexual orientation means heterosexual, homosexual or bisexual and refers only to consenting adults acting within the law." It's consenting adults, at what stage of life does a person become a homosexual. Is it only at the age of 18 that they do become a homosexual? So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it leaves a little bit of uneasiness for me in this area.

We have to understand the rights of others when we talk about sexual orientation. What about people that

have a duplex - and it was mentioned by the member before me - someone that has a duplex and rents it out to a couple that are homosexual. They have a common backyard, being in a duplex, and naturally you would have some sort of evidence of their orientation - and they have a young family. Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this something that we have to say to the individuals, you cannot, stop. You have to allow your children to view a lifestyle that is not normal. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't think that we should be forcing people into this.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the teaching profession - and I could imagine there are homosexuals in the teaching profession today - but because it is frowned upon somewhat there is not open evidence of their sexual orientation. So the children don't see it and don't view it as a normal lifestyle, but if this bill goes through and this section of the bill goes through, then we have some problems with that now becoming a lifestyle that society accepts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't accept that lifestyle. It is an immoral, it's unwholly and it's an unclean lifestyle but unfortunately, as the member said before me, that it is an act of nature. And it's not a kind act of nature, it happens to some individuals. But percentage wise I don't know, but it's a cruel and unkind act to people who are born homosexual.

I don't think homosexuals in most cases should be discriminated against. But there are instances I think the rights of others have to be respected. A homosexual should have all the rights to medical, to work - as I said we hire people on their merit and not on their sexual orientation - but there are certain things that affect lifestyles that I think we have the right to determine for ourselves.

I am somewhat concerned that the Opposition House Leader or the Attorney-General have not allowed members opposite to have a free and open vote on this discussion, because I know there are members over there that are horrified with this bill and their opportunity and their ability to represent their constituents properly in this Legislature has been throttled by the Attorney-General. But that's not unusual because he also has not proclaimed The Freedom of Information Act.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order being raised by the Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I've been accused in debate in this House a moment ago of throttling other persons' point of view or right to express themselves. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have stated and I'll state again for the record, that is totally inaccurate. Everyone on this side of the House who wants to speak on this bill is free to do so and express their individual concerns. That's more than the dispute on the facts, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a misrepresentation and I want it on the record that it's a misrepresentation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are certain rules in the House among them, Rule 40.(1), no member shall speak disrespectfully or use offensive language against the House, or against any member thereof.

MR. E. CONNERY: Did I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, something that was offensive?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, you said that I had throttled people's rights.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: I assume then by the Attorney-General's statement that members opposite can get up and speak on the bill and can speak in opposition to the bill if they so determine. Because I know that there are members on that side of the House who are not in favour of this bill, and their religious upbringing does not allow them, their church does not allow them to support it. Yet we see somebody, who I don't believe has any church affiliation at all, saying to Christians, you can't speak out against that bill. That is immoral and is not proper in this Legislature.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I grasped with this bill to some degree, I had my own feelings on it, but also I represent a constituency and I went back to that constituency and asked for their advice. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we also had a poll and in the poll I'll accept that the question said, "Would you grant special legislation for homosexuals?" And somewhere over 90 percent of the respondents said, no.

I've received letters from church people; I've received letters and phone calls from individuals within my constituency. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not have one respondent who said that they were in favour of the sexual orientation part of this bill, not one.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we don't have an overwhelming flood of people saying, yes, leave it in. Most of them are saying, no, take it out; we do not want this bill. So I am representing my constituency when I speak in opposition to that section of the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what happens if we condone this sexual orientation? Because if we make it an alternate lifestyle, do we say to people that it is fine to be homosexual? What will this do to our community? Will it then have other people viewing it as being a good alternate lifestyle that we will have more people becoming homosexuals?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Rule 44.(1): "No member shall engage in private conversation in such a manner as to interrupt the business of the House."

The Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: I guess, Mr. Deputy Speaker, members opposite are very sensitive because they've been throttled and not been allowed to have free speech on a very, very important bill that can affect this community, our province, for many, many years to come or forever. So I can understand their sensitivity to it.

But if we allow this lifestyle and we allow it to be an acceptable alternative lifestyle, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will see an increase in homosexuality. We will see young people viewing it as an acceptable lifestyle, moving in that direction before they'd had an opportunity to really understand their own sexual orientation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are two groups of people within this debate that I think we have to recognize. I believe and I firmly believe that there are people who

were born homosexuals, and that have no ability to change their sexual orientation. We have seen homosexuals who have married, and I know of instances where they've married, raised a family and just could not take the sexual - it wasn't a happy marriage sexually. It was a good lifestyle, but their sexual orientation just didn't work, and went and came out of the closet, so to speak, and entered the homosexual community.

But there are others who have chosen to be homosexuals, and in this last while we have been inundated with people from the homosexual community, lobbying us in this building, trying to convince us to support the bill for sexual orientation. What really bothered me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was one individual, a lady, who was a professed lesbian, said that she had been married, divorced, entered into a heterosexual relationship, had a child, had many heterosexual relationships, but decided she maybe would like the lesbian lifestyle a little better.

Well, I'll tell you, this totally put me out on the issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If we make it a well accepted lifestyle, will we have people choosing - choosing - to be homosexual, and if we ever permit that to happen in our society, then we have gone to the bottom rung of the ladder. This government and this Attorney-General is prepared to encourage a lifestyle that is not good.

So my concern is: How do we give some support to those who really were born that way, an accident of nature, to have a reasonable lifestyle without affecting the community at large? And as I said, they should not be discriminated against from having a job, from having medical attention and all those things in life, but some other people who are opposed to that lifestyle should have the right to say no, we don't want to be exposed to it and we don't want our children exposed to it.-(Interjection)- I've read the bill, yes I have, and maybe a little more thoroughly than you did. You and I even oppose people who call us short but they do, and we accept it because we are. That's a form of discrimination.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the case of Big Brothers and Big Sisters, we don't see men being Big Sisters to girls and, conversely, we don't see women being Big Brothers to boys, and I guess maybe there's a reason for that. Now, should we have homosexuals, well should we have - members opposite laugh, and I guess they can laugh in their misguided interpretation of right or wrong. They laugh, and that's fine.-(Interjection)- That's right.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we saw in the States where a group were forced to take homosexuals in as Big Brothers. I think these are some of the areas that we of society have the right to say no to. There are instances where we have to have these rights, and it's unfortunate but it has to be.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we could amend the bill or have some additions to the sexual orientation, there are certain areas I agree with, that I think we need to eliminate discrimination, but there are a lot of other areas that we have to leave our own human rights, personal rights, the rights of the community, the rights of parents to defend and support their own moral and religious opinions. As the member before me said, we do make commitments to a higher being, to our God, and we do have the obligation to support some of those obligations.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to put my thoughts in the record. I am concerned. I wish the Attorney-General would allow members opposite a free and open vote, an open discussion on this issue because I would like to hear some of the true feelings of members opposite, who have a very deep religious background and understanding.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I rise in support of the bill, and I rise also in response to the Member for Portage la Prairie who asked for the expression of true feelings. I would certainly like to give my true feelings, as I believe the Member for Lakeside did, as I'm not too sure about the Member for Portage la Prairie who seemed to relate the constant misinformation that has been promulgated by various sectors of the press and by various people who do not like to see equality in our society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to run through the act itself and what the act does because, so far, the two Opposition members who have spoken dwelt on one particular section of the act. This is an important act for all Manitobans, because the intent of this act is in certain defined categories. Let me read the defined categories so members opposite understand where this act applies.

The act applies in employment; it applies in rental housing; it applies in public services; it applies in public contracts; it applies in the purchase of property and employment advertising. Now this is where the act applies. It is reasonably specific that it applies in those circumstances and those circumstances alone, as defined in the act.

The Big Brother situation, the example used by the Member for Portage, is not covered here. That is a voluntary service that is not covered under the act in any manner, shape or form. It is a red herring to use Big Brothers as an example of where discrimination would not be allowed, so Big Brothers who are inappropriate for little brothers would be forced under the act to be hired by the Big Brothers organization to deal with a little brother. That is absolutely not the case under the act, and the act is very clear on that. If the Member for Portage read the act as well as he said he read the act, which I find hard to believe from his comments, he would understand that.

I would also like to point out some of the other categories and attributes of individuals in this province which are dealt with under the act. There is religion, which will be defined to include creed and also religious belief, association or activity. There is sex, which will specifically include circumstances related to pregnancy, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Political belief will be expanded to include political association or activity. The basic rights of Manitobans in respect to harassment - not just sexual harassment - but harassment because of any of the attributes defined under the act now becomes an offense.

MR. H. ENNS: I might change my mind. You're harassing me right now.

MR. M. DOLIN: Sorry about that. The Honourable Member for Lakeside says I'm harassing him. Perhaps he may consider harassment my simple attempt, given his years of experience in this House, to edify him and educate him on the misstatements and the misunderstanding he had of the act in his statements before.

I will also deal with the matter of religion and homosexuality which the member seems to have misinterpreted the church's position from the statements that I will read to him from the church. Perhaps he should reconsider some of his statements and perhaps maybe rethink the position he took, because it is not based on what is in the act. It is not based on the position as stated by the church, and it is not based on reality.

Further areas of discrimination: contract compliance provisions will enable the Government of Manitoba, where appropriate, to make affirmative action a requirement of firms contracting with the province.

Advisory opinions - now this is a very important clause - from the Human Rights Commission will assist Manitobans - and this is particularly relevant to the business community - where a given practice or policy is acceptable. So whereas the Member for Portage mentions, in hiring or firing or setting certain employment standards within a job situation, where an employer is unsure that a case does not have to come before the Human Rights Commission to be tried under the law, that the employer has to find himself under public opprobrium but the employer can go and say, I'm considering putting in such and such a practice in regard to, for example, Mexican labourers. What do I do to make sure that I am fair under the act, that I am treating these people as equal citizens before the law and before God?

The Human Rights Commission can now say, Mr. Employer, here is what you would have to do and, if you do (a) and (b), you would not be within the act but we can give you some advice on how you do that to ensure that all the people of Manitoba have the same rights in the categories defined under the act, as I pointed out, employment, rental housing, contract compliance, etc. I think that's very important for the business community so they don't end up in situations where they are unknowingly discriminating against somebody, where they think they're doing the right thing and find themselves in a courtroom when they find that they were wrong, as some of the members opposite have been wrong in their interpretations of the act.

I think if they acted on the statements that I've heard from the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Portage La Prairie, if they acted on those statements, they might find themselves going contrary to the law. And I think maybe - you know, I have no question that they would be operating with sincere intent and trying to be fair and good and they may not be doing that. This way, they can get an advisory opinion where people can explain to them what the act actually means and how it is to be applied.

There are changes in the act of membership on the Human Rights Commission. There's a permanent panel of adjudicators set up. I think the basis for this act and we have been dwelling - and I will get into that one category, which seems to be the most contentious category, and that is the matter of sexual orientation.

The basis of this act is very simple, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We, as a government, believe that Manitobans are fair. We believe that Manitobans believe in equal rights and opportunities for a job, for renting an apartment, for using public services to all people, regardless of their religion, regardless of their race.

We also believe, as the Member for Portage pointed out, the Conservative Party sent out a biased report, saying would you - it was a survey. It was their equivalent to the Gallup Poll. Well this was no Gallup Poll, it wasn't even a trot poll or a canter poll, it was a backward-walking poll. This poll told them: Would you like special rights for homosexuals? You could replace the word "homosexuals" by any other group in society, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You could replace it by Christians, by Jews, by blacks, by orientals, and people in this society do not want special rights for any group, nor does this act promote or propose that.

What this act does, it says everybody shall have an equal opportunity and an equal right to take a chance at the good life in this society. Nobody shall be discriminated against because of the attributes that they have as a person, be it skin colour, religion, race, political orientation, sexual orientation or the other attributes defined in the act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me give a quote. The Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties, the President, Harry Peters, in a letter from the president, says: "Contrary to what you may have heard from the critics of Manitoba's new Human Rights Code, it does not confer special rights upon any persons, but rather ends them. It ends the special rights of homophobes to discriminate against gays and lesbians. It ends the special rights of employers to sexually harass employees." He also points out: ". . . a right employers have enjoyed since our Court of Appeal ruled last year that our present code does not prohibit such conduct."

He also points out: "Archbishop Exner," who was quoted by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, "has stated, 'The fear of Catholics that their church will be forced, under the Code, to let homosexuals become or stay priests and nuns.' Nothing could be further from the truth. The Code clearly provides for a limited amount of differential treatment, where the views of lifestyles of a certain person or potential employee run contrary to the honestly held religious beliefs of another person or employer. The new Code will no more force the Catholic Church to accept homosexuals as church leaders than the present Human Rights Act would force a Jewish congregation to accept a Catholic as their rabbi."

Now if one does not believe the opinions of the Attorney-General, of various church groups, the Anglicans, etc., or members from this side of the House, I would like to read from a rather lengthy letter, which is entitled: "Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic Church on the pastoral care of homosexual persons." I will point out that the letter very clearly states: "A person engaging in homosexual behaviour acts immorally." I have no argument with that being a principle and a statement of the Catholic Church. I would further go on to say and quote from this letter, which says: "It is deplorable that homosexual persons have been and are the object of violent malice of speech or in action. Such treatment deserves condemnation from the church's pastors wherever it occurs. It reveals a kind

of disregard for others which endangers the most fundamental principles of a healthy society. The intrinsic dignity of each person must always be respected in word, in action and in law."

It goes on further to say, "We encourage the Bishops then to provide pastoral care, in full accord with the teaching of the church, for homosexual persons of their diocese."

What the Catholic Church seems to be saying - and I will give you the author of this letter. This letter, for the edification of the Member for Portage la Prairie, by the way, was circulated by one of our religious Catholic members on this side of the House who had taken the trouble to research the position of the Catholic Church on this issue. This was done during an audience granted to the undersigned prefect. His Holiness, Pope John II, approved this letter, adopted in an ordinary session of the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, and ordered it to be published, given at Rome, 1 October 1986, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, Prefect.

The position in the Catholic Church, I think, is very similar to what we are attempting to do in the act, and the offence I take at the distortions being made by members of the public who are trying to create an impression that somehow different and special rights and a condonation, a support of a homosexual lifestyle, is intrinsic to this act is blatantly false. It is also blatantly against what is the doctrine stated by the Pope's emissary in the fact that the dignity of each individual shall be respected.

What we are doing in this Human Rights Act is taking the position that we are enforcing in law, as stated in the letter, which is our responsibility as legislators, we are taking the responsibility for ensuring all Manitoba citizens have equal rights under the law. No special rights. We are not singling out any particular group.

And I fail to understand why members opposite, when you look at the act, which defines the attributes that are covered under the act, why they single out this particular group as having special rights. There are a number of other groups. We talk about race, we talk about religion, we talk about political belief, we talk about a number of other areas, pregnancy, etc., which were also attributes as defined in the act. Why is the Opposition and members of the more irresponsible public, who seem to agree with the Opposition's attempt to discredit this legislation, why are they saying that there are no special rights given to those particular people with those attributes?

Why are they not saying that black people are somehow getting special rights under the act? Why are they not saying religious minorities such as Mennonites are getting special rights under the act? Because they also are included and protected under the act.

I would point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the case being made by the Opposition . . .

MR. H. ENNS: We are all people, but some practise immoral acts. We are all people.

MR. M. DOLIN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside says they're all people, but some people practise immoral acts. He is absolutely correct and I do not deny one whit what he is saying. However, this act does not deal with morality and does not deal with the private

morality of individuals in their own private lives. We are not saying in this act that homosexuals who practise their lifestyle publicly, allowably and in circumstances where they will proselytize other people. There is a section in the act which prevents employees from doing things against the wishes of their employer within the codes as set up by the employer.

You know, the member says that somehow this is condoning homosexuality. It's doing nothing of the kind. There is a term that the Member for Lakeside used during his address, and I believe it was a sincere address, and the Member for Portage la Prairie used, which is a commonly known expression - it's called "in the closet." Homosexuals, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are said to be in the closet.

Has the Member for Lakeside ever thought why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are homosexuals in the closet? Because they are afraid. They are living in a situation of fear. They are afraid to stand up and say: I have a lifestyle which is not popular; I have a lifestyle which is not acceptable to the general heterosexual community. Therefore, I will be beaten up; I will be refused a job; I will be refused rental accommodation; I will be refused public services. So what do I do? I will hide in the closet.

I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that what we are saying is we do not condone the lifestyle, but do not allow, in a free society, an individual to have to live in a state of fear. Be he black or of a different religion, or Oriental, or be this person a female, this is an intolerable situation in a free society.

I think the Member for Lakeside, when he used the example of his cattle, if there was a cow in his herd, or a bull, who was of a different lifestyle, that bull or cow would be driven out of the herd, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I could not help myself from commenting across the hall: "Is this the way that men and women should live?" And the Member for Lakeside was somewhat taken aback, Mr. Deputy Speaker. He said, "Oh no, these are dumb beasts, brute animals; we are above that." Well, what I am saying is what this act does is bring us above that.

We will now allow, in a free society, if this act is passed, anybody to have to fear when they go for a job or when they use the public service or when they want to rent an accommodation that is rentable to the public, and this includes people whose lifestyles you and I do not approve of. I do not approve of that lifestyle, but nevertheless they have a perfect right to live that lifestyle.

There's a saying from William James that every man and woman in society has a right to swing their arm, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but your right to swing your arms ends where my nose begins.

What I am saying and what this act is saying is yes, we are condoning and giving people the right to swing their arm. I have no right to tell somebody what their lifestyle should be or what their religion should be or what their morality should be. They have a right to do that as long as they do not interfere with me, and I have no right to interfere with them.

What members opposite seem to be saying is they wish to impose their morality on the rest of us, their religious beliefs. I respect their religious beliefs, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am not a Christian, but I believe that there is an importance in distinct, moral values in the

teaching of Jesus Christ and Christianity, and those who uphold that faith, I think are the pillars of this society.

But I do not believe that teachings believe in discrimination. I do not believe the Catholic Church, the Anglican Church, the Mennonite Church, the United Church or any Christian Church supports discrimination against another person. They believe in helping a person; they believe in treating people as equal. They believe in treating individuals with dignity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which is what we are attempting to do in this legislation.

To continue to suggest otherwise that somehow, because this lifestyle is abhorrent to me, or the Member for Lakeside, or the Member for Portage, that individuals in this society who - I think even the Member for Portage recognizes - do not necessarily have a choice in developing this lifestyle, that we somehow should condemn them and abuse them and beat them up and refuse them jobs and refuse them accommodations and refuse them public services which we consider ours and are paid for by all taxpayers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think if members opposite thought in a good Christian manner and a moral manner, they might rethink their opinions.

The Member for Portage suggests that we are somehow browbeating the more religious people on this side, that I, particularly, as Whip, am beating people into submission so we will all be like sheep on this side of the House supporting this bill when our moral code prohibits us from doing that.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Well, I suggest to you that's balderdash; and I also suggest to you that we have moral people of all religious persuasions on this side of the House who recognize the values and the teaching of their religion. And I do not know one religion in the world that comes immediately to mind that believes that all men are not equal and all women are not equal, and all men have the same rights and deserve the same chances in this society. I think everybody on this side of the House believes that. I hope to God that everybody on the other side of the House believes that.

Because if you operate on that code, I would suggest to members opposite that maybe think a little more about what you're saying about special rights for this group; special rights for that group; when the act says nothing of the kind. And when we are not proposing that. What we are saying is any child born in Manitoba, or any person who immigrates into this province should have exactly the same rights in employment, in public services, in rental accommodations.

The Member for Lakeside used an example, if he had a duplex and he wanted to rent the side of the duplex. And the Member for Portage la Prairie picked up on it and talked about homosexuals in his backyard. What, fairies in his garden, I don't know what he's talking about. What he's saying is, "I shouldn't have to rent to those people." Well the fact is, I have heard the same arguments over the years with rentals to non-whites. I've heard the same arguments of rental to people with other religions. Those arguments are unfair in a free society. If you are putting an accommodation for rental on the market in the public domain, then a

person who passes certain criteria of being able to pay the rent, of being of good moral character, of not damaging the property, whatever their religion, race, sexual orientation, sex or what-have-you, they have a right to rent that apartment and we are going to, by legislation ensure that they have that right.

How in God's name would the Member for Lakeside know the person he's renting to is homosexual? Does he want them to wear yellow arm bands as they did during the Second World War when the Nazis forced them to do that? Is that what he wants? Or as the Mayor from Calgary wanted them to have pink lapel buttons or something to identify themselves. That's absurd.

Homosexuals of either sex do not look any different than you or I, Madam Speaker, they do not act any different. They are people who have a different sexual orientation, they dress as we do, they work at the same jobs as we do, they ride the buses the same way we do, and they rent accommodations the same way we do. And they have a right to do that, Madam Speaker. They have an absolute right.

I walk down the street, Madam Speaker, and I see people on the street with funny haircuts and earrings, and black leather jackets. This is not a lifestyle I approve of. I don't know whether they're homosexual, or punk or whatnot. If I don't like, I don't have to dress that way. They have a perfect right as citizens in this society to dress any way they want within the law or to operate in any way they want within the law as the act clearly points out.

For members of the Opposition to say because I don't like the way somebody looks, he should stop looking that way, is offensive to me. If the Member for Lakeside would suggest to me as an analogy to that, if he didn't like renting to somebody with dark skin, should he have the same right to do that because it is offensive to him? That is the analogy that comes very clear to my mind. I believe the Member for Lakeside is a more decent, honest person than that. And I truly believe the religious tenets that he discussed and that he brought out, he actually believes in. What I would suggest to him then is go back and read the act more carefully. There are no special rights in the act. There are equal rights, there are equal rights for rural people, for urban people, for black people, for white people, for yellow people, for red people, for men, for women, for people of heterosexual orientation, of homosexual orientation, for people of any religion you want to name because this, Madam Speaker, is Manitoba. This is not Russia, this is not Chile, this is Manitoba. This is a free democratic society.

We on this side of the House are taking not only a correct position, and an honest position, but a moral position. And I strongly urge members from the other side of the House to stop trying to distort reality. Stop trying to make this legislation into something it is not. This legislation is what it says, it is a Human Rights Act to prevent discrimination. It is not an act to give special rights to any group in society. All people in this society are created equal and we will pass this legislation and force that all Manitobans - even the Member for Sturgeon Creek - are treated equally.

Madam Speaker, I hope further comments from members opposite are a little more informed, that they do a little more research on the act than the two

Wednesday, 17 June, 1987

speakers we have seen up to now. Because, Madam Speaker, I do not think it will wash in the public - in the media it certainly hasn't washed and the two major papers in the City of Winnipeg have condemned the fallaciousness of the arguments brought forth by the Leader of the Opposition who was speaking for his caucus, I assume.

What he is saying is give this matter a special right. I would hope that the members opposite would start looking at the legislation as it really is. The Member for St. Norbert started to do that before he drifted off into the same kind of bias in his opening remarks. The fact is, yes, this is an act, it is a fairly comprehensive act, it has clauses which may affect certain groups or individuals like the business community, landlords, people who want to rent various situations, condominium owners. It may affect them in certain ways which I think it is our responsibility as legislators to make sure this act does what it is purporting to do and that's provide fair treatment for all Manitobans, and no discrimination against any Manitobans.

Now, if members on the opposite side would get off this hobby horse of special rights and stop trying to make black into white, which it is not and deal with the specifics of the bill, we could probably pass the best piece of any discrimination legislation ever seen in Canada and set an example not only for Canada, for all of North America and maybe all of the free world.

I encourage members opposite to stop fooling around and start dealing with the realities. Get off the homosexual hobby horse because it is not a special rights situation. It is no more special rights than any other attribute as defined in the attributes in the act.

So, Madam Speaker, with those remarks I felt it was incumbent upon me to put that on the record. There is no, somehow evil force on this side of the House to get people to do things they don't want to do. We have discussed this openly and freely in honest debate, in caucus. We have taken a principal position of people coming from different religious backgrounds and from different ethnic backgrounds and different orientations as far as work and national origin and we have come to a conclusion as a caucus that this is the best piece of legislation that we can put on the table for all the people of Manitoba to provide them with a situation where they will not have to be in fear of discrimination in a workplace, in rental accommodations, in public services or in other areas as defined by the act.

Madam Speaker, I commend this act to the House and I urge Opposition members to think a little more carefully before they start condemning on fallacious matters.

Thank you very much.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I too wish to join the debate on Bill 47.

The Member for Kildonan encouraged members of this side of the House to join the debate, and to paraphrase him, with a little bit more thought, I think is what he said. In listening to him fairly carefully, Madam Speaker, one would come to the conclusion that what the Member for Kildonan is saying is, you will not have

that clearer thought, clearer understanding, you will not be able to convince us that you're right unless you agree with us. It seems what the Member for Kildonan is saying because he took deliberate pains to attack almost each and every one of us that has spoken on this bill so far.

So, Madam Speaker, I then say to the Member for Kildonan, I suppose I will disappoint him also because believe me, some of the things that have been said by members of the Opposition to this point in time will be reiterated in some respect by myself.

I admit, Madam Speaker, I haven't researched this area. Quite frankly can you research this area? How do you research this area? -(Interjection)-

Well, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Education tempts me and tells me to read the Bible. Of course, I think there will be members here who will quote from Leviticus in due course. Yet, I tell you, Madam Speaker, we're quite aware that the members opposite would love to have us quote the Bible over and over again in this debate. We understand that.

Madam Speaker, were we outside of this forum, were we in front of the public in a broader context, I would gladly quote the Bible, because I'm a believer in it and I follow it. I'm not fully understanding of it and I'm not an overly pious person, but I understand it in many respects and believe me, I subscribe to many of the basic religious laws that are written within it.

So I say to the Minister of Education when he tempts me to quote the Bible, Madam Speaker, there'll be another time, there'll be another forum.

Madam Speaker, homosexuality is and does occur obviously within our families, either closer or farther. I can say that within my family it's maybe closer. So when the member challenges me to do research, how does one do research when they live with it in a fashion?

Madam Speaker, the Attorney-General attempts to make the view and the discussion very black and white - very simple - in my understanding. He puts it purely in the words that would lead one to say, or try to judge the issue, on the basis of discrimination. Again, paraphrasing, should a person, should a practising homosexual, be fired for that practise alone? Madam Speaker, when I listened to the Attorney-General very carefully during his Second Reading of the bill that seemed to be what he was saying to me - represented the rationale for the inclusion of this particular section.

Madam Speaker, it's why, in my view, my church, the United Church of Canada, in many respects supports - when I say the church, I'm talking about the executive of the church - the government in this view. Indeed, I had an opportunity just last week to pose the very direct question to members of my conference specifically dealing with Bill No. 47 as to why they took the decision they did in support of it.

Madam Speaker, they quoted almost the identical rationale as was offered by the Attorney-General when he brought forward the bill. It's the one of discrimination. Quite frankly, when the Member for Kildonan says, don't make it a black-and-white issue, allow there to be some grey areas, some compromise, I find that falling somewhat out of the attempted consistency that was laid before us by the Attorney-General.

Because when the Attorney-General uses the rationale to that question, should a person be fired because they're identifiable, practising homosexuals?

To me that isn't very much a black-and-white issue. That's why the executive in my church, for instance, is a supporter of the bill. Because they would say nobody should be fired without just cause and just cause certainly is not being a practising homosexual.

Madam Speaker, I can accept the process of that argument, quite frankly. I can see that how if you are going to argue at that plane or at that level it becomes a yes or no question. If that's where the members opposite, the government, who have been convinced, and I dare say pressured in some respects, by the Attorney-General and other supporters that the argument should be based at that plane, at that level, then, Madam Speaker, I can see why the majority of them to this point, at least those that have spoken, would be in support of the bill.

My colleagues have attempted to say something else. They've attempted to ask these questions, to what extent will the courts confer greater rights upon homosexuals because of the very simple - and I say that in fairness - inclusion of the section dealing with homosexuality?

We're asking, does this legislation confer greater rights upon homosexuals than it contemplates, than indeed the Attorney-General contemplates, than indeed any person who wants to argue the question on the basis of strict discrimination as to whether one should be fired or not? Madam Speaker, that's our concern, that's why I rise today in my place to try and again expound upon that very real concern, not only in the minds of many of my constituents who, by the way, based on the very same questions, the very same survey that other members of this side have commented about, are 90 percent in favour of not extending rights beyond those that exist today.

Madam Speaker, the question is, what flows from this act? What are we going to be asked to pass, which somehow outside of the power of this Legislature is going to be interpreted in a somewhat different fashion? As the Member for Lakeside says, interpret it in a fashion that is totally against the theological laws and the religious laws that have much import to him and, indeed, I daresay, to myself. Because, Madam Speaker, if we don't ask those questions, quite frankly, we are doing a disservice to lawmaking and I daresay we are doing a disservice to our constituents who are, in the vast majority for whatever reason, not wanting us to support the law.

The fact that some of us may be out of favour with the editorial writers of the Winnipeg Free Press and other media, Madam Speaker, doesn't really bother us a lot because, quite frankly, I think we learned long ago that if you're with people - and people have views on this, not because of something the Opposition has done, to go out and hold meetings like we've done in our taxation meetings to whip up public fury - (Interjection)- That's right, this is a different issue. Everybody has an issue, has a view on this, and everybody's view, whether it's researched or not, has full value.

Madam Speaker, what fears us the most today is the liberal interpretations that are being given to most of our statutes outside of the authority of this House. Until and unless the Attorney-General can tell us how it is, for instance, that teachers - and I'll tell you, Madam Speaker, I've had many calls on this, particularly with

respect to teachers - who in some subtle fashion, however subtle, begin to promote that lifestyle within a classroom, how it is they can be removed from their position, Madam Speaker. Unless the Attorney-General can tell me how the classroom can be safeguarded from an abnormal practice, then, Madam Speaker, I cannot support the bill, because the underlying theory is that everybody respects the classroom, that everybody who is in a place of authority and everybody who's a role model will do the right thing, that they will not try to impose upon their class their views. As ideal as the world would be, Madam Speaker, we know that the world doesn't work that way.

Madam Speaker, you, in going through the public school system, myself in going through the public school system, indeed those in this group who have gone through private schools, know whatever person is before them instructing, lecturing will in some sense impart their values into that class. In all, some of my constituents are asking, are in those cases where a practising homosexual who is now teaching their children in some subtle form begins to show those children that indeed the practice in which they are engaged is not only acceptable, it is also normal and it is protected by law, Madam Speaker. Therefore they take more liberties within that classroom than they are allowed. Madam Speaker, then the Attorney-General has to tell me how those children are protected.

Well, the Attorney-General says it's a specious argument. I'll save it for another debate when we are maybe debating humanism and I don't know if we ever will, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Kildonan chastises my colleague, the Member for Lakeside, when my colleague used the analogy of the cattle on his farm. He asks, are we not higher than that? Well, of course we are, Madam Speaker, but how much higher are we? As society, how much higher are we?

Madam Speaker, the members opposite talk about beaten wives. They talk about a society who turns its back on a whole host of areas and the more that they can identify the problems, the quicker the laws are passed and indeed the greater the tax measures are in support of the oppressed. Yet, Madam Speaker, what do we see in society? We see larger homes being built for smaller families and people totally turning their back on the community, expecting government to do it. So, when the Member for Kildonan says, are we not higher than that? I question how high we are. The NDP Party should know better than most, because they're the ones who practise this political class warfare, Madam Speaker. They work that system. They use it to their advantage in the political fashion, particularly in the area of economic classes. They make people believe they're downtrodden because of the wealth.

Madam Speaker, it seems to me that they who use class warfare at its highest level will fully realize that maybe not this generation but generations to come are going to have their own reason for lashing out somewhere. They always have in history and they always will, Madam Speaker. We're not an awful lot more civilized today than we were 1,000 years ago and people will lash out because there will always be problems; there will always be shortcomings. There will always be reasons why they haven't risen, Madam Speaker, to the level that they want to achieve. People will reach

Wednesday, 17 June, 1987

out and lash out and history, whether its biblical or otherwise, teaches us one thing: The people who they will lash out almost firstly against is the homosexual community.

Madam Speaker, what's my point? My point is this: That if a person is of good will and a person has a good heart, and a person understands the value and the worth of a fellow person and they are an employer, they do not need a law to tell them that that person who's identified as a homosexual and who is probably contributing good work in that workplace, no law is needed to protect that person. Because a person who is good in heart and good in spirit, it will make no difference to that person, and that person will provide a continuous level of employment for that employee.

But on the other hand, Madam Speaker, in our midst if there are people who find out, after they have somebody on staff, it comes to their attention that that person is a homosexual and they are offended by it and they want to remove that person from their employment, no law will prevent it.

A MEMBER: That's right. He'll find a way.

MR. C. MANNES: There is no law that the socialists opposite will pass that will prevent it because if a person, an employer, feels strongly enough about it, they will do it. There will be a reason, Madam Speaker, and it will not be stated and it will not be proven, and there's no Human Rights Commission in the land that will be able to do anything about it. That person will be removed from that employment.

Madam Speaker, why are we passing this law? Why are we doing it? Because if we need protection for the person, 10 percent of the population who supposedly have an orientation towards homosexuality, Madam Speaker, then why do we not also include on that list protection for the adulterer? Because today there are fundamentalists who have businesses but they're probably want to fire for that reason, too. And are they any less identifiable than a homosexual, are they? They are people, Madam Speaker. They're black, they're white. They've got different religions but they're people. Why should they not be added to that list? The point I'm trying to make is if you add adulterers, then where do you stop? - because the list certainly doesn't end there.

Madam Speaker, I question the need for this law because again, as I reiterate, a person with a good heart, a person who knows the good in people will never ever fire somebody for being a homosexual if that person provides good service to that business; and secondly, does not promote their lifestyle at that place of work. I guess that's the point I am trying to make to the government, because it seems to me what they are then saying in rebuttal to that, ah ha, but what happens if that person does promote their lifestyle at their place of work? Some protection must be afforded to them. Madam Speaker, that's what brings the argument full circle. Because my constituents, indeed I dare say the vast majority of Manitobans are saying that within their schools, public or private, particularly within their schools, they want to know who it is that is teaching their children. They want to be able to pass final judgment as to whether that person stays in the employ of that educational institution or not.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I believe that this is, as far as I am concerned anyway, very important legislation, and I think that it is imperative that I should speak and make sure that my feelings on this are very clear and on record.

One of the main reasons why I felt that I should speak is after the introduction or the Second Reading, the Attorney-General, I saw in the paper the heading that the NDP caucus to be ordered to back bill. I checked on every word that was said by the Attorney-General. I didn't find that at all, and I want to make that position very clear.

There is no doubt that in politics, if you belong to a political party or if you belong to an organization, they have the right to make rules. There is no doubt about that. There is no doubt that a political party could say that the Whip is on and the caucus must vote together. There's no doubt about that at all. But I can assure you there are not enough devils in hell or angels in paradise that's going to tell me when to vote and how to vote if I feel that it's against my conscience. That is not up to the party, that is up to every single individual.

Every single one of us, it's not the party that knows. It might be something that doesn't interest the party, that the party doesn't see it the way I do. But if I feel that it is a question of conscience, I and I alone will decide how I vote. There is no doubt that if we're going to go in this, in this political setup, that we have to compromise. It is difficult; it is frustrating and at times we stretch things. But when it is a question of conscience, well, then certainly we must make sure that we go along with our conscience.

I can tell you that in this case I will vote with my conscience. I can tell you that I was one who was very concerned. I've asked the same question. I've heard the two speeches from the Attorney-General, which I thought were very good. He didn't play games or try to be devious or try to have something with two meanings; he was very clear. I listened to the Attorney-General, to the Member for St. Norbert, the Member for Morris, and I think they were good speeches. I don't agree with everything that was said. I think they were sincere speeches and I heard part of the speech from the Member for Kildonan. I would hope that there will be the same kind of sincere speeches.

I will not fault anybody here, and I will not try to fault the Member for Morris or to say, well, you're not doing it right, and you're prejudiced and so on if you don't vote exactly the way we do. But I would think that he has a responsibility to study the bill and not to say, like it was said to me so many times, well, it's what it's perceived to be. That's not good enough; I think it is what the bill says.

I asked the same question and I had my doubts. I came here as many of you know. I started in politics for one thing, to try to eradicate prejudice in the schools, and I agree with the Member for Morris, that one of the most important things of any family who cares is the education of their children. I'm with him on that.

But why then do I say that I have no hesitation in supporting this bill? And I could say the same thing, exactly the same thing that the Member for Morris said. I'm not overly pious, but I believe. I received a Christian education. I believe in the teaching of the Judeo-Christians. I was taught in that and I take direction from my church but, on the bottom line, I go with the dictates of my conscience and I think that's all we can do.

I must say that the teaching that I received was always that everybody was created equal, and there should be no discrimination against individuals, against people. I also ask myself the question, well why? They're people, and I must admit it wouldn't be my first priority but, after the time that I spent in the Navy during the Second World War and where some of my shipmates were going ashore trying to find some "queers" as they called them so they could roll them and kick the hell out of them, and I realize that these people did not consider them people. They considered them something lower than that, and they were fair game. And I'm not exaggerating at all. Anybody who would remember the service during the war or, if you're too young for that, ask your friends and your fathers and so on, and that was a game. That was fair game then. So, maybe there is something, maybe it's not going to hurt.

And I will tell you that I'm very disappointed in my party, that they didn't see fit to reduce or to try to eradicate the prejudice in dealing with the private schools. Let me tell you that I'll remind the Attorney-General and all the members of this party that they were very serious when they brought this bill in, and I welcomed it. That's another reason I vote for it also.

I see here that one of the people who shouldn't be discriminated against is because of your religion, and I see that on page 7 also: "further the principle of equality of opportunity and equality in the exercise of civil and legal rights regardless of status." I subscribe to that, and I certainly will come back to that.

Now my main - and I should say that, in the speech that I heard my honourable friend from St. Norbert say, he brought in something that I hadn't looked at too much, and I certainly will do everything possible that is in my power as a member of the front bench to see that the commission is representative. When I say representative, not necessarily they have to have people from every party, that's not what I'm saying. If we've got the people in our party, they should be people who support our party - we've played so many games lately on that - but as long as they have the ability, as long as they're representative and as long as they represent different groups, maybe different religious beliefs and so on, and I think that's important.

I said awhile ago that the Attorney-General was very, very straightforward and I want to quote something he said that makes it easier for me, making sure that I am on the right track. Let me quote two paragraphs from Wednesday the 3rd, Hansard, on page 2714, to start with on the Second Reading. And I quote:

"Note has been taken specifically by Archbishop Exner that - and he's concerned about it and he's right to raise the point - that former section 6 of the act, which talked about bona fide qualification for employment with respect to a limited number of organizations, religious, non-profit charitable, etc., etc., he wonders where that section is. Well, in fact what

we've done in the act is to broaden that out to cover all sectors, not just those few named groups, so that if in fact there is a bona fide qualification, it is clear in the re-enactment that it doesn't just simply to a select number of groups. And I'll elaborate on that in a few moments.

"Obviously if one is employing a domestic or a child care worker, or a baby sitter in one's home, one has the right to employ a person who meets the family standards, which may be standards not only of proficiency but standards in terms of spiritual life or anything of that kind. That is provided for in the act".

Then in the next page, also I'd like to read: "For example, to deal directly with the kind of point that I'm raising, can a Catholic school insist on Catholic teachers? Yes, of course they can. Moreover, Catholic schools can insist on Catholic teachers who live by the church ordinance and conventions.

A case not too long ago in Ontario where both the teachers involved were Catholic, but in contravention of the dogma of the church, had divorced and remarried and were discharged from their teaching on those grounds. Some might say that ought not to have happened. It was challenged, but it was upheld because it said that the church had the right in terms of selecting its teachers to deal with its students and so on.

So I think it is quite clear. We'll see there that - and you could read the bill as well as I do - they talk about bona fide reason. The point is I can see no conflict and I can see that I can still follow the teaching of my church and, in fact way more, because my church preaches that we don't look at any individual as lesser. We see them as equal and we haven't the right to persecute anybody. In fact, if they're sick, you try to help them a little more.

I'm not saying this is for everybody here, I'm saying that as far as I'm concerned, this is not a natural act. It is a kind of sickness and I feel that we are protected after the discussion I had with my leader, the Attorney-General and others. What I've seen, what I've read and in discussing with other groups that there is protection. There is a lot of protection, because we are not enshrining the act. Show me one word in there where it says you don't discriminate and you must go along with their way of living.

I would say that if somebody has that problem - and how many of the homosexuals came over to see me to lobby? I suppose they've been around everybody, and most of them were saying we are like that but not because we wish, not by choice. Do you want to discriminate against these people who are doing their best and who are living, or are not living, they have the temptation? Is it better to have a heterosexual who goes out every night, who has somebody different every night, and in front of the kids and so on? Is that any better?

It is not the person, it is the act, it's the way they're living. That's what we must protect ourselves and our children against. That is the concern that we have, not the individual. I know it's difficult and we'll say again, it's what it's perceived to be. If we have this attitude, we'd still have slavery here and you know how difficult it was with the southern gentlemen and ladies and people of high standard. It was a way of life and it was very difficult. We've had to do things like that. You can be criticized, but you've had to do things like that to

change this. I think it would probably be the most important thing and the best service we can render our fellow Manitoba citizens to try ourselves to eradicate prejudice and there is always prejudice and, at least, if there's prejudice, if we can't help it; if we have prejudice, at least not to act on it.

I can tell you that before anybody is hired, for instance - let me talk about, let's not dictate to other people but in our church there has to be a recommendation. If this person is a heterosexual who is playing around and so on, that's not the kind of person we want to teach the kids and, if he's a homosexual and he's playing the game, we don't want him either and we won't have him. The Member for Morris is right, we won't have him. But the Attorney-General also is right.

I'm explaining why I'm voting for it. He's listening to me and he has a duty to tell me in Second Reading if I'm wrong. If not, it goes on the record. It's on the record and it'll be very clear what kind of legislation, what we have in mind. We don't want to discriminate against individuals.

Is there anyone here who thinks that's bad? We were talking about reading the Bible awhile ago that said maybe you should take care of them. Well, that's not the way I read the Bible. I read the Bible - mostly the one who never sins throws the first rock and those kind of things.

But the point is, that I am just as much - in fact maybe more - against the act than anybody in this House. There is no way that someone who flaunts it, someone who wants to live that way, will be able to teach my kids or my grandchildren. I have the right to do that and it's very clear in the statement that there's always the excuse, fine, unless there's a bona fide reason or whatever. I think we should give this a bill. We can do an awful lot of service by pushing this thing and say this is what it's perceived to be.

I had problems until I was sure what this bill was all about. I'm not going to say anybody is prejudiced or start any accusation, but you have a responsibility to make sure that you don't misrepresent the bill. Some of you have. Some of you publicly have represented and talked about in interviews and different things some of them have.

Some of them have talked about that this, for instance, because you've heard one person say, well, now, my spouse - from a homosexual speaking - now will have a pension and all the benefits. You know that there's nothing said in here that encouraged that; quite the opposite. There's nothing in there at all. It's not what it's perceived to be if we try to give it the wrong slant and mislead it. I think that's all.

If we're honest and say what this bill is all about, fine, I don't intend to make any accusation on anybody, but I don't expect anybody to tell me that I don't care.

I think that I have proven in this House, for the last 20 years, that I care and that one of the main reasons why I ran as an MLA was to defend and, in fact, that I crossed the floor of this Chamber was to try to promote better understanding, less prejudice, and parental rights in education. I still believe, I'm not ready to sell that down the river - and equal opportunity for all the students also. That's all I'm saying.

As a human being, and it's a teaching of my church also, that nobody should be mistreated. The more that they're sick and they need some help, give them help.

Don't turn your back on that. That doesn't mean that because you want to be nice to them and help them out that you're going to say whatever you do, and how you live is right. That is wrong. It'll never be right, not as far as I'm concerned. There's not a question of choice. You can do what you want. I'm not in their bedroom and so on, but they're certainly not going to start living like that and teaching our kids.

I think we have all the protection we need in this bill and I certainly intend to support it.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. (Agreed)

Second Reading on the Proposed Motion of the Attorney-General, Bill No. 48, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. (Stands) Is that agreed? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 49 - THE REAL ESTATE BROKERS ACT

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Bill No. 49 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Yes, Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to this bill and leave it stand in the name of the Member for Fort Garry.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I just want to indicate that this is a relatively short bill and unless a person knows what it's basically about, it seems not an important bill.

I would just like to indicate that being a real estate broker, owning a small real estate company in the rural area, that I would like to put some comments on the record regarding the changes that are being proposed here, regarding the deposit money that people pay and trust to the broker when they make a transaction.

I always felt concerned, Madam Speaker, that the present system was actually a bit of a wrong system and I think the concept of what is being proposed in this bill is generally acceptable, though I have some concerns that I want to raise with the Minister at the tail end of my comments.

At the present time, Madam Speaker, I suppose there's a little bit of a difference, to some extent, between a rural brokerage, a real estate broker, and the ones in the city. In my particular case, Madam Speaker, ever since I joined the Legislature in '77, my real estate business has been very meagre and not doing that well. When I look at a bill of this nature, I just want to raise some concerns that I have with that.

Madam Speaker, the present system, the way it is right now, if somebody makes an offer and puts down a deposit, normally a cheque is made out to the real estate company and that money is deposited in a trust account, a non-interest bearing trust account. What has happened is that actually the bank or credit union,

wherever you have that trust account, has had the use of the money without having to pay any interest on it. Nobody's really had the benefit of it, and I think that is a fallacy.

And I think the bill is intended to correct that because, Madam Speaker, I know of a situation where an individual paid \$1,000 down and then a controversy arose between three or four lawyers who were involved because there were a number of real estate companies. As a result, that money stayed in the trust account for five years while the fight was going on. It could not be withdrawn for the people who made the offer. Nobody got any benefits out of it. I think this bill is trying to correct that situation. So, I have no difficulty with that because the present system is, I think, not an adequate system. I think if I'm correct, Madam Speaker, other provinces already have addressed this over a period of time, and I think it's overdue that we maybe make some changes in this direction.

There are problems the way it is right now and certainly, Madam Speaker, the banks should not be the ones who are getting the benefit of this thing. The fact that there should be interest drawn on this money and then the utilization of it either to the people who have the money there - you know, I have no argument with that aspect of it, that the benefit should accrue to somebody and, if nothing else, then to the Real Estate Board that adjudicates and is the authority in this case. Those portions, I have no difficulty with.

However, Madam Speaker, I want to draw some concern to the Ministers presenting this bill because what can happen, like I indicated, possibly in a rural setting, in a smaller-type of operation, it maybe becomes a bit more cumbersome that way. Madam Speaker, there are cases where individuals, when they make an offer to purchase, put down a \$10 deposit, a \$50 deposit or a \$100 deposit, and make that offer subject to financing being approved and stuff of that nature, which is understandable because if the financing cannot be approved the offer is null and void, the money comes back anyway.

Under these circumstances, Madam Speaker, each individual deposit or down payment has to be put in a separate account to draw interest. Now, I want to caution - you know, maybe the Minister can clarify that a little later on, but my impression of reading the bill, Madam Speaker, is that if an offer is made, a deposit is made out to the brokerage involved, the real estate broker, the broker then has to deposit that money and have a separate account for that. The difficulty that I'm trying to illustrate to the Minister is that, in some of these smaller operations, it gets to be very cumbersome.

I know of - now, I'll be careful so I don't necessarily allude too much circumstances because I'm not trying to create a conflict. We've done some checking on that, Madam Speaker, and it seems that we can speak to this, because it does not deal with our gain as real estate brokers and, as a result, we don't have conflict in speaking to this bill. That is why I want to raise some of the concerns.

For example, a limited real estate brokerage that doesn't maybe have a full-time secretary, maybe even part time, where you have this deposit being paid in, a down payment on a transaction, then that has to be - and we basically know what the rules are in a case

like that - until now, it had to be put into a non-interest-bearing account.

Under these circumstances, my question, Madam Speaker, is that it now has to be put into an interest-bearing account, and it is at the option of the individual who made the deposit whether he wants to collect interest on that. What I'm suggesting to the Minister, and possibly he can look at this and clarify it when he closes the debate on this thing somewhere along the line, whether there would not be a minimum amount that could be dealt with because, as I indicated before, many of these offers are subject to financing or subject to other conditions. That is why, in some cases, it's a low down payment but basically, regardless of how big the down payment is, the deposit that is being made, it's basically the vendor and the purchaser who basically will decide whether the deposit is adequate.

Madam Speaker, there is a lot of merit in this thing because there have been cases where people make a substantial deposit, maybe \$10,000 or \$20,000 in a case like that, and then instantly it makes a lot of difference if that money starts working or getting interest on it. I can see where possibly an account should be set up on the basis of that. But when we start talking of the more minimal amounts, that raises some concern with me. Madam Speaker, the Minister is shaking his head and is indicating that, somewhere along the line, maybe I'm not interpreting the bill correctly. I would appreciate if he could give us some indication.

Madam Speaker, I have a brother-in-law who was a real estate salesman in Kelowna, B.C. - he happens to be in Manitoba at the present time - and he indicated that B.C. at the present time has this kind of legislation in place, where these deposits have to be deposited and proper accounting kept on that.

Madam Speaker, at the present time, it is my understanding that all real estate brokers who take money have to do a proper accounting of it anyway, and rightfully so. There has always been, at the present time, because of the fact that it is supposed to be in a non-interest-bearing trust account, there has been a tendency and I know of some cases - I'm sure the Minister himself does, and the Real Estate Board certainly does - of cases where lawyers or maybe some realtors have taken and couldn't resist the temptation of utilizing that money for maybe their own purposes. I'm sure there are cases. I've had some correspondence, because the Real Estate Board from time to time reiterates the fact of the things that should or should not be done with trust money. I certainly feel supportive of that because, as I indicated, the tendency could be there, almost a temptation in some cases, depending, that money could be deposited and some revenue could be generated through that interest.

Madam Speaker, as I indicated initially, I think there is merit to this bill. I have no difficulty with it generally. I think possibly some of my colleagues, who are in the same position as myself, will wish to address maybe some comments on that. Generally, I feel that it's correcting a situation that should have been addressed maybe some time ago already, and I feel that we're on the right track.

I would just ask the Minister who's presenting this bill, in his closing comments somewhere along the line, that he would maybe clarify that aspect of it of the

minimum amount somewhere along the line, and exactly how extensive the record keeping has to be done before a certain amount and after a certain amount, or if there is any saw-off point where we can look at it, saying, well any deposit over \$100, \$200, \$500, that might apply a little differently.

Madam Speaker, with those remarks, I'd like to have the bill stand in the Member for Fort Garry's name. I believe there might be a few other comments, but I just wanted to raise my concerns, generally being supportive of it and hoping that we can have some clarification on that.

Madam Speaker, once the Minister has closed second debate on that, we can always pursue it further in committee, and hopefully there will be presentations from people involved as well that will come forward. As I indicated, I'm sure that the Minister will be looking at clarifying some concerns and, if need be, if there have to be some amendments, they could be brought forward.

MADAM SPEAKER: The bill will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 51, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Morris. (Stand)

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 52, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Morris. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 53, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Morris. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, Bill No. 56, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs, Bill No. 58, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 59, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 60, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Pembina. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 61, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Bill No. 62, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation, Bill No. 64, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 65, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emmerson. (Stand)

BILL NO. 66 - THE ELECTORAL DIVISIONS ACT (2)

MADAM SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister, Bill No. 66, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, with leave of the House, I'd like to speak to this bill, leaving it standing in the name of the Member for Lakeside.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise to ask some very serious questions with respect to Bill No. 66, that being An Act to Amend The Electoral Divisions Act (2).

Madam Speaker, as the House knows, this bill has been laid before us sponsored by the Premier, and it attempts to do basically one thing, Madam Speaker. It attempts to try and help the NDP out of a terrible dilemma. Madam Speaker, redistribution is upon us. And as indeed I know you are aware and all members of this House are aware, the government will no longer be able to hide behind constituencies that are undersized not only in Northern Manitoba but, I dare say, in the core of the City of Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker, there has to be a major reshuffling of the boundaries in the electoral divisions of this province.

No longer can a party, particularly the NDP party, come to the reins of power, Madam Speaker, having, for instance, out of the ten smallest-ranked seats, population wise, representation in nine of those seats. Madam Speaker, no way should a government come to power by having out of the ten largest populated seats, one riding out of the largest ten; the Conservatives having eight and the Member for River Heights being that other one within the top ten.

Madam Speaker, we saw in the last election a government that had 41.8 percent, I believe, in public support cast in their favour. Madam Speaker, the Conservative Party of Manitoba had 40.44 percent, and yet the seat count difference was four.

And you know, Madam Speaker, the anomaly of this situation is that there were many, many, constituents in Southern Manitoba, had they come out to vote, and I can think within my own riding of 2,000 individuals, that had they come out, would have, I know, in the favor of probably 2 to 1, supported the Conservative Party.

I could see where, under the existing boundaries, quite frankly, the public support to the Conservative Party of Manitoba could have enjoyed 45 percent, and still that would have represented not one difference in the seat count.

Madam Speaker, the NDP has a real problem. Some of us were waiting, oh, almost semi-smuggly, I would dare say, to see how it was they were going to address the problem. Finally, this bill did come forward, again sponsored by the Premier, requesting that this Legislature give direction to the commission, Madam Speaker, calling for seats, wholly or in part, above the 53rd parallel to have a variation of 25 percent - in this case, below the mean. Some who might not know the populations might say, well, why would they pick on the 53rd parallel? What's so significant about that?

Madam Speaker, for the record, the smallest constituency population wise - and I'm not going to

quote population statistics. What I will quote are registered voters because there's a strong correlation between registered voters and population.

Madam Speaker, it may be of some interest to members here gathered, and indeed those people in our public who read the record, to know that, for instance, the Constituency of Churchill had 6,570 registered voters - it's the smallest rank; 59th is the Constituency of Flin Flon with 8,485 registered voters; 49th, the Constituency of Ellice, right in the Core of Winnipeg - 10,504. Burrows, forty . . . well, I'm a little out of the ten ranking, Madam Speaker, but it was in the mid-40's in rank.

Continuing down this list, Madam Speaker: Logan, represented by the Minister for Small Business and Tourism, 52nd in rank, registered voters 9,276.

And as I continue: 53rd in rank, that being Rupertsland, having a registered voter count of 9,172.

Madam Speaker, 54th, the Constituency of The Pas - 8,720; and 56th, the second-smallest - that being Thompson - 8,111.

Madam Speaker, just so that I'm fair on the matter, there was one Conservative riding in the smallest ten constituencies. That was the riding of Morris with 10,685.

Madam Speaker, those are just numbers at this point. They are until you start to compare them to the larger size constituencies. You very quickly come to the Constituency of Niakwa, which is No. 1, having registered voters of 18,985, almost 19,000 versus 8,000.- (Interjection)- Yes, yes, the Member for Kildonan takes some solace because he's the one constituency out of the top ten, represented with an N.D. party. Madam Speaker, as he points out, he's second at 18,957.

Madam Speaker, what does a government do when they realize that the numbers that came into being 10 years ago, or roughly - when did they come in - roughly seven or eight years ago, were so skewed in their favour, how is it that they'd react to a situation like that? Well, they realized that to bring forward a 25 percent variation, as was allowed in the former act, really did a total disservice to the principle of one person/one vote. They're fully cognizant of that, Madam Speaker.

Indeed, the federal redistribution exercise that just occurred over the last year, all of the province, broken into 14 constituencies, all had variations less or greater than 10 percent, including Northern Manitoba. So that sort of represented some benchmark, some framework for them to follow. They couldn't pull an awful long distance away from what has been and will be coming into place in a federal sense.

Yet, Madam Speaker, members opposite realized how vulnerable they were in Northern Manitoba and they had to make a decision. They had to make a decision to either freeze in those seats, and there's been precedent for that occurring, particularly in Saskatchewan. But, Madam Speaker, the problem was that there were five northern seats, and how can you lock in five of them? Well, you couldn't. So the government decided, in their wisdom, to sponsor a bill - Bill No. 66 - which allows a 25 percent variation in those five seats. Madam Speaker, we will push them to give us the rationale why.

Madam Speaker, no longer can they say, like they have in the past, that the communities of the North

somehow should be treated differently than the rural communities, the rural ridings of the South. Madam Speaker, members opposite who represent those ridings - although I know at times, at a specific point in time, sometimes have great difficulty in reaching the communities within their constituency - for the most part and for the greater portion of the year have travel services far beyond some of the members, not all, but some of the members that represent Southern and Southwestern and Northwestern Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I see a few heads shaking over there, in disbelief, saying "You're wrong." Madam Speaker, the Constituency of Thompson is all contained within the area of 20 square miles and maybe less - all of it. Madam Speaker, what could possibly be the rationale for providing a 25 percent variation to the constituency of Thompson? Well, there's only one rationale, and that is, of course, it's represented by an NDP member, Madam Speaker.

And they realize fully well to add something on to Thompson and make it fall within the fair or 10 percent variation rule, of course, will cause a hurt either in the ridings of Churchill or Rupertsland. So, Madam Speaker, the members then, when they're making this argument as to the difficulty of serving the North, have to throw out the Thompson seat completely. They cannot bring it in their argument. So where do they go? Well, Madam Speaker, they may wish to go and then argue for The Pas, or indeed Flin Flon.

Madam Speaker, in discussions I've had with the Minister of Education, he's indicated that, you know, his constituency is rural in nature, too; that it takes him eight hours to drive across it. Well, Madam Speaker, I don't doubt that it does. Geographically, it is large. But, Madam Speaker, if one wants to go to the preliminary census figure, basis the 1986 census, and if one wants to look up Manitoba and look specifically into the census division covered by Flin Flon, that person will find a listing of roughly 12 locations where there are people. Twelve locations, not municipalities.

If you look at my riding, if you look at the riding for the MLA for Dauphin, Madam Speaker, you will see 12 entries also. But those, all of a sudden, are towns or villages or reserves, Madam Speaker. Those are municipalities. Those are municipalities with many hamlets and towns, Madam Speaker, and the Member for Dauphin knows of what it is I speak. For him to visit all of his hamlets and communities and towns, I dare say, is more onerous than many of his colleagues who represent the North.

So, Madam Speaker, the rationale that the government would want to use in the argument breaks down completely. We have people - those of us that represent Southern Manitoba and represent the Northwest part of Manitoba - we have people living on the mile. On the mile every mile. There isn't a Provincial Trunk Highway that can take us from one side of the constituency to the other, necessarily, that takes eight hours to travel. But Madam Speaker, there are members representing northern ridings over there who can access every one of their constituents in one quarter of the time than some of us who have purely rural constituencies.

The members opposite are going to have to address that, because, Madam Speaker, not to do so and put forward a strong argument is to say to the House we

Wednesday, 17 June, 1987

fear for the Northern seats as a government. There is no logic today, Madam Speaker, that can give the government a rationale for arguing that there should be 25 percent variation above the 53rd parallel. Absolutely none.

Madam Speaker, we will want to understand why the NDP is attempting to gerrymander the commission and, indeed, the rules of the next election - well, maybe not the rules of the next election, Madam Speaker. There's some thought that would say the NDP would love to call an election before the new rules come into place. I dare say I may be one of those people who believe that. But the point being, Madam Speaker, if one believes in the principle of one person one vote, indeed like the federal commission did when it brought forward its boundaries that has, for instance, my hamlet where I live south of Winnipeg being part of the Constituency of Portage-Interlake, I'm thrown into the same constituency as constituents of this province who live 150 to 200 miles north of Winnipeg. Madam Speaker, that was done because there was a principle that had to be followed.

Madam Speaker, I think if the members opposite are going to pull away from that principle, then they have to tell us why. Any threats by members opposite about, "we're going to read this speech up North," well, that's no threat. That's no threat. Go ahead. Because what they're saying is that they believe that the people of the North believe that the principle of one person one vote should be violated. I give the people of Northern Manitoba more credit than that, quite frankly, Madam Speaker. I give them a lot more credit than that. Nobody asks for an unfair portion of political power, other than

some of these people, Madam Speaker, who have no job to go to, indeed, if consolidation should rule that one of them could no longer represent a riding.

Madam Speaker, I'll listen very carefully to members opposite and hopefully they'll come forward and enter into debate on Bill 66 because, to me, it's an important bill and one that should be held in full public view. Indeed, I hope that the public of Manitoba takes a real, genuine interest in the rationales used for and against this bill.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The bill will continue to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

The hour being 5:00 p.m., Private Members' Business.

On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: There is an inclination on the part of the members to call it six o'clock and I'm quite willing to go along with that.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House? On the other hand, I need some direction, because I've called this resolution, on whether it goes to the bottom of the list. What is the will of the House? To pretend I didn't call it?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: With that understanding, the hour being 6:00 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow. (Thursday)