



First Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

37 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan
Speaker*



VOL. XXXVII No. 102 - 1:30 p.m., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1988.



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fourth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIBERAL
ANGUS, John	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BURRELL, Parker	Swan River	PC
CARR, James	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIBERAL
CHARLES, Gwen	Selkirk	LIBERAL
CHEEMA, Gulzar	Kildonan	LIBERAL
CHORNOPYSKI, William	Burrows	LIBERAL
CONNERY, Edward Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
COWAN, Jay	Churchill	NDP
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James Hon.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Emerson	PC
DRIEDGER, Herold, L.	Niakwa	LIBERAL
DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIBERAL
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Laurie	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
EVANS, Leonard	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen Hon.	Virten	PC
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
GILLESHAMMER, Harold	Minnedosa	PC
GRAY, Avis	Ellice	LIBERAL
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HEMPHILL, Maureen	Logan	NDP
KOZAK, Richard, J.	Transcona	LIBERAL
LAMOUREUX, Kevin, M.	Inkster	LIBERAL
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANDRAKE, Ed	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
McCRAE, James Hon.	Brandon West	PC
MINENKO, Mark	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
OLESON, Charlotte Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald Hon.	Pembina	PC
PANKRATZ, Helmut	La Verendrye	PC
PATTERSON, Allan	Radisson	LIBERAL
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	Rhineland	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren	Lac du Bonnet	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Turtle Mountain	PC
ROCH, Gilles	Springfield	LIBERAL
ROSE, Bob	St. Vital	LIBERAL
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
TAYLOR, Harold	Wolseley	LIBERAL
URUSKI, Bill	Interlake	NDP
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
YEO, Iva	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, December 20, 1988.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Helmut Pankratz (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

Mr. Clerk, William Remnant: Your committee met on Wednesday, December 14, 1988, at 8 p.m.; Thursday, December 15, 1988, at 10 a.m.; and Monday, December 19, 1988, at 10 a.m., in Room 255 of the Legislative Building.

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 14 - The Regulations Act; Loi sur les textes réglementaires

Bill No. 42 - An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate The Royal Winnipeg Rifles Foundation; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Royal Winnipeg Rifles Foundation"

Bill No. 48 - The Expropriation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'expropriation

Bill No. 49 - The Public Works Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les travaux publics

Bill No. 50 - The Brandon Charter Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Charte de Brandon

Bill No. 53 - The Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation Continuance Act; Loi sur la prorogation de la société Manitobaine du pétrole et du gaz naturel

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee also considered:

Bill No. 15 - The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act; Loi sur le fonds en fiducie de promotion de la coopération

Bill No. 21 - The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route

Bill No. 34 - The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités

Bill No. 45 - The Legislative Assembly and

Executive Council Conflict of Interest Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les conflits d'intérêts au sein de l'Assemblée législative et du Conseil exécutif

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your committee recommends that the fees paid with respect to the following Private Bill be refunded, less the cost of printing:

Bill No. 42 - An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate The Royal Winnipeg Rifles Foundation; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Royal Winnipeg Rifles Foundation"

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. Pankratz: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River (Mr. Burrell), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. Clerk: Your committee met on Thursday, December 15, 1988, and Monday, December 19, 1988, at 8 p.m.; and Tuesday, December 20, 1988, at 11 a.m., in Room 255 of the Legislative Building. Your committee elected Mr. John Angus as Chairman at the 11 a.m. meeting of Tuesday, December 20, 1988.

Your committee heard representations on Bills as follows:

Bill No. 38 - The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale

Mr. T. Dalmyrn - Canadian Mental Health Association

Bill No. 47 - The Liquor Control Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools

Mr. P. Meyer - Private Citizen

Mr. D. Sexsmith - Broadcasters Association of Manitoba

Mr. A. Peters - Private Citizen

Bill No. 11 - The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'exécution des ordonnances de garde

Ms. J. Bjornson - Manitoba Charter of Rights Coalition

Ms. B. Suek - Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women
Ms. M. Peek - Private Citizen
Mr. A. Hamer - Concerned Families for Fair Child Access
Mr. W. Muirhead - Concerned Families for Fair Child Access
Ms. S. Braid - Concerned Families for Fair Child Access
Ms. L. Lamb - National Association of Women and the Law
Dr. M. Matas - Manitoba Law Reform Association
Mr. J. King - Family Law Subsection, Manitoba Bar Association
Ms. R. Rachlis - Family Mediation Manitoba
Ms. N. McCormick - Private Citizen
Dr. C. Ross - FATHERS (Fathers Association to have Equal Rights)
Mr. F. Arnold - In the Best Interests of the Child
Ms. M. Arnold - In the Best Interests of the Child
Ms. K. Thibert - In the Best Interests of the Child
Mr. A. Gowryluk - In the Best Interests of the Child

Bill No. 40 - The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg

Mr. N. Turnette - Winnipeg Greens
Mr. F. Steele - City of Winnipeg
Mr. W. Kucharczyk - Private Citizen

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 12 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1988); Loi de 1988 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives

Bill No. 38 - The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale

Bill No. 52 - An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate "The Winnipeg Canoe Club"; Loi modifiant la Loi intitulée "An Act to Incorporate the Winnipeg Canoe Club"

And has agreed to report the same without amendments.

Your committee also considered:

Bill No. 11 - The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'exécution des ordonnances de garde

Bill No. 40 - The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg

Bill No. 47 - The Liquor Control Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. Angus: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources): I would like to table the Annual Report of the Conservation Districts of Manitoba for the year 1987-88.

* (1335)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Meech Lake Accord Position

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): This House spoke as one voice yesterday in withdrawing the Meech Lake Accord from our proceedings. My caucus and I agree with the sentiments expressed in the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) letter calling upon the Prime Minister to hold a First Ministers' Conference as soon as possible, and the Premier has said within a week. Since we will not have the benefit of public hearings, Mr. Speaker, it is, therefore, important to learn today from this Government what positions they will be taking to that conference on behalf of all Manitobans.

My question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings), will this Government take the position to the table that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms must be fundamental law and that nothing must take precedence to any changes in our Constitution, including any cause detailing "distinct society" for Quebec?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, it was, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) said, a very difficult day for all of us yesterday, but I want to indicate that before we get into a discussion today about positions that the province may put forward or that other provinces may want to bring forward that a full and complete assessment on our part, on behalf of the people of this province, will have to be undertaken to make sure that we are very conscious of the fact that we want to be nation builders.

Mrs. Carstairs: With a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier, yesterday, we heard the removal of the Meech Lake Accord but on Friday we heard very, very strong support from this Government for the same Accord. We must know, as Manitobans, what this Government's position is going to be, what it is. Why will they not inform us as to their position on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms today?

Mr. Cummings: First of all, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) would like to lead us into a hypothetical discussion prior to the opportunity for the Premiers of this country and the Prime Minister to have an opportunity to get together.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) has taken a very strong position regarding Meech Lake. We have always said that we wish to understand all aspects of the discussion. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) stated our reasons for the withdrawal of the motion yesterday, and I would suggest that we are, in entering

into this discussion today, doing nothing to reduce the level of feelings that can be generated at this time by this discussion.

Mrs. Carstairs: The Meech Lake Accord is hardly a hypothetical document. It is a document that has been signed by 10 Premiers and the First Minister. It is a document supported by this Government just last Friday in no uncertain terms.

Senate Reform

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) tell this House today if this Government, in a First Ministers' Conference which might take place as early as next week, will they take the position that unanimity must be removed from the Meech Lake Accord for the purpose of Senate reform and the entry of new provinces into Confederation?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): It is obvious that the Leader of the Opposition would like to lead this Government into putting forward positions in a highly charged atmosphere. I will take that question as notice.

National Standards

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, with a new question.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) of this province who should be speaking today for all of the caucus on that side of the House, will this Government take the position that programs established, which give access to federal funds, must have national standards and not national objectives as outlined in the Meech Lake Accord?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Again, given the emotional feelings of the day and the highly charged situation, I would like to advise the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Cummings) that the Government of Manitoba will put forward its position at the appropriate time.

* (1340)

First Ministers' Conference Meech Lake Accord

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): With a further supplementary to this Minister, does the Deputy Minister and does not his Government have a position to take to this First Ministers' Conference which they have asked to be held as early as next week, and what will that position be with regard to the holding of a constitutional conference on aboriginal rights as soon as possible that such a conference can be convened?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, obviously any position that we take to, first of all, a

hypothetical conference that we have not yet acquired the date—

An Honourable Member: You called for it.

Mr. Cummings: We have called for it, but we cannot provide it. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) stated our position yesterday in regard to calling for this conference and, as I stated a few minutes ago, under a highly charged and pressurized situation it would be only inflammatory for Manitoba to be putting forward strong positions at a time when we want to go to this conference and to act in a conciliatory and a nation building manner.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Deputy Minister, the Premier put a position on the floor of this Legislature on Friday. He put an entirely different position on the floor of this House yesterday. Can this Minister tell us what position, or is there no position, that this Government will take to the First Ministers' Conference which has been asked for by them, not by anyone else? What position will they take with regard to the Meech Lake Accord and all of the difficulties that have been enunciated by all the phone calls that all your Members received about the Meech Lake Accord?

Mr. Cummings: Well again, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) is anxious to justify some position that she may feel that she has taken very strongly, wishes for us to put—

Mrs. Carstairs: I do not need any justification.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) indicated yesterday that in light of certain decisions that were made over the weekend that we were entering into a situation where it would be very difficult to have discussions and hearings on principles and on the important parts of any debate without it becoming very emotional. I appeal to the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) that she consider that and that we, as Manitobans, consider in the light of that statement that we wish to be nation builders and act as conciliators in this instance.

Meech Lake Accord Consultations

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is also to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). On Friday, the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) suggested that there be a meeting of all Party leaders to deal with the feelings of Manitobans on the proposed Meech Lake Accord. It is a proposal in his speech that I welcomed, although I did not agree with all the contents of his presentation to this Legislature.

* (1345)

In light of the fact that we have all been hearing about the strengths and weaknesses of the Accord and

certainly those positions have been put forward for a number of months by a number of Manitobans, and in light of the fact that the First Minister has correctly called for a First Ministers' meeting to deal with the Constitutional Accord, can the Deputy Premier, in light of the Premier's comments last Friday, guarantee that the Leaders of the other two Parties will be involved in dealing with the strengths and weaknesses of the Accord so that the kind of consensus that the Premier asked for in his presentation last Friday can be incorporated into the feelings that are being expressed at the First Ministers' meeting that hopefully will be called in the new year to deal with this issue?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, we are ever mindful of the situation that we are a minority House. At the same time, we are also mindful of the willingness of our Premier (Mr. Filmon) to discuss matters with other Leaders in this province. It would be inappropriate for me to commit him to a deadline and to a meeting, but I can tell you that all of the concerns and the issues raised within this House will be part of his considerations.

Mr. Doer: I did not ask for a deadline. I just thought it was in keeping with the speech on Friday. I am going to go on to some other matters, Mr. Speaker.

Rafferty-Alameda Project Inter-basin Water Transfers

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): The Government has given us a number of assurances dealing with the Rafferty-Alameda project. We are in receipt of a letter now from the former Minister of Environment who signed the letter which we received on December 7, indicating that in the Rafferty-Alameda Dam the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States is discussing inter-basin alternatives for augmenting water flows in the Souris River system, a concern we raised when we first identified the money and the feasibility study for the U.S. Corps of Engineers, a concern we have been raising continually to try to square the discrepancy between the technical report that says it will take a number of years to replace the water and the Government's position that more water will flow under the Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project.

Can the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) please advise us of the position of Manitoba on this mid-Dakota project, which is just another term for the Garrison Diversion in terms of the future water quantity and quality in Manitoba?

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think we have on numerous occasions indicated to this House that it was not our Government but it was the previous Government that agreed to piping water out of the Garrison to the Cheyenne River which would supply water to Fargo, an inter-basin transfer of water which was agreed to by the previous administration—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Dauphin, on a point of order.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner) persists in putting misinformation on the record in this House. He has before. It was a matter of privilege. You, Mr. Speaker, in your ruling, said it was a point of order. The Minister has repeatedly referred to an agreement. There was no agreement on Garrison. Clearly, he was talking about a reformulation Act, which is not an agreement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. A dispute over facts is not a point of order.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, in a presentation made at a meeting in North Dakota, a former Minister of the previous Government proposed to North Dakota that this, the former NDP Government, would agree to the construction of a pipeline that would flow water out of Garrison and that the water be treated in such a manner that it would not allow biota transfer. I wonder if the NDP administration now is saying to us that no, you should not allow that same process to take place to transfer water out of Garrison to Minot. Are they saying to us now that we should go back—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I remind the Honourable Minister that answers to questions should be as brief as possible.

* (1350)

Environmental Impact Study

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). It is really out of frustration that nobody on the Government's side is taking care of the environment in Manitoba. That is the problem. We have the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner) in this damage control exercise because we do not have a Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) who is watching the store.

The same letter deals with the fact that there is not going to be an environmental impact study under the U.S. Corps of Engineers with the downstream effects of Manitoba, contrary to what the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner) has stated. Can the Deputy Premier please advise us why we have been given commitments to the downstream effect and why there is nobody, nobody on the Government side watching out for the environment in Manitoba?

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources): As I indicated just a few days ago, we as a Government of Manitoba had asked that the Army Corps of Engineers would extend its study in North Dakota to include that portion of North Dakota from Minot to the Manitoba border. We have asked for that study. We have not received any clear indication from the American Government or the Army Corps of Engineers that it will be done. But until such a time as we receive that indication, I am simply in no position to indicate whether it will or will not be done.

Environment Minister Resignation Request

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):

My question again is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). Mr. Speaker, we have had the Rafferty-Alameda situation taken out of the hands of the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery). We have the sludge still sitting on the railway tracks in Flin Flon. We have Leaf Rapid workers being told they are going to be paid and then not going to be paid. We have the City of Winnipeg breaching every part of the Environment Act that is imaginable.

My question to the Deputy Premier is will he be recommending when the Session closes that the Minister of Environment be replaced with somebody who will watch out for the environment on behalf of Manitoba?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Municipal Affairs):

I apologize for answering this question because it tends to dignify the type of question that was asked. When this Government took over, we were 10 out of 10 in environmental protection in this country, and he has the gall to look to our Minister and have it cured within six months.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Fort Osborne Barracks Heritage Site

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, in a request for proposals dated November 30, 1988, and advertised in various papers the week following, the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Albert Driedger) advised Manitobans that another piece of Manitoba's history may soon disappear and this is relating to the Fort Osborne Complex site. The same newspaper advertisement also advised that the deadline for proposals is January 13, 1989, some six or seven weeks after the request for proposals was included in the paper, and that people submitting proposals would require a \$100,000 deposit to be submitted along with it.

In the call for proposals, the Ministry of Government Services advises, "it is seeking to secure the best possible financial return to the Province of Manitoba." They also suggest that the proposals would be evaluated on a number of bases and Heritage Resources, of course, is included but towards the end.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson). I understand that she had met in early November with a heritage group who was interested in advocating that certain portions of the Fort Osborne site be designated as heritage sites. My question to her is, has the Minister designated any of the buildings or grounds at Fort Osborne as heritage sites or will developers decide what is important to the architectural history of this province? Will the public have input immediately before any decisions are being taken?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): I want to indicate quite clearly at

the outset that there was extensive consultation and cooperation between the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation and Government Services when this proposal call was put out. Our goal is to preserve as many heritage buildings as possible or that are proven to be feasible regarding cost, structural condition, zoning and re-use potential.

* (1355)

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko), with a supplementary question.

Mr. Minenko: With a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, certainly if the Government was interested, I am a little surprised then why Heritage Resources is towards the bottom of the list of the required elements to the proposal.

Development Proposals

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Albert Driedger). Will the Minister extend the date for the proposals to be submitted by at least six months so that various volunteer organizations can submit proposals, or does this Government already have a developer in mind?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Government Services): I take exception to the last portion of the question there because that is the reason why we have asked for a proposal call to allow input and, as far as the deadline is concerned of January 13, Mr. Speaker, we have consulted with the various advisers that we have and that is a normal time period that has been used in the past for this kind of a proposal call. So I see no difficulty with it and I have no intention of extending the deadline of January 13. However, it is certainly going to be the intention of ourselves, as Government, and the people involved with the proposal once we make that decision that there will be consultation with all groups involved.

Tender Deposit

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks): A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, can the Minister advise this House how the \$100,000 security amount was arrived at, and is he prepared to lower the amount of this deposit so that it does not scare away any community and interest groups who would be interested in participating in the process of enhancing and preserving our provincial heritage?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I might just indicate to the Member that the reason for the \$100,000 deposit is so that we have those people who are seriously considering being involved and putting forward a proposal call, instead of having this available to all

individuals who just come up. It is a very complex-type of situation that we are dealing with, and that is the reason why we have the \$100,000 deposit. If the individuals bring it back, they get their \$100,000 back.

Manitoba Telephone System Out-of-Court Settlements

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): My question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System (Mr. Findlay). Some time ago, the Minister took as notice my questions requesting information with regard to out-of-court settlements for former senior officials of MTS who had either resigned or been dismissed due to their role in the MTX affair. Subsequent to that, there have been media reports that such settlements have indeed been reached. Can the Minister now inform this House, who MTX has settled out of court with, how much were those individual settlements for, and when can Manitobans, the owners of this public utility, expect full disclosure of the details of these settlements?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Telephone Act): One individual has been settled with out of court. His name is Mr. Gordon Holland. The financial settlement was deemed to be a business decision that was appropriate given the costs of going to court and the potential costs of a settlement that may be occurring because of going to court. The amount, I care not to disclose. It was reported reasonably accurately in the newspaper, and that is the best I can say. That is the only individual that has been settled with out of court.

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, why has the Minister agreed to settle out of court with individuals who played a key role in the MTX affair which caused the loss of almost \$30 million worth of taxpayers' money, ratepayers' money, money which, by the way, could have been used to grant communities the toll-free access they want to Brandon and Winnipeg? But why would he have done that, rather than allow the court cases to proceed so that Manitobans could rightfully discover how much the Government knew about the whole MTX affair before it was exposed?

* (1400)

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, as I said, in the answer to my first question, it was a decision based on the financial consequences of going to court. If we went to court, we would incur court costs plus the settlement costs which we believe would have far exceeded the cost of settling out of court. (Interjection)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

MTX Information Release

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I accept and understand the Minister's answer that it is far better to save the taxpayers' money if the Government settles out of court with all the principals involved, but when

will this Minister take the necessary steps, given the fact that he is prepared to settle out of court to ensure that Manitobans are properly and rightfully informed of the exact details of this whole sordid episode in MTS' history, from the day it started during the Lyon administration to the present, or is the Government simply going to settle with every one concerned out of court to keep the whole matter hushed up?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Telephone Act): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Member that if he cares to check the records, he will find that the Order-in-Council was signed January 15, 1982. If you will check the record, you will find that the Conservatives were no longer in power at that point in time, no longer in power.

Mr. Roch: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Springfield, on a point of order.

Mr. Roch: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister did not even attempt to answer my question on the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roch: —matter being hushed up.

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roch: Will he now be given the opportunity to answer the question?

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Surely the Honourable Member who has been around as long as I have knows that what he raises is not a point of order and that he cannot compel certain answers from Ministers. He cannot tell the Ministers what the answers must be.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable—order, please. The Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch) does not have a point of order. Order, please.

Aboriginal Rights First Ministers' Conference

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): My question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Glen Cummings) and this is a very serious issue dealing with, of course, the Meech Lake and the lack of recognition of the aboriginal people in Canada. Once again, we have seen the provinces and the Canadian Government leaving out the aboriginal issue. The business dealing with the first nations of this country has never been concluded. We, as aboriginal people, have never been recognized as part of this country. We are the first citizens of this country. The paramount importance to this country should be to resolve the treaties and the promises that were made with the first nations of this country. Will the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) insist that the issues dealing

with aboriginal people be put on the agenda with the First Ministers' Conference?

An Honourable Member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the Party that the Member was part of Government with were signatories to the Accord which has now been withdrawn from this House. I want to assure him and assure all Manitobans that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) will take forward all of the concerns that are raised regarding the constitutional issues.

Mr. Harper: My supplementary question is to the same Minister, in dealing with the aboriginal issues, there has not been a word uttered from the Premier in regard to the aboriginal issues in Manitoba. I believe he has dealt with the Anglophone rights in Quebec but not the issue of aboriginal people in Manitoba.

Self-Government

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupert's Land): Will the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) have his Government meet with the aboriginal organizations to discuss the position of this Government in respect to self-Government and other aboriginal issues in respect to the First Ministers' Conference?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, obviously I have stated several times that as Government for this province, we will take into consideration all of the concerns that are brought forward and I appeal to the Members of the House that in the heat of discussion and the very charged atmosphere that the constitutional discussion is in right now, that we all look forward to being nation builders.

Position

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupert's Land): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) is that our Premier took the position of supporting the aboriginal people but did not get the support of the other Premiers and the First Minister of this country. (Interjection)- I am talking about Howard Pawley when he first took the position at the Meech Lake Conference. Will he insist that the first item be dealt with and the priority be placed on the aboriginal people in this country. We were the ones who were here first, the first nations of this country, the first people of this country and never have been afforded the recognition, not even developing the country of this rich country of Canada where you at least insist that the priority replaced is the aboriginal issue.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to repeat the answer that I have been giving all through Question Period and that is that as a responsive Government for the people of this province, our Premier (Mr. Filmon) will be putting forward all the concerns of people of this province.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Thank you, and if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, just a moment to thank you and all Members of this Legislature and the press gallery for all your kind words of congratulations on the occasion of the birth of Joseph Harry, who has turned out to be a surprisingly happy and content baby, despite having spent so much of his time in this Chamber before his birth. With respect to bringing him into the Chamber, I will be discussing that with you, Mr. Speaker, but for anyone interested he is in the NDP caucus room. You can come by and have a visit.

Day Care National Plan

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a serious question along the lines of the questions asked on Meech Lake. It is another serious national issue. It is to the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson). The Minister will know that yesterday a report was released by the National Council of Welfare entitled "Child Care—A Better Alternative." It is, as the Minister knows, an organization that is non-partisan and it has been appointed to advise the federal Minister of Health and Welfare on various issues including child care. Given that this report is so critical about the current plans of the federal Government to put in place a national day care strategy, would the Minister, in the vein of yesterday's decisive action, communicate Manitoba's concerns to Mr. Epp about the national day care plan and call on the federal Government to redraft that legislation and to reformulate the national day care plan?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Community Services): I thank the Member for her question. Yes, I received a copy of that report yesterday, not having had time to go over it thoroughly, however, and discuss it with colleagues, but I will assure the Member that I will discuss the matter with Mr. Epp.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: In doing so, would the Minister ensure the House that she will convey to Mr. Epp, the federal Minister, Manitobans' very grave concern about this plan and deep opposition to the tax incentives that are part of that plan, and ensure that the money is redirected to more necessary spaces and for better quality day care and for improved salaries for day care workers?

Mrs. Oleson: Yes, as I said I will be discussing the matter with Mr. Epp. I have not had time to study the rationale for the recommendations that the group made on the tax incentives. I will be taking a closer look at that and I will be discussing it with Mr. Epp.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: On a final supplementary, I trust that the Minister will be including in that appeal to Mr. Epp the concern about the absence of national objectives and standards in the current legislation.

My final question to the Minister is, will she make good on a promise that she made during Estimates to

table Manitoba's plan or submission to the federal Government for accessing funds through the national day care plan, a promise that she said she would do during Estimates? Would she make good on that promise and table that plan before the end of today's sitting?

Mrs. Oleson: I have to take that under advisement. The negotiations and the discussions with the federal Government were just about to commence when the election was called and meetings were being held. They are going to be held in discussions on the implementation of the federal plan. So I have had to go back to the department and see what is available.

* (1410)

Native Justice Inquiry Funding

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): I may take a little longer in my preamble, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will not mind. My question is for the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae). It is very serious. The Aboriginal Justice Inquiry has now made it very clear that to do a complete job they need an enlarged budget. We, as a province, I believe got into this important initiative, not completely knowing the scope of what we would find and I believe the commissioners are now telling us the potential scope of the report.

If we do not get the complete empirical data now from Native groups and from other research staff, the \$1.5 million committed to this will be wasted. By not supporting a thorough and complete job by this inquiry, what kind of a cost-benefit analysis exactly is the Attorney-General doing?

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, a little while ago, I could not help but take note of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) remarking that this Legislature can speak with one voice. Sometimes, to listen to the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) and I, you would wonder if that were possible, but in point of fact there are many times that we in this House speak with one voice and we have had occasion to work together in most cases in a very cooperative way.

So I just thought I would say before we finish this part of the Session that for the benefit of those out there in the public who think that all we ever do is disagree, maybe it does not sound like we are working together but we very often are. The Honourable Member raises the issue of the Native Justice Inquiry and the latest proposals coming forward from the inquiry. I would be happy to hear the Honourable Member's proposal as to how much further funding he thinks we should make available.

Mr. Edwards: I would suggest that a starting point should be the amounts that have been asked for by the inquiry. The Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) has previously said that he does not wish this inquiry to become like the Marshall Inquiry and cost many millions of dollars. We also share that desire, but a successful

inquiry in Manitoba will prevent the type of situation that led to the Marshall situation in Nova Scotia. Will the Attorney-General not look to the future and make a wise investment today, I would suggest, in this inquiry, and I would suggest a wise investment in the future of Manitoba's Natives? Will he specifically consider and assess the specific amounts asked for by the inquiry as a part of next year's Budget?

Mr. McCrae: The Honourable Member, without I suggest knowing an awful lot about what is being proposed by the inquiry, has suggested that to start with we should make available the \$440,000 being asked for. My query is, where do we end with?

The other point is he talks about considering and assessing the proposal. That is exactly what we are doing right now. We are looking also at proposals being brought forward by representatives of the Native community in our province. That is exactly what we are doing, so I do not have to take the Honourable Member's question as a representation, although I do. We are already doing exactly what he asks.

But I would like to know where the Honourable Member would like us to end with, because he talked about starting with an additional \$440,000.00. I suggest he and his Leader get together, plug that into the Liberal computer, along with all the other \$700 million worth of spending—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McCrae: —that they have been talking about during the course of this Session.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. James, with a final supplementary question.

Mr. Edwards: It is ridiculous, the suggestions the Attorney-General is making. I am very happy to see that he is taking our advice and he is looking at the request by the aboriginal groups, and he is looking at the request of the commissioners. That is the first time that has been on the record. So there is progress being made and—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Mr. Edwards: I look forward to the results of his assessment in a timely fashion. Given the national importance and interest in this inquiry, Mr. Speaker, will the Attorney-General advise this House whether he has been in contact with his federal counterparts to see if they are willing to contribute to the ongoing cost of this inquiry and to doing a thorough and complete job?

Mr. McCrae: It is interesting that the Honourable Member should note that this is the first time I am on the record. The Honourable Member should note that never have I been on the record as saying that I would not be considering and assessing. I have never said that. So the Honourable Member should be careful of the information that he puts on the record.

The fact is the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs has received \$100,000 in funding from the federal Government. The federal Government obviously knows this inquiry is up and is running, is doing a good job of hearing from Native peoples across this province. The media attention this matter has been given is a very positive thing because I believe that it is raising the consciousness in the public, is raising the sensitivity in the public to Native issues in Manitoba, Native justice issues in particular. Any potential systemic discrimination there might be in our system of justice towards Native people—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McCrae: —is becoming known by the people of Manitoba, making it easier for us to address.

Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Upgrading

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) will have time for one final question.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). The people of Flin Flon have been waiting for some eight months now for word from the provincial and federal Governments with respect to modernization at Flin Flon.

Given the increasing insecurity that is being felt by the 2,300 people who are employed by HBM&S, given the fact that there has been virtually no initiative shown by the provincial Government, will this Minister now, as we approach Christmas, take an interest in the welfare of the people in Flin Flon and the community and extract from the federal Government a commitment to proceed with the modernization at HBM&S to provide the financing that is needed to support the development of HBM&S in a timely fashion? Will he do that now for the people of Flin Flon?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): The negotiation for the funding of the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting smelter has been ongoing for some months now. They are not easy negotiations, Mr. Speaker. They total some \$130 million and it is not something that you can finish overnight.

The Member well knows the delicacy of the negotiations. I think in the best interest of both Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and the people of Flin Flon as well as the Government of Manitoba that this not be debated in a public forum. I will assure the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), however, that our commitment to the Town of Flin Flon and other northern communities remain and we will continue with our best efforts to conclude these negotiations.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I have committee changes.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders be amended as follows: the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) for the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards).

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) for the Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose).

Mr. Jay Cowan (Second Opposition House Leader): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders be amended as follows: Storie for Plohman.

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Mitchelson for Orchard; Helwer for Enns; and Gilleshammer for Ducharme.

I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders be amended as follows: Helwer for McCrae.

I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Mitchelson for Orchard.

* (1420)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Before going on to Orders of the Day, I would like to draw Honourable Members' attention to the loge to my left where we have with us today Mr. Gerard Lecuyer, the former Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson).

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ORDER FOR RETURN NO. 7

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupert's Land): I move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), that an Order of the House do issue for the return of the following information:

- (a) a list of all untendered contracts that have been let by the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs since assuming office; and

- (b) the dollar amounts of each of those untendered contracts and which individuals were awarded those contracts; and
- (c) the names of individuals who worked or will work on each of those contracts; and
- (d) the names, position titles, date starting, and pay rate for all individuals hired or appointed by the Minister for term positions, contracts and permanent positions since the Minister assumed office; and
- (e) the process the Minister will be putting in place regarding the recent announcement of a census to be conducted in northern Manitoba to ensure that qualified unemployed Northerners will be hired as census enumerators and census coordinators; and
- (f) a list of all the locations where the Minister will be bulletining the positions of census enumerators and census coordinators, as well as a copy of the written instructions the Minister has issued to ensure that northern residents will be aware of open competitions for those positions.

MOTION presented.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): This Order for Return is acceptable to the Government, and I might inform the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) that we are looking at the possibility also of providing a list of untendered contracts let by the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs from the previous Government as well.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

Mr. McCrae: When the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock) is in his chair, Mr. Speaker, I will move a motion.

PROPOSED MOTIONS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock), that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba adopt the bilingual Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, as set out in "Schedule A," in order to comply with the June 13, 1985, decision of the Supreme Court of Canada.

MOTION presented and carried.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the existing Rules of this House in bilingual form, which constitutes "Schedule A" to the motion that we have just dealt with.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that the fees paid with respect to the following Bills be refunded, less the cost of printing:

Bill No. 24 - An Act to Incorporate the Dauphin General Hospital Foundation

Bill No. 42 - An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Royal Winnipeg Rifles Foundation

Bill No. 52 - An Act to amend an Act to Incorporate the Winnipeg Canoe Club.

MOTION presented and carried.

Mr. McCrae: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that when the House adjourns today, it shall stand adjourned until a time fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the Government.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I understood that unless there was an agreement between the House Leaders that the motion should go now, that that motion be put at the end of the day, not prior to any accommodation that may or may not be made. There are no guarantees that any of the Government's legislation will pass today.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, with the multiplicity of motions that will be moving today, I would be happy to accede and to ask that be withdrawn at this moment and we will raise that matter later on today.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have leave to withdraw this one? (Agreed)

* (1430)

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Bills in the order as listed on the Order Paper, beginning at Page 2 with Bill No. 37 and Bill No. 35 and, after having completed those Bills standing on the Order Paper, standing in the name of the Government, but also the third readings of the Private Member's Bills that have reached that stage. Then following that, Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Bills in the following order: No. 11, No. 15, No. 21, No. 34, No. 40, No. 45, No. 47, No. 12—

An Honourable Member: The mikes are gone, the mike is dead. I was going to ask for a list so we could follow this in order.

Mr. McCrae: I will speak up, Mr. Speaker.

I ask that the Bills be called in the order listed on the Order Paper beginning at page 2, with Bills 37 and 35 and following. Then after completing the Bills as we see them on the Order Paper, a number of Bills have been reported from committees and they would be dealt with in the following order: Bill 11, Bill 15, Bill 21, Bill 34, Bill 40, Bill 45, Bill 47, Bill 12, Bill 14—Mr. Speaker, am I reciting these too fast for the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie)?—Bill 32, Bill 38—

An Honourable Member: Wait, wait, wait.

Mr. McCrae: Bill 42, Bill 48—you do not have to write Bill each time, just the number will do.

Mr. Speaker: Are we going to get through this?

Mr. McCrae: Did I say 48? Bill 49, Bill 50—

An Honourable Member: Bingo.

Mr. McCrae: Bill 52, Bill 53, Bill 55. Mr. Speaker, a number of the Bills that I have recited will require leave, and we can ask for that at the time we move those Bills if that—maybe we can cover that now by asking Honourable Members, the Bills that I have recited, if we could have leave to move those at third reading. If not, we could ask for leave at the beginning of each Bill.

Mr. Speaker: It appears that we will need leave Bill by Bill.

THIRD READING—AMENDED BILL

BILL NO. 37—THE CROWN CORPORATIONS PUBLIC REVIEW AND ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS ACT

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance) presented, by leave, Bill No. 37, The Crown Corporations Public Review and Accountability and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur l'examen public des activités des corporations de la Gouronne, l'obligation redditionnelle de celles-ci et certaines modifications corrélatives, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, we want to, on behalf of my Party, indicate that we have general support of course and will be supporting this Bill.

We are pleased that during the second reading we were able to achieve some improvement to the Bill that would allow for public hearings, public meetings to be held by various Crown corporations to ensure that the public has an opportunity for direct input into decisions of the Crown corporations. That was a feature of a Bill that we as a former Government had indicated was important in terms of approving accountability of Crown corporations, and that is why we brought it forward. With the cooperation of the Opposition Liberals in the House, we were able to have that amendment approved by this House.

I would actually indicate that I felt it was unfortunate that the Government did not see fit to include the issue of public meetings in the Bill to improve public accountability initially, where they would not have had to have had this amendment forced upon them. However, that is the case. We would have liked to see more public meetings provided for, up to seven or eight in the province for Crown corporations. However, we do have one in the City of Winnipeg, one in rural Manitoba and one in the North and that, of course, is a big improvement to ensure that Crown corporations are accessible to the public in terms of accountability and input on decisions that affect them. So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, we do support the Bill.

However, there was an amendment in second reading that the Government brought in which eliminated the reference to cost vacation systems as it applies to the Public Utilities Board in considering the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation's request for rate increases each year. We are told now by a number of groups that, in fact, this deletion of reference to classification systems was, in their mind, an error and will make it very difficult for the Public Utilities Board to in fact hold meaningful hearings and considerations of rate increases by MPIC.

As a matter of fact I believe that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) agrees with that position that was put forward through Legal Aid representing the Manitoba Society for Seniors and other groups in that, if classification systems were not able to be dealt with by the Public Utilities Board, they would not be able to do a meaningful job of considering rate increases. Now, we had brought that forward to the Minister of Finance for consideration. He has indicated from his seat that there would not be an amendment coming and, of course, we will have to wait and see whether this does make it very difficult for the Public Utilities Board to deal realistically and fairly with the issue of rate increases by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

If it does cause problems, I am sure the Minister is going to have to bring an amendment next year on this issue. So we regret then that we did not get a report in the short time that the Minister had this information from him as to whether he agreed with the assessment that this would provide a problem for the Public Utilities Board in dealing with MPIC and I of course would like to have clarification but, in any event, we will indicate support for this Bill.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, we too would like to voice our concern about the amendment that was made on second reading. We have also been approached about some concerns raised by persons acting on behalf of consumers, about the removal of classification systems from consideration by the Public Utilities Board.

Particularly, given the concern the public has about the operations of Autopac, and I realize some of this information came forward late and I would simply urge the Minister to take the time between now and the time we return to the House to review that information, to reconsider their position, and we would certainly be supportive of an amendment that corrects this deficiency in the Act. Beyond that, you know our concerns are on the record. We think the Act is an improvement over the previous Act. We are still concerned, given the actions of the Government on conflict of interest, why they insist on having MLAs on the boards, but we have registered those concerns and in principle we support the improvement that this Act brings to the control of Crown corporations.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill No. 37. Is it the pleasure of the House to—the Honourable Minister of Finance.

Mr. Manness: I could conclude debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Finance to close debate.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I will only spend a few minutes addressing a couple of points raised.

Firstly, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) asked with regard to an issue that he brought to my attention last week dealing with the exclusion of classification systems in one particular clause of the Bill. I would like to indicate for the record, Mr. Speaker, that when we drafted this Bill originally that we had great problems with the MPIC area as to how we could fully capture, in terms of the worded context, as to what direction to give the Public Utilities Board. As one recognizes, there are literally thousands and thousands of classification rates. We thought that it would be a bad directive to give to MPIC, in essence demanding them by way of legislation to look at each individual class. It was on that basis that we brought forward our amendment earlier to withdraw. We were certainly totally cognizant of the representation made by, Mr. Smeltz, particularly—Mr. Arne Peltz, pardon me, with regard to this particular—(Interjection)—I ask him to forgive me, Arne Peltz. Certainly they are cognizant of his wants in this respect.

* (1440)

But I must say to both Opposition Parties, from our viewpoint, it is best to see how this present application before the Public Utilities Board, given the broader range and yet without the specific directive, in essence, the legislative directive to the Public Utilities Board, that they should be allowed the opportunity to look at the thousands of different classifications, that if we could just try and bring it to a broader rate grouping. If that does not work out, if we find there are major problems with that, then certainly another year we are prepared to introduce amending legislation that will take care of it.

With regard to my final comments, I just want to go on record to say that I appreciate the efforts of the Opposition Parties. I think that democracy was well served in the committee. I think that certainly most of the representations made with respect to Bill No. 37 were done so on a high level of debate, and a level that I think which bore in mind the general interest of most Manitobans with respect to their Crown corporations.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words, I am glad that the House is consenting to passing Bill No. 37 and there is no doubt, because this is such wide-covering and enabling legislation, that there will be refinements that will be required to direct towards it, if not next Session, certainly in short order in the years to come.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

DEBATE ON THIRD READING

BILL NO. 35—THE LOAN ACT, 1988

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No.

35, The Loan Act, 1988; Loi d'emprunt de 1988, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): I will be brief as well. This particular Act is just one of the annual pieces of legislation brought forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to conclude the business of the province. This year's Loan Act, I do not think is remarkable in terms of the request that is being made to the Legislature. However, I did want to say that many of the projects that are going to be undertaken, as a result of this Supply, are important projects, whether they be through the Manitoba Telephone System or others.

I did want to put on record that—and I have painted this picture for the Minister of Finance on previous occasions—while our Crown corporations require authority to borrow money to develop the capital, the infrastructure of our Crown corporations, this Government, in my opinion, has lost and is losing opportunities to develop our economy, to use our Crown corporations, to expand the potential of our Crown corporations on many occasions.

We have a Bill before us in this Legislature which calls for the repeal of the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation. I have pointed out to the Minister responsible that by investing capital now in that corporation, he could be improving the Government's equity position in that corporation, improving its financial picture into the future and making it a more attractive corporation for sale.

Mr. Speaker, the Government's Loan Act requirements this year are modest, but I think that the Government itself is failing the people of Manitoba because it has no clear economic agenda. It has no clear private agenda, legislation, Government initiatives that would deal with the eroding situation in the Manitoba economy. The unemployment is growing, housing starts are dropping off. Clearly, rural Manitoba is in economic difficulty and I have spent the last weekend out in southwestern Manitoba and can tell you that there are considerable hardships being experienced in the business community in that part of the world.

The Government's agenda either in the private or the public sector—and that is our Crown corporations—is desperately lacking. This Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is going to stand up and tell us, no, you know our Budget projections are right on. I hope the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) can stand up and tell the House that next March and next June, because I think that the impact of the drought, for example, has not been felt at all through our economy and will not be felt for some months to come.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to let this particular Act proceed. I hope the Minister of Finance heeds the warning and is developing a blueprint for economic development for kick-starting our economy in selected areas over the next few months, if in fact our predictions and what seem to be the economic indicators come to fruition and the economy does start to seriously slow down. We start to see unemployment increasing

dramatically, we see a continuation of the trend of migration out of the province. We want jobs in this province for our young people. We want them to have an opportunity here in Manitoba. I hope that this Minister is not going to sit on his hands when he has at his disposal tools to prevent the erosion of our economy and its performance over the past five years. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, again I thank the Members opposite for the expeditious manner in which they have debated this Bill. Although I would hope another year I will attempt to introduce it even more quickly in the Session, and maybe they may deem fit in passing it more quickly also.

Let me say, in listening to the MLA for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), he says it is remarkable or he said it is unremarkable, it is just an ordinary Bill. In my view, it is very remarkable. It is the lowest loan authority that I have experienced in sitting in this House for eight years where any Finance Minister has come to this House and requested the support of all Members. Let me say, I think it is remarkable with respect to that alone.

The Member opposite—I am glad he was in the southwest part of the province this past weekend or over the last number of weeks. I am glad he has had an opportunity to return to his roots to see exactly the status of rural agriculture. That is not because primarily of the fact there had been an NDP Government in place for a number of years, and certainly it is not because we have come in as a new Government. It is because agriculture has experienced some severe difficulties over basically the whole decade of the 1980s. He does not have to tell me about the seriousness of the business community that he saw first-hand. Maybe for the first time in a long time, maybe it came to some revelation to him because of course it is real, it exists.

I think I have to make comment with respect to Crown borrowing. There is nothing wrong with Crown corporations borrowing but let it be said that, once their levels of debt versus equity begin to achieve 90 percent plus, they move to the realm where indeed, if they are subjected to any type of vagaries, the ratepayer is hit with incredible shock, and that is ultimately what has happened with respect to a number of the Crowns.

So, if Crowns have no great degree of debt and they begin to become involved in a major capital expenditure that necessitates debt, that is all and well. Nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, there is no great impact. But our Crowns, unfortunately, find themselves in a position today where they have a very high debt-to-equity ratio and indeed, I think, have to be watched and restrained to some degree.

Now, I will stop by making the final comment that the Members opposite seem to take some great delight in seeing some economic indicators that would bring forward a reflection of the economy, which is little less than robust. I cannot help particularly thinking of the MLA for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) a great purveyor of doom, who seems to take great delight in

any individual specific economic indicator that would tend to reflect an economy that is maybe slowing down.

* (1450)

Mr. Speaker, let me say it and I will say it for the final time probably this Session that the economy of the Province of Manitoba, the provincial economy today is well positioned to move into the decade of the 1990s. Let me say furthermore that without doubt, there is going to be a slowdown in the national economy. That is inevitable. You cannot have 30 straight quarters of strong economic growth, as we have had in this nation, without some type of moderation. It is going to happen. As a matter of fact, it is one of the reasons why the Bank of Canada, I suppose, is ensuring that inflation does not get out of hand. That is the offset. The offset will be a moderation in economic growth.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to the finances of this province, that the news that will be forthcoming in the months to come, as it reflects in our third quarter and our fourth-quarter financial results, will be such that Manitobans will be very well satisfied as to the competence of this Government to manage well, firstly; and secondly, to put it on to a stable footing for the economic growth years of the 1990s that will return to us again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

THIRD READINGS—AMENDED BILLS BILL NO. 8—THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH SMALL CLAIMS PRACTICES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance) presented, by leave, Bill No. 8, The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): I simply request leave for a brief moment to make a final comment on this Bill. The Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) put forward this Bill and, at the committee stage, myself and the Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) and I believe others made serious comments about the Bill in terms of what it does not do. I simply want to reiterate those concerns as we move into passing this legislation, which does bring improvements to the working of small claims in this province. We have high hopes that small claims will become an even greater asset to the people of this province. We know from experience in this province that the court system does have problems in serving what can commonly be called small-time litigants; those are people who simply want the court system to deal with their differences but do not want to spend \$10,000 or \$15,000 litigating. The fact is that in today's world that is what it costs to run the course of a full Queen's Bench civil trial.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mark Minenko, in the Chair.)

To that extent, we look forward to some innovative improvements to the small claims procedure far beyond the scope of this Bill. We look with great interest at the Law Reform Commission Report of 1986 and look forward to some of the feasibility studies that we asked the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) for at the committee stage but which he was unable to produce.

Mr. Manness: On behalf of the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae), let me say that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Close debate.

Mr. Manness: —I will bring to his attention again some of the information that was sought by the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards). I am sure he will respond in due course to those questions that were posed at that time.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 23—THE REGULATIONS VALIDATION STATUTES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance) presented Bill No. 23, The Regulations Validation Statutes Amendment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): There are a number of Bills which fall into line in the re-enactment process as a result of the Supreme Court decision, and I propose to speak briefly at this time and then simply reference that with respect to the other Bills.

At the committee stage, these were dealt with fairly summarily on the understanding from the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) that these Acts had no substantive impact and that they were simply put into place in a timely fashion so that we could meet the ruling of the court, and I think that ruling of the court today and this week is particularly germane to be speaking about it in this House. That was a court ruling which was not easy to comply with in terms of the translating of all of our statutes.

This has been a very great chore for many, many individuals to work at, and I would simply reiterate our commendation to them for a very fine job on all of the translation which they have done and on this group of re-enactment statutes which will, hopefully, serve us well in the future. I am sure they will. We on this side of the House certainly support the decision to translate our laws. We think it is an important step forward for this province and, in that regard, we are pleased to support this group of statutes.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 27—THE PRIVATE ACTS REPEAL ACT

BILL NO. 27 was read a third time and passed.

BILL No. 28—THE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS' ORGANIZATION FUNDING ACT

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance) presented Bill No. 28, The Agricultural Producers' Organization Funding Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say a few words before having this Bill end its legislative motion and move into its operative role.

I do have concerns with this legislation and I have raised them in committee, particularly, Sir, that this Bill does not give the farmers of this province the option of deciding whether there should be a vote on a general farm organization. Someone else will make that decision. In fact, it will be the certifying body.

* (1500)

Even on that issue, the question of whether there shall be a referendum in the case of a farm vote is of secondary nature in terms of the authority of the Bill. It gives that authority to the certifying agency but it is a "may" and it is one of the considerations. The prime consideration under that legislation is the membership numbers of whichever group is applying. I think that was very clear in terms of the discussions we had.

As well, we debated and discussed the issue of the "opt-out" provision. I believe, and I do not know why the Government and even the Liberal Party had concerns about this and would not accede to the amendment to allow an "opt-out" provision that is constant both in Parts I to III as it is in Part IV of the Act.

We put forward the case that if a new group was trying to be certified there would have to be a letter written to the members who were there before, because I am sure many of those members who were supporting another group or the original group that was certified would not likely wish to contribute at least for the short period of time to a new group that was challenging the certified farm group. Quite frankly, at that time, there would not need to be a rerequest by the producer to actually opt out of that new group.

While we support the whole question of the commodity groups having the right for a checkoff, that certainly is a part of the Bill that we support. The main features of the Bill, I believe, will entrench a certified farm organization based on the rules that are presently in this Bill and will really not allow for a healthy challenge, given the political reality in the farm community in this province over the years.

There is a plurality of political viewpoints and the only way that change will occur under this legislation

will be by pure apathy itself. It will be the disintegration and disinterest of the farm population that will spell the demise of a central agency.

That is unfortunate. I would have thought that the Government would be prepared to allow a fair bit of debate in the farm community and a fair bit of activity in terms of organization and determination as to which groups will represent the farm community. Our druthers would have been to allow farmers clearly to make a choice, whether it be by one group, two, or even three groups, but that was not to be.

With those concerns, I am sure that we will see the Bill move on, and I anticipate that there will be a fair bit of concern in the farm community because there are many in the farm community who will not be aware of all the ramifications of this legislation, some of whom would have wanted the clear choice to make their own choice as to which farm organization represents them.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): I am pleased to be able to indicate that the Official Opposition supports this Bill. I think that it got a good level of good hearing in the public hearings that were held. I was a little concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the element of time was against us in some respects in that the Bill came forward and the public hearings were held so shortly after the passage of the Bill to the committee and I was surprised, frankly, to see the level of interest that was generated and the number of presentations that were made.

I was though somewhat concerned by the comments that were made by some of those who appeared before the committee about what they felt was a lack of knowledge about the Bill and the implications of it to the farm public, particularly when one of the presenters indicated that he felt that perhaps as many as 75 percent of the producers were not aware of the implications of this Bill. I think it behooves the Government to make sure that there is a considerable amount of publicity, and there may even be a necessity to have informational hearings so that there is good understanding of the implications of this Bill in the rural communities before in fact it comes into practice.

I think there is also, with the minor amendments that were made, additional responsibility placed on the certifying agency. The agency now has the opportunity to look at not only the documents that are submitted by the organizations that are seeking certification, but it also has the opportunity to hold public hearings if it is deemed that would be advisable. In addition to that, it has the opportunity to conduct a referendum if it feels that would be appropriate.

I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the certifying agency, while we want to ensure that this is always at arm's length from the Government, I think it is the responsibility of the Government to reinforce once again the scope that certifying agency has when it is attempting to make its determination of which organization should in fact be certified. I have some concerns that it should not be simply a numerical issue when they are trying to decide which organization should in fact be certified. I think they have to bear in mind

always that we are talking about something in the range of 25,000 to 27,000 producers in the province and that any one of the organizations that is seeking certification is a long way from having the so-called majority of the producers within its membership lists.

They have to be cognizant of that fact and I think that they should, particularly in the early stages of this program, be prepared to go to a referendum if there is any doubt in their mind whatever as to the level of support that any of these organizations have within the community. We know on the basis of those who appeared before the committee that there is considerable disagreement in the rural communities about who should represent them. Should it in fact be only one organization? I think that it is certainly the intent of this Bill to move towards some strong voice, some unanimity insofar as the voice of the farmer is concerned, and I think everything should be done within the power of Government to ensure that we gain that unanimity and that this does not end up being a divisive Bill because of the way in which it is handled.

One other concern that I think came forward and has been mentioned by my colleague from the Interlake (Mr. Uruski) is what appears to be the potential for having one organization represent farmers in perpetuity. That is what appears to be a difficult arrangement in terms of anyone, any other group, challenging the first one that is certified. I think that this needs to be looked at. It may even warrant some amendment to the legislation at a later date.

As long as members who are checked off are identified as being full-fledged members of a certified organization and the certifying agency looks only at the membership, it is very difficult to conceive a challenging organization being able to demonstrate membership that would be equivalent or greater than the one that was first organized or first certified. I think this has to be looked at carefully as to the long-term implications of that, because I think what one can infer from it is the first organization certified will remain certified unless it rots from within. It is going to have to be internal disintegration that is going to force the change in the certified agency. I think this is a critical issue that needs to be looked at.

* (1510)

I am also a little concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the whole issue of remuneration for those who are responsible for the collection of fees is left a little bit up in the air and I assume will have to be dealt with in considerable detail in the regulations when they are brought forward, but I would just pass on to the Minister that I think a balance has to be struck between when the legislation becomes effective in relation to getting all the mechanics of it in order.

It seems to me that we are looking at a fairly complicated procedure as far as getting a list of producers, making sure that there is not duplication of producers, that type of thing. While I may be overemphasizing this, it looks to me as though the mechanics of this Bill will be relatively complex and, if it is necessary, I think the Minister should be prepared

to even consider a delay in implementation in order to make sure that the mechanics of it are well-thought-out and that in fact it can be made operative rather than have a bunch of headaches over the day-to-day operation of it, because this looks to me as though it has the potential to create some further problems if it is introduced before the mechanics of it are clearly spelled out.

But with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do feel that this is landmark legislation. It has been something that we hope a majority of producers have wanted for a long time. I think that attitude has been expressed and I think there is general support for it in the farming community. With that, I hope that it moves forward and that it is effective in bringing about what the anticipated results are.

Mr. John Plohma (Dauphin): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to express some serious reservations along with my colleague, the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), on this Bill and, as a matter of fact, very similar reservations that were expressed by the Liberal agricultural critic, even though when he had an opportunity to ensure that amendments were passed which would have improved this Bill to ensure that there was fairness and equity and a democratic process in place for the designation certification of an agency, he chose not to support those amendments. I find it rather ironic that at this point in time he now comments on this Bill, raising a number of concerns that he could have dealt with in committee and had ensured that there was this fairness.

I was not able to participate in the final hearings of this Bill in committee because of other committees sitting at that time, so I did want to put a few comments on the record with regard to this Bill. I noted when the presenters were making their pitch at committee late last week in the evening that one presenter said that it was rather ironic that this Bill seems to play on the very apathy that exists within many organizations, in this case among farmers with regard to ensuring that they have a strong voice by the fact that it is the requirement for this organization to exist in the first place, because of the apathy that exists and, therefore, there is a requirement to have an organization that is legislated.

Now, if farmers or producers in the past had been able to organize in a voluntary way, naturally there would not have to be a compulsory check-off, but in essence those who want to write themselves out, pretending to be in essence the same as they have been in the past in supporting an organization, will tend not to do that even though they may feel that the organization is not fully representing them. So in fact we will end up with a lot every two years. What would in fact happen is that a lot of farmers would indeed be a member of this organization because they had not written themselves out and, therefore, the appearance of support would be much greater.

Because of the apathy issue, then it would really be the case, it would be warranted. So it would be very difficult for another organization ever to achieve any degree of support that the certifying agency could look

at when determining if indeed there should be some other organization representing the farmers of this province. Because in fact, if they go by numbers, some 27,000 producers, over half of those producers would have to write themselves out in order to leave the impression that there is not the support of 50 percent of the producers. That is very unlikely that would ever happen, because it is a conscious decision that has to be made by these producers and they have to actually undertake a process in order for that to happen.

So I find it almost impossible from what I can see here that another organization could ever represent the producers and in fact it would be entrenched by that organization, being probably KAP, with only 5,000 of the farmers in this province as members, the most of course of any organization, but still only 5,000 out of some 27,000. Therefore initially it will take a very small number of producers to get certified and after that it will be almost impossible, even if another organization had 5,000 to be recognized as being anywhere close to the support that the certified agency has. So I think it is somewhat undemocratic and I think we should have had a provision, at least initially, for a referendum amongst producers so they could have chosen. If two organizations came forward, they could have made a conscious decision by way of vote as to who they want to represent them. Yet that decision is left up to a third party, to the agency, if they so choose. That is undemocratic in my mind and I think that, therefore, I have a great deal of difficulty with this Bill, even though I support strongly the need for a strong agricultural organization in this province.

I said that in public forums, during the last election, at the KAP meetings, but the method of doing it is not the one we support and the vehicle that this Government has chosen, drawn up largely by KAP—I should say, this Act, largely by Kap, maybe 90 percent of it is produced by KAP.

That means it is a sweetheart deal, as my colleague says, where a small group has drawn up the legislation and made it almost impossible in the future for another organization to ever gain the support required to represent the producers of this province. I think that is unfortunate and I think it should not be a closed shop here. There should have been a greater opportunity and there was an opportunity during the committee meetings to move amendments that would have ensured a more democratic process. That was not done and unfortunately now we are at the stage where it is a little bit too late. The Liberals have supported this even though they have concerns. I think that will come back to haunt them later on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture will be closing debate.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): It is indeed a pleasure to rise and to take this opportunity to close debate on this very important piece of legislation which, as other people have mentioned, will be historical in the future. It is landmark kind of legislation which recognizes what many producers in the Province of Manitoba have wanted for some time, and that is a vehicle to check off producers at large

so that there can be a strong farm organization. The Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) says he wants a strong voice for farmers in Manitoba, and that is exactly what this legislation is going to present to the farm community.

I guess I take extreme offence to the comments that this is not democratic. This is democratic to the "nth" degree. First off, every producer has the up-front option of voting himself out of the organization. He never has to be checked off. Secondly, with regard to the challenge aspect that the Member for the Interlake (Mr. Uruski) and the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) mentioned, there are really two opportunities for a new organization to challenge the existing organization, should it be KAP.

One is internal. Internally, there is a democratic process in place. If KAP is the organization, there are 12 districts set up where all the (Interjection)- For the information of the Member for Dauphin, the process of setting up the general farm organization, now known as KAP, is extremely democratic. Every year, there are elections at the local level to elect the members that go to the general council, some 48 members. There is election internally then for the executive of the organization.

* (1520)

If that organization is not representing the interests of the farm population, that is where the internal politics start. That is where the internal democracy starts, in terms of the people you elect to go on the general council to direct the organization. Secondly, if over a period of time, the organization through the people they elect does not fairly represent the farm population, their membership will fall off through the opt-out. It will fall off drastically through the opt-out and if they really are doing a terrible job, a new organization will start up, just like KAP did.

They started up in response to a need for representation of their issues at the provincial level, at the federal level and even at the international level. There has been a large ground swell of support for this organization and for the democratic principles of setting up this organization.

I think there is no question in my mind that the certifying agency has been given sufficient power to deal with the wide variety of circumstances that may unfold in the future. We did make an amendment through the committee stage to 23(b) allowing the certifying agency to conduct the referendum if, in their wisdom, they thought that was a necessary vehicle to determine which organization should represent the farm population of Manitoba. I think that there was a reasonable degree of support for that addition to 23 because it gave a clear signal to the certifying agency that additional opportunity was at their disposal. We believed it was really at their disposal anyway because they were allowed to take whatever steps or proceedings which it considers necessary or desirable. I mean, that throws the waterfront wide open.

Certainly another comment made by the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) was that he was not in favour of the requirement that farmers have to reaffirm their

desire to opt out every two years and, clearly, there is the opportunity of a new organization at some two-year interval down the road, and the only reason we require reaffirmation is that people then have a choice as to whether they support the organization that came forward to be certified or the policies of that organization as they unfold over time. We require them to reaffirm their support or give them an opportunity to withdraw their support. That is why we give them that letter every two years to carry out that.

I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will definitely take into consideration the general comments that all the critics made. Certainly the mechanics of implementation are something that we want to be sure are in place, but I will just remind the Members that really all the Bill does is set up the mechanism for the checkoff and the certification of a particular farm organization. Technically and legally, it is their responsibility from then on, and they live and die with what they do, in terms of how they treat the farm community. We think we have a large group of very aggressive and capable farm leaders in rural Manitoba. There are a large number of issues that the farm community must make representation on, and I do not think the number of issues is going to decline in the coming years. We believe the mechanism in this Bill will give them an opportunity to present that voice to whoever is in Government, federally and provincially, and be able to recognize the abilities of the farm community to speak on their behalf.

With that, I would like to close debate on this Bill, and I hope that all Members of the House will support the Bill in this its third reading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would just like to advise all Honourable Members that on third reading there is no closing of debate.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 29—THE CATTLE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Municipal Affairs) presented Bill No. 29, The Cattle Producers Association Amendment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not take too much time but clearly this Bill is not required. We have just passed Bill No. 28, which sets out the procedures by which any commodity group can obtain a promotional checkoff by virtue of either (a) a petition, or (b) by referendum if there is not the support of at least 60 percent of its members.

What we have here in this Bill—and it was brought out very clearly by members of MPCA before the committee—they did have a compulsory checkoff prior to 1984 and those revenues, they said at committee were coming in at about \$200,000 per year. The moment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we said that those revenues shall be voluntary, that a producer has the

right to opt out at the time he or she sells their animals—and in fact I said to the organization that, if they wanted an ongoing checkoff by the use of a manifest system, I was prepared to allow that. They discarded that suggestion.

We are back bringing this Bill in again in a slightly different form—I will admit in a slightly different form—of a checkoff, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But what we are signalling here to the farmers of Manitoba is that if you are a member of MCPA you have one set of rules, and if you belong to any other commodity group we have a different set of rules for you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is totally inconsistent, it is contrary, it can only be viewed as nothing more or nothing less than a political payoff to MCPA for their support of the Conservative Party—nothing more, nothing less, and I hear the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson) saying, oh come on.

If that is the case, then the rules are there. They are very clear in Bill No. 28. They have the voluntary checkoff now within their present legislation. If they want something more, they can apply under Bill 28 and the procedures are there. This Bill is not necessary. It is contrary to the signals and what we are saying to the farm community in Bill 28.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): I am not going to get into an argument with my honourable colleague to my left here. As far as I am concerned, we are looking at a Bill where we are simply bringing about the reinstatement of the checkoff procedures. I guess, to put it very simply, I am prepared or willing to look at this as essentially a grandfather approach to something.

It has been in place. It is simply a case of re-enacting what they had and re-enacting it in a somewhat improved form. Therefore, I am prepared, and the Members of the Official Opposition, to support this Bill. I think that it is essential that the Cattle Producers Association have this opportunity, because I think most of us would agree that there are some major problems within the beef industry at the present time. I am not going to attempt to determine who is to blame for that.

I think each one can look at the situation and know that something has happened that has taken most of our feedlot industry away and we are now in the situation where we have nothing significant in the way of a packing industry as far as beef is concerned. I think that this is an opportunity for those who are producing the cattle to take their future into their own hands and attempt to bring back the beef industry to what it was a few years ago.

The one concern that I do have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the split that has occurred within the organization between the Manitoba Cattle Producers Association and the Manitoba Cattle Feeders' Association. I am pleased to see that there has been some attempt to reinstate them as one organization rather than look at the feasibility of having a double checkoff, which would be the case if the Cattle Feeders' Association were attempting to have a separate checkoff.

I am willing at this point to have the confidence that organization can get its act in order and operate in a unified forum in the future. I wish them success in doing this and, while one can argue that the Bill is not essential because of the implications that it could be handled through Bill 28, I think perhaps the Minister could have solved some of this by having the numbers reversed. At least we would have been looking at them in a more appropriate chronological order, if nothing else. But I am satisfied that there is some urgency to this Bill. I am not convinced that Bill 28 will be in place as fast as their opportunity to get 29 into place for the Cattle Producers Association and, on that basis, I will certainly lend it my support.

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): I would like to make a few comments on Bill 29 and I missed the opportunity to speak on Bill 28. I just want to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I think it is important that the agriculture community have a strong voice. I do not think it is not necessary that it be one strong voice. I think the example that was brought forward by some of the presenters during the committee stage which pointed to the Legislative Assembly as an example which it showed a representation of three different Parties here and their strong voice for the citizens of Manitoba.

I think there is an opportunity out there for strong representation in the farming community as well. They can be accommodated, just as this Legislature is accommodated. There are three different perspectives brought forward to this Legislature. That same type of perspective could come forward in the farm community as well. So I do not think it is really necessary to restrict it to one. I am disappointed that we could not get the Liberals to agree to the amendment to have more than one organization.

I also was disappointed that the Liberals did not support us when we brought a resolution forward or an amendment forward for continuing opting out. I think the Minister explained why every two years they have to do it again—every two years. I am referring to Bill 28. I think it would have been more acceptable to the farming community to be able to opt out once and stay out until they made the decision to go back in but that has already been passed.

On Bill 29, I think the previous Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) spoke and said it was not necessary for this because Bill 28 puts in place a process for a commodity group to establish themselves. I do not know why we should be giving preferential treatment to one organization. Why should they be any different than the commodity group or any other group that is out there? The Cattle Producers Association was in place previously. The spokesman at the committee told us that there was \$200,000 revenue coming in on an annual basis.

Once that automatic checkoff was done away with, then the revenue dropped down to 20,000 members. I think it shows you that they were not doing that good a job of representing their organizations. Otherwise, they would have continued to support that organization. I do not think it is necessary to have this Bill. I think that we should pull it and let them go through the same

* (1530)

process as any other commodity group would have to go through under Bill 28. With that, I conclude my remarks.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): The Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) indicated that I am very concerned about this Bill. He is right.

I will have to say at the outset that just because this existed before, as the Liberal critic has mentioned, it does not mean that it has to exist again. It does not mean that it was right before. There is a voluntary checkoff system in place. What this Minister is saying is that it is not good enough for this group. In fact, what they need now is to have legislated support for their organization.

I cannot understand why this Minister would bring this in at this time, unless it was simply to appease or reward a group that had given him and his Party political support in the past, as opposed to dealing with it in a consistent way when he has brought in Bill 28 which deals with the issue of a farm organization that he now brings in separate rules for one commodity organization simply because they happen to have had this before, if you follow the reasoning of the Liberal critic. The fact is they have the voluntary checkoff system in place at the present time. There was no need for this amendment at this time except, as my colleague has said, as a political payoff to this organization for their support for this Party, this Government.

We cannot support special status for one commodity group, one agriculture organization nor can we, more importantly, support something—and I do not think the Minister should be able to support a process that is inconsistent with the legislation that he has just passed and the provisions that it provides for commodity groups in that legislation with a referendum or petition being required in order to have that kind of a checkoff for that organization. So in fact he is setting up a separate system for one commodity group. I do not understand how he feels that is consistent with his legislation that he has brought in.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

We cannot support this legislation under those terms and, therefore, will be voting against this legislation.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): It is indeed a pleasure to be able to make a few comments on this Bill, especially after the comments from the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) and the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), who sat as Cabinet and so unceremoniously removed the checkoff provision that was in place under Bill No. C-25. In 1983, they decided that only one organization should have their checkoff removed. They want to have a voluntary checkoff for an organization.

If they had any level of consistency in their approach to organization funding, they would have made all the unions have voluntary checkoffs, not mandatory. They had no level of consistency. They said they wanted to remove the funding mechanism for MCPA. It was purely a political decision on behalf of that Cabinet. If they believed that voluntary funding is the way to go, why

did they not do it for all the unions? Why have they not answered that question? No, they chose unceremoniously to direct their wrath at one organization.

The Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans), the Liberal critic, said it best when he said they had a grandfather position in terms of legislation. We are correcting an incredible wrong that was done because the previous Government chose to vindictively address one organization, which is another very democratic organization that has 12 districts in the Province of Manitoba, and their directors are elected by producers at large. What more democratic process can you have?

We have incorporated into this amendment an up-front opt-out, so that any producer who really does not want to be part of MPCA, who wants to be part of any other farm organization or whatever his reasons are, he does not have to be checked off. It is as simple as that. Up front, he opts out forever. So I do not know what more democratic process they want than that one that is there: (1) they can opt out; or (2) they can conduct themselves in a democratic process. If they have points of view they want represented, they can run for election in each district for MCPA at their annual district meetings. Once a year, a democratic process is in place or they can opt out any time they want forever, so there is no more democratic process than that.

Again, it recognizes the fact that the livestock industry needs a strong voice to represent the producers of Manitoba on a variety of issues, both provincial and federal. They have done an excellent job in the past and I know that the leadership is out there, that will be elected to be directors on MCPA to conduct the affairs of that organization in the best possible way for the producers of Manitoba from now on into the future. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 29, The Cattle Producers Association Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des éleveurs de bétail.

Did they call for a recorded vote? I am sorry.

An Honourable Member: Call the question.

Mr. Speaker: I put the question. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion on Bill No. 28?

Some Honourable Members: 29.

Mr. Speaker: I thought I was just doing—

Mr. Clerk, William Remnant: No, you are on 29.

* (1540)

Mr. Speaker: The Bill before the House is third reading of Bill No. 29, The Cattle Producers Association Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des éleveurs de bétail. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? (Agreed)

Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Uruski: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

Third reading of Bill No. 29, The Cattle Producers Association Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des éleveurs de bétail.

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

YEAS

Burrell, Connery, Cummings, Downey, Driedger (Emerson), Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Hammond, Helwer, Manness, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Oleson, Orchard, Pankratz, Penner, Praznik, Alcock, Angus, Carstairs, Charles, Cheema, Chornopyski, Edwards, Evans (Fort Garry), Kozak, Lamoureux, Mandrake, Minenko, Patterson, Roch, Rose, Taylor, Yeo.

NAYS

Ashton, Cowan, Doer, Evans (Brandon East), Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Maloway, Plohma, Storie, Uruski.

Mr. Clerk: Yeas, 37; Nays, 11.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

SPEAKER'S RULINGS

Mr. Speaker: I have a ruling for the House while I have everybody's attention. On December 7, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Jay Cowan) rose on an alleged matter of privilege arising out of the refusal of the Honourable Minister of the Environment (Mr. Connery) to allow the said Member to travel with the Honourable Minister on a Government aircraft to Leaf Rapids.

The Honourable Member has characterized the provisions of The Legislative Assembly Act, authorizing Members to travel on Government aircraft, subject to certain conditions, as a "privilege." In my opinion, this is not the case. The Honourable Member, I believe, was completely accurate when he stated that it was a policy of several administrations that Members would be allowed to travel on the Government air service if there were seats available to them. This, I am advised, is what the legislation provides.

The Honourable Member has made reference to Speaker Walding's ruling of July 11, 1983, on an alleged matter of privilege. The circumstances on that occasion were significantly different in that the Honourable Member raising the matter alleged that mail between himself and his constituents and services provided to him by caucus staff were being impeded and in some cases suspended. I do not believe it is a relevant precedent in this case.

* (1550)

Again, I believe I should remind all Honourable Members that parliamentary privilege is the sum of the

peculiar rights enjoyed by the House collectively and by Members of the House individually, without which they could not discharge their assigned responsibilities. Privilege is concerned with the special rights of Members strictly in their capacity as Members in the performance of their parliamentary work.

As I stated in my ruling of November 23, Speakers Lamoureux and Jerome, in 1971 and 1975, respectively, ruled that privilege is limited to the duties an individual must discharge as a Member. Maingot's "Parliamentary Privilege in Canada" points out that parliamentary privilege applies while a Member is taking part in a proceeding in Parliament or in a Legislature.

Maingot also states that parliamentary privilege is concerned with the special rights of Members not in their capacity as Ministers or as Party Leaders, Whips or parliamentary secretaries, but strictly in their capacity as Members in the parliamentary work.

The Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) may have legitimate grounds for a complaint or a grievance but, in my opinion, has failed to establish a prima facie case of a breach of privilege. The issue he has raised does not concern a duty he must perform as a Member, nor does it involve a proceeding in a Parliament or Legislature.

I must, therefore, rule this issue out of order as a matter of privilege.



On Thursday, December 15, I took under advisement a point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) respecting the words "you are so full of bull" allegedly spoken by the Honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Connery).

I have reviewed Hansard and these words are not recorded in it as having been spoken by the Honourable Minister. The Hansard tapes have been checked and these words were not picked up by the sound system.

I must, therefore, rule that there is no point of order.

THIRD READINGS

BILL NO. 6—THE FIRES PREVENTION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs) presented Bill No. 6, The Fires Prevention Amendment Act; Loi sur la prévention des incendies, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill No. 9, The Statute Law Amendment—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, we have a Member who would like to speak on Bill No. 6.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, order. The Honourable Member for Radisson (Mr. Patterson) has the floor.

Mr. Allan Patterson (Radisson): I would like to speak briefly to this Bill. Manitoba is fortunate in having two excellent fire colleges in Winnipeg.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), on a point of order.

Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland): Yes, I was going to speak on Bill No. 6. Am I being recognized now or is he speaking on Bill No. 6?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Radisson was up before the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. He is speaking on that Bill.

Mr. Patterson: As I was saying, two excellent fire colleges in Winnipeg and Brandon serve the province well. I understand that some time in the past there was a bit of a problem with the Winnipeg Fire Department having some reservations about the qualifications of those who graduated from the Brandon School, but that particular problem has been addressed and rectified.

The amendment to the Bill that is before us is more or less of a housekeeping measure and merely gives the Government the authority to charge tuition at the colleges, the tuition being free to Manitoba residents and not being able to charge to other out-of-province students in the past. So this merely enables the department to charge out-of-province students, and rightfully so, tuition and have some contribution towards the overall cost. Because of this, Mr. Speaker, we will be glad to support this Bill.

Mr. Harper: I would just like to put a few words on the record in regard to this Bill. First of all, the Fire Commissioner—the Government may be able to charge the Northern Affairs communities in regard to the Fire Training Program or any kind of fire training. As you know, many of the Northern Affairs communities have volunteers who work with the mayor and council and the communities. Many of those communities are also situated close to an Indian reserve and they tend to share some of the facilities, maybe the trucks and the fire hoses or the fire extinguishing equipment.

It is unfortunate that the situation developed a few days ago in regard to a particular reserve, namely, the Fairford Indian Band, where the band was not paying the bills. But I think something could be developed out of this, some understanding with some leadership taken on maybe by the Minister of Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) to resolving many of the differences between some of the reserves and the nearby communities and making arrangements for some sort of service.

It is difficult, I realize, in the northern communities where there are virtually no roads that exist, where

maybe families are in danger because of lack of adequate equipment. I know that many of the reserves receive some money from the federal Government to have some sort of fire protection for the Indian reserves, but the money they receive is totally inadequate for the bands to have some sort of program for the entire reserve. It is totally inadequate for the chief and council to purchase any equipment and also to put in a program which is appropriate for the northern remote communities. It is very expensive, but I would urge the Government, especially the Minister responsible for Native Affairs (Mr. Downey), to start maybe taking some leadership role in talking with the Indian bands in the communities to have some sort of an understanding and sharing concept with the nearby LGDs and the reserves.

I hope in the future some sort of arrangements can be made and I look forward to working with the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) on some of these things and I hope he would listen to some of the advice that I gave him and also listen to the aboriginal leaders. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

* (1600)

BILL NO. 9—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (RE-ENACTED STATUTES) ACT

Bill No. 9 was read a third time and passed.

Hon. James Downey (Acting Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the House to introduce third reading on the following Bills, the first Bill being No. 11. By leave, I would like to proceed then to—we will return to that one if it is the wish.—(Interjection)—Okay, Mr. Speaker, by leave, I would ask leave to have third reading on Bill No. 12.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to have third reading of Bill No. 12?

Mr. John Plohma (Dauphin): Well, yes, I am speaking on it if it is up.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), on a point of order.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): When the House Leader announced at the beginning of the Session that we would be following a certain order, he gave first Bill No. 11 when we moved from the Order Paper to The Child Custody Enforcement Act. We have a speaker on that. The Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) would like to address remarks. She is not here. The second up was Bill 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act. We have a speaker on that if it is in accordance with the Acting House Leader's wishes.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I am not sure I heard what the Honourable Member

for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) said but, after Bill 11, I had called Bill 15. Have we completed Bill 11?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Mr. Downey: It was the information that I had that Bill 11 would be called and that is what I called. It appears that the Members are not prepared to speak on it at this particular time. So we will switch for the convenience of Members opposite—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): On a point of order, it was prearranged which Bills we would be calling. We are prepared to go ahead through leave, which we initially gave back at 2:30, that we will come up with Bill 11 at this time followed by Bill 15 and in the sequence that the Attorney-General gave to the Speaker. So let us go ahead with Bill 11.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): If it is agreeable with Honourable Members, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to facilitate the business today, I would propose to call Bill 15 and then proceed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We needed leave to bring forward Bill No. 11. Obviously, we do not have leave to bring forward No. 11. We needed leave to bring forward Bill No. 15. Obviously, there is no leave.

The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), on a point of order.

Mr. Lamoureux: Earlier today, this afternoon, leave was given to bring forward Bill 11. Bill 11 was to follow Bill 9 on leave earlier this afternoon. In keeping with that, we should be now reading off Bill No. 11.

Mr. McCrae: I am not sure, perhaps it is because we are dealing with so many bills this afternoon, but it is difficult to get everyone on side, Mr. Speaker. In any event, the discussion on whether we should call Bill 11 or Bill 15 has taken sufficient time that certain Honourable Members are present.

BILL NO. 11—THE CHILD CUSTODY ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 11, The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'exécution des ordonnances de garde, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise to this Bill in its third reading. Perhaps of all Bills that we have dealt with as yet in this Legislature in this Session, The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act has been the most contentious and perhaps rightly so because we are dealing with our most precious resource, and that is our children.

Throughout all the debates on each side of the pros and cons of this Bill, we have to as legislators realize that we are dealing with not the parental rights, whether they own or disown or do not have rights to the child, but we are looking at the rights of the child. No parent, as well meaning as they may be, can claim total ownership, because no one owns another person. This is more obvious when the person in discussion is at an age where they may not legally speak for themselves.

As a mother of several children, I can understand the anguish that it must be for children going through a divorce situation. Wherever possible, we want as a Party, and I hope as a Legislature, to see divorced couples or separated couples do what is the best for the child wherever possible. We urge and support all ways of reconciliation of complete access where necessary. We do not, however, ever want to see a child in an abusive situation, whether it is physical or mental abuse. However, the child has a right wherever possible to two parents and they have a right to be nurtured by two parents wherever possible.

This Bill is setting up a pilot project and it has done so not looking toward any one set of parents. It is looking at the welfare of the family unit, the child being the centre in this case. We, in the Liberal Party, support this Act in hopes that will give us resolution where conflicts arise in custody. We would like to point out to all groups, whether they are the mothers' groups or the fathers' groups or whatever interest group they may be, that as a political Party we are not looking at any other area other than the welfare and the well-being of the child.

* (1610)

If we give up one moment of security for a child, the scar that is there will be there forever, I dare say. So I am very pleased to support this Act and we on this side will be watching it extremely carefully. Should it not prove adequate, we will be bringing in further legislation, I am certain. But should it prove that it has its purpose, as I hope it will, then we will feel very pleased at being part of the participants that support this legislation and we pass it on to further reading.

Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): I too am pleased to rise to put a few points on the record on behalf of our caucus. I quite agree with the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles), who just spoke and said this is probably one of the most contentious and probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that is before us in this Session. Although it is a very small Bill, the impact of it on the lives of families and particularly the quality of life for children is absolutely critical.

I do not think there is anybody who could have sat in the committee and heard the young girl who came and spoke to us and appealed to us all to approve this Act, because she was from a broken family and had access to both parents. Initially, it appears that she had not had that access and was feeling quite negative towards one of her parents because of lack of access to the other. It was clear that she recognized that she benefitted tremendously in terms of the experience and the learning and the love that she received from both

of them, and was telling us that she would not have liked to have been cut off from either of those two parents, that we should do anything we could to make sure that happens as often as possible, that children have access to both parents.

I think that we agree with, as I said last night, the intent and the principle of the Bill. Anything that can be done to help families and to help parents who are going through the trauma, which is one of the most traumatic things an individual in a family can go through, the trauma of divorce and separation, particularly the trauma to the children, is something that we want to support.

In the presentations, the clearest thing of all was that there was nothing very clear about the studies, the statistics and the information that were brought forward that would support this Bill and this program. One of the questions we would have to raise—I believe the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) when he said, "We are very concerned about this Bill. We are going to monitor it continually, not just wait till the end of the pilot project, and we will be talking to groups, organizations and individuals and making sure that we find out how that Bill is working."

That suggests that we really should not have legislation. I think we have a pilot project program that we may want to change rather quickly as experience shows us what parts of it are working and what are not. When it is put in legislation, we all know—you see, the Bill is not a pilot project. The program is a pilot project, but the Bill is a piece of legislation and these two are integrated. We would have preferred to have had the pilot project just as a program without legislation which would have made it much easier for us to make any changes that were needed.

I would like to make a friendly suggestion to the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) and his statement that they would be monitoring it in an ongoing way. I would just ask him to look at one of the recommendations from one of the presenting groups the other night who asked him to set up an advisory committee made up of groups and organizations. It could even be all the groups and organizations that presented different points of view at the hearings the other night, but to formalize a group that will monitor and provide advice and reaction to the Government, instead of just having it very loose and not in an ad hoc manner, I am still not convinced that we know how serious the problem is when the Attorney-General's own figures show 15 percent saying they have had some trouble with access. But what is "some trouble"? Some trouble might mean that they had difficulty taking their child out once or twice after the separation. Some trouble might mean that they have never had access to the child for one reason or another since the separation.

I think it is very important that we know how serious the problem was—we have a breakdown of the 15 percent—how long the problem went on, because we also know that these things are resolved over a period of time, that feelings run strong when the separation first occurs and people sometimes take positions then that they soften over the early course of the separation. We need to know how many out of that group were

judged to be an appropriate denial of access, because some of them would be judged as appropriate denial, either because of alcohol, abuse, or because of the situation described by one young mother the other night when the child was not cared for properly, that when her young child was with the father, it was not looked after properly. So we need to have more information there.

(The Acting Speaker, Mr. Ed Mandrake, in the Chair.)

I was very concerned about a couple of suggestions that said we should be tying maintenance and access. I want to go on record as saying there should be no relationship to maintenance and access. If there are access problems, they have to be handled in some other way. You cannot cut off the money to the supporting parent who is feeding and clothing and housing those children to sort out a conflict between the mother and the father in terms of access.

I am glad that the mediation is not going to be mandatory, because we think mediation that is mandatory often will not work but the opportunity will be made available to them.

One of the major concerns we continue to have is that they have not addressed the question of the training and selection of volunteers. This is a critically important job they are going to be doing. They clearly need to be screened very well before they are selected and they need to have some training program before they become access supervisors in this very, very delicate situation between perhaps not just competing but conflicting parents. So we would say that we question the need for legislation. We would ask again that the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) consider setting up an advisory committee to monitor the pilot project and that he seriously consider developing a selection and training program for the volunteers.

With that, Mr. Acting Speaker, we would just wish to say that we would have preferred that they took an additional two or three months that we think would be required to work out these concerns that we and a number of others have so that the program would have gone ahead but would have been a little bit stronger.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Mandrake): Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to just leave a few brief comments in addition to those made by my honourable friend from Selkirk (Mrs. Charles), who I think spoke quite eloquently about the role of children and the importance of children and obviously she is very well qualified to do that.

I simply want to pick up on some of the groups that made presentations to the committee, and I think we were all impressed with the number and the quality of the presentations that came before us. I congratulate all of them for very thorough presentations, very interesting presentations on this critical Bill before us. However, as we all know who were at the committee, the primary focus of the discussion was not so much the Bill but was the program, the pilot project, a pilot project that has been worked on for in excess of three

years and indeed was not only initiated but taken to a fairly highly sophisticated level under the previous administration.

The Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill), I take issue with her suggestion that the legislation is somehow a stultifying factor and something that we should not get into and should not enshrine legislation because it cannot be changed quickly. The fact is this is enabling legislation. It provides the bare minimum to do the program. It in no way means that the legislation has to be used by the program. The legislation is there to facilitate only the very narrow aspects of the program that may need that enabling legislation.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I know from experience with The Maintenance Enforcement Act that legislation was changed very quickly and regularly with respect to that program and I have no doubt that we will have to do the same for this program. I have no doubt that there will be changes which we come to see that we need once this pilot project gets under way.

Let us be clear that the legislation is not something that should, in my view, stand in the way of going ahead with this program. It simply is the bare minimum to allow what is there to take place and, if it is wrong, if it is incorrect, we will know and we will do something about it. I have no doubt that will be the case.

* (1620)

With respect to the suggestion of the advisory committee, having met with the Action Committee on the Status of Women and the Charter of Rights Coalition, I know that they started their discussions by saying they did not feel there was a perceived need to go ahead. However, I have every faith that they will participate fully in any advisory capacity made open to them with respect to this program.

I am informed, and I believe the head of the Family Law Branch here, who says that invitations to be on an advisory committee which will meet regularly have been extended, so I think the suggestion of the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) has indeed been met, on my information, and I look forward to the participation of those groups that came before us in an advisory role.

I think it is clear that in the early stages of this program that committee will have to meet very regularly, and that may become less of a need to meet so often as the program goes on. It is scheduled for a three-year term but, in any event, I have every faith that they will contribute in a helpful and cooperative manner with respect to this program. If the program does not have the need that we suspect it has now, then that will become clear as well, and I would suggest that this program, as well as perhaps allowing us to work out some kinks, will also allow us to see if we are spending those dollars in the best way possible.

To that end, I note that half of the funds do come from the federal Government and I think their contribution is something that we should thank them for. I think we should monitor this pilot project closely with a view to assessing all of the unknowns that the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) points out that we

have before us. We have some vague figures. The studies are not complete, I do not deny that. I do not think anybody denies that, that they are not what we would perhaps hope in terms of specificity.

We have thought about this and worked on this for three years and I think it is time to go ahead with the pilot project. I look forward to seeing it in action, and indeed I look forward to the work of the advisory council and improvements on this program, which I am sure will be a part of its three-year experience.

With that, I simply indicate that I am hopeful that this will be, as the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) expresses as well, run by fully competent and qualified people, be they staff members or volunteers. I have no doubt that that will be the case, given the past record of the Family Law Branch in this province. Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 15—THE COOPERATIVE PROMOTION TRUST ACT

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs) presented, by leave, Bill No. 15, The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. William Chornopyski (Burrows): It gives me great pleasure to rise and make a few remarks in respect to this Bill, Mr. Acting Speaker. The Bill, of course, is a good one and an old one, and all this Bill 15 does is it updates a Bill that had been established somewhere in the 1920s. The Bill is The Wheat Board Monetary Trust which was, as I say, established in the early Twenties in order to promote cooperative movement in this province. It has certainly done that. We have, since the 1920s, established many co-op movements, whether they be in the implement or whether they be in the oil and fuel, farm fuel, business or any other commodity that services the public at large.

The board has approximately \$300,000 in the trust fund and approximately 30 percent of that is given out in grants on an annual basis to help establish new cooperatives such as in recent years we have had a number of housing cooperatives, for example. There have been a number of these housing cooperatives established throughout the City of Winnipeg and, I am sure, throughout the Province of Manitoba.

I have absolutely no problem supporting this Bill. It is a housekeeping Bill. It just updates the Bill a little bit because I think it is probably long overdue. As I said, Mr. Acting Speaker, I was going to make just a few short remarks. I would ask Members of this House to support this Bill because I think it is a good one and I certainly have no problems with the Bill at all. Thank you.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I have a number of comments I want to place on the record. I have debated this Bill previously. I think it is important to point out

for the record that indeed it is a good Bill. It was a Bill that had been drafted by the previous NDP Government. It was consistent with the major emphasis that was placed on cooperative development by the previous NDP Government.

I think it would be unwise of me to allow this Bill to pass without once again referencing the fact—and particularly since the Minister responsible for Cooperative Development (Mr. McCrae) is listening, I know, so attentively here in the House—that we in the New Democratic Party caucus are strongly opposed to the fact that cooperative development in this province has been put on the back burner because of the changes that have taken place with the Cooperative Development Department, more specifically, the fact that the department has been absorbed by the other departments for which the Minister is responsible, most notably the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Department.

(The Acting Speaker, Mr. Bob Rose, in the Chair.)

We think that is wrong because we believe very strongly that cooperative development is a sector onto itself that has a great deal of potential. We believe that was demonstrated under the leadership of the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) when he was the Minister for Cooperative Development. We feel that this move will put cooperative development on the back burner and will turn back the clock to when cooperative development in this province did not have the same type of priority that it has had in the last number of years. We think that is wrong. We will be opposing that.

* (1630)

As I said, in committee if this Government was going to bury Cooperative Development we certainly would not have supported that. But it would have made more logical sense, at least, if they had put the Cooperative Development in with other economic portfolios such as Industry, Trade and Technology, for example, and put it on an even footing with other sectors, most notably with the public sector and the private sector. I will be continuing to raise this in Estimates in the upcoming years, continuing to point out that the move by this Government was a wrong move.

I also want to just briefly comment too that I think this Bill is sort of indicative of the general tone of this Session in the fact that perhaps, I would say, the only good things that are happening generally are things that were already in the works. There really is not much of an agenda from this Government. When there is an agenda, it tends to be a negative move such as what has happened with the Cooperative Development Department. So we certainly support this Bill. It is a good Bill. I think the Government is going to really have to think very strongly about its agenda. But generally, I think its agenda is pretty well bankrupt, as indicated by this Session. It is bankrupt in the area of cooperatives, but I think it is bankrupt generally.

After having sat in this Legislature since 1981 and having heard the Members of the Conservative Party suggest that they have all the answers, I find it rather ironic that now that they are in Government we see

such a poor legislative agenda from this Party. We certainly are going to be looking for far more from this Government, whether it be in terms of cooperatives or other areas in the future. Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 21—THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs) presented, by leave, Bill No. 21, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Ed Mandrake (Assiniboia): It is a pleasure to speak to this Bill. We agree that Manitoba has to have a National Safety Code. We support this Bill in principle.

During committee, I had offered suggestions to the Minister on various parts of that Bill. As I was reading through the regulations which were provided to me, I had asked the Minister to look at the documentation that could be taken from these various companies. I had suggested that the reproduction of these documents be done immediately. In the regulation, as I read it, it says, within 14 days, supply the person from whom the seizure was made and an employee of the company with a complete copy of or return the seized document. It is going to cause problems. There are other problems in this Bill that certainly should be addressed in future days. Basically, in principle, we the Official Opposition do support this Bill. Thank you.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Acting, Acting Deputy Speaker, and that is not a reflection on the Chair, incidentally.

Mr. Downey: Just a reflection on your ability to speak.

Mr. Plohman: You will get your turn yet. The Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) will have lots of opportunity to be nailed yet today, so he should not be too smug over there.

I wanted to indicate that we are supporting this Bill. As has been indicated previously, there are some provisions in the Bill that are something like Ed Broadbent—very, very scary, they say. I want to indicate that those provisions in the Bill that have to be put in place, because of the nature of the situation we find ourselves in, moving from regulated environment to a deregulated environment are required, I believe, yet they have to be watched carefully how they are implemented. In fact we could find ourselves where there are many trucking companies and individual drivers who could have their liberties as an individual, their rights infringed upon, I guess, to a certain extent in the interests of safety. We have to watch that the pendulum does not swing too far in one direction.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

So we will be watching the implementation of this Bill very carefully over the next while, and I hope the

Minister will be as well vigilant and bring forward additional amendments, if required, in the future to ensure that the pendulum does not swing too far in taking away the rights of those people involved in the transportation industry. As I mentioned during second reading, it is ironic that we have had to go to this extensive deregulation of the trucking industry in this country in the name of deregulation, very ironic. The one that we will see, I guess, over the next number of years as to whether in fact this system will work better than the old system that was there which was the economic regulation as opposed to regulation for safety. We will see whether it is going to work. It will be rather interesting to see perhaps whether we have to go back to the old system of regulation in the future because of the difficulty in implementing precisely the various components that we are passing in this Legislature today.

So we do support and we will be watching carefully the issues unfold as they relate to deregulation, the National Safety Code.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, I just like to indicate to both critics that I have listened to their comments over a period of time and I appreciate them to some degree.

We are going through a very complex time and breaking new ground in terms of implementing the National Safety Code and, as indicated by the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), in terms of deregulation that is taking place. I have made that commitment or indicated to the critics during committee stage that possibly we will be coming back next year with further amendments as we peel away into this new era of the National Safety Code and deregulation. There are many things that will be looked at and I think we will all be watching. Members indicate they will be watching. I will be watching as well to see exactly what the impact will be in terms of how we move in this direction.

So I thank the Members for their support.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO.34—THE MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs) presented, by leave, Bill No. 34, The Municipal Amendment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): This is one of the more interesting Bills that have been put forward in the House in that it was put forward to do a certain job and then we found out it was not going to do it, is my understanding of the history of it. So in committee, we have deleted a paragraph, amended it, and we think that now it serves more rightly the purpose of its intent. We, as Official Opposition, did not see the purpose of putting a section in there that did not have a full representation of all the municipalities in Manitoba and that it left some opportunity for bidding wars, in essence, to take place between municipalities.

* (1640)

I still stand by the fact that if they wish to put this motion in and bring it forward as a resolution from the UMM and the MAUM Association, then I am sure as Opposition Parties we would be very glad to support it. But when it was not asked to be in the first place and it is not necessary, I do not see the reason for the clause being inserted and I certainly appreciate that the Minister for Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) thinks this was a very major mistake. I do not know what he is reading into our intent by leaving it out. We certainly are not saying that municipalities are not responsible for their abilities.

I fully believe in municipalities that, in many cases, and I have said in this House that I believe municipal officers have even a more difficult job than we in this Legislature do because they are so responsible to the people on a one-to-one basis. I have full support in all elected officials in the province and I do not in any way, by saying that this paragraph should not be included, say that I do not support the municipal elected officials.

I do believe that they should have the opportunity to run their own communities. On the other hand, we also have to recognize that we do have a Department of Municipal Affairs which is put in there as an overseer for many municipalities, especially the smaller municipalities that have, because of their size, some limitations. I do not want to see large communities being put at the advantage above smaller communities, unless by resolution that becomes the desire of the organizations involved.

So, Mr. Speaker, I fully support this Bill as amended. I am not sure it accomplishes a great deal but, if it helps in any way the City of Brandon to make a committee for its police detachment and allow public officials or rather members of the public to sit on that committee, which I fully support, I think we have done something in this House to put forward their individuality. While speaking on this Act, I would point out that the City of Brandon is in itself having to come to the Department of Municipal Affairs and perhaps, because of the size of Brandon, we should be looking at the uniqueness of Brandon and dealing with it under Urban Affairs.

As we have mentioned before, there should be some procedure to bring municipalities from one department to the other department. So, I will in essence of time just say that we do support the amendments of this Act and the Act itself and hope that Brandon will have great success in having a police force that is to their purpose, and we hope this municipal Act will provide what the municipalities want. If they wish to come back to us and have us reinsert this paragraph, we will consider it at that time but, in the meantime, I hope that this is satisfactory to the cause that began the initiation of this Bill.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few remarks to what has been spoken in the debate on third reading of this Bill No. 34, and I could concur with maybe not all but most of

the remarks made by the Member of the Legislature for Selkirk.

I specifically want to refer to the portion relating to the amendment which allows any municipality, but in this case obviously specifically has reference to the City of Brandon, to enable that city to continue to make grants to Brandon University.

A rather unique situation existed in the city and its relation to the university. I do not know whether any other university in Manitoba gets regular grants from municipal Governments. I do not believe so. I would compliment the City of Brandon who for many years contributed the equivalent of one mill to the City of Brandon and, as I understand, the legislation that permitted them to do so has run out. If this Bill was not forthcoming with this provision, next year the city would not have been able to have assisted the University of Brandon financially as it has done for so many years.

First of all, I want to compliment the city for its concerted interest in this matter. I had, perhaps others as well, an opportunity to speak to city officials, the mayor, the city manager, and I know that they were satisfied with this type of amendment that we now have. I believe that Members of the Opposition were concerned about the nature of the amendment first proposed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings) that it was simply too broad, too wide in authority given to municipalities. That does not take anything away from municipal Governments. I think we have, by and large, excellent municipal officials, people who are dedicated and who do a good job, by and large, in governing the municipalities, large and small, in this province of ours.

Nevertheless, that particular amendment as proposed, as I can see, and from all the advice we could get, was not in keeping with the tradition of The Municipal Act. The Municipal Act always had a very restricted approach to permitting municipalities to make grants. If you look at the Act, you will see a list of detailed items permitting a municipality to make a grant, for instance, to a hospital or to a public restroom in the town. That has been the tradition. It is not a partisan matter; it has been a tradition for decades and decades. The other concern, of course, is that leaving it so broad as we did, as it was originally, it would have enabled municipalities to also get into the business of competing for industry, because included under the term "grants," as we found out, indeed were the possibility of financial payments to be made by municipalities to businesses in order to attract them.

I think Members would want to agree that the last thing we would want to see would be our municipalities, large and small, competing with one another for the same business so that they end up spending more of the taxpayers' money than perhaps was necessary or should have been in the very first place. So that was our initial concern. As I said on further investigation, we found that indeed it was not in the tradition of the Act anyway.

I would suggest, I guess as the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) was sort of inferring or did suggest, and propose that if at any time in the future municipalities

have some need to have authority to make grants to other organizations, that could be dealt with by the Legislature. I was thinking of one in particular. I know some municipalities were interested in promoting airports and runways in the municipality.

I do not believe there is any authority now. I stand to be corrected, but I do not believe there is authority now for the municipalities to provide grants to various runways or small airports that may exist or may wish to exist in the municipalities.

There are grants, I know from—there have been grants from Government departments, provincial departments, but I do not know—and I stand to be corrected on this. I do not think and I do not believe it is a practice for municipalities to do so. It was suggested that maybe this is something that could happen if we just allowed the omnibus approach. I say, if it is necessary, if municipalities want to do this—and I just use this by way of example—then surely it could be brought forward by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings) at some future time and a case could be made. If a case is made, I am sure all Members would want to support this.

In no way do we want to inhibit or prevent the municipalities from carrying out their responsibilities for the well-being of their citizens. Nevertheless, the reason the requirement for the amendment came up was the particular problem that existed in the City of Brandon, the problem that the city had and of course the problem that the University had. I am quite sure that the university representatives, the president, would have been in touch with everyone in the House or representatives of all Parties with regard to the dilemma that they face. They were most anxious to see this particular amendment occur.

At any rate, we have this amendment, and we have no problem in supporting it. As they say, it is in keeping with the tradition of the Act. I would only conclude by commenting on the remark made by the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) with regard to treating the City of Brandon more as an urban centre. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution that has not been fully dealt with but, nevertheless, we had this resolution for the Legislature to express an opinion on whether the City of Brandon should continue to be under the Municipal Affairs Department or whether it should relate to the Urban Affairs Department.

As I said, at the time of introducing the resolution, I have no complaints with the Municipal Affairs Department, I have no problem at all. I have full confidence. But that was not the point. The point was that we do have in this province a second large centre, a thriving city in the western part of the province. It has needs peculiar to that city. It has needs and it has problems similar, more similar to the City of Winnipeg, I would submit, than to some small rural municipality which may only have a few hundred or a few thousand people, those rural municipalities mainly being concerned with rural roads, with drainage, and other important matters that rural municipalities have to be concerned with. The City of Brandon has to be concerned with an urban police force, has to be concerned with garbage collection. It has to be

concerned with other health matters that arise when you have thousands of people concentrated in an urban centre.

It has a bus system. Here we have urban transit grants provided under The Municipal Act, we have urban transit grants provided under the Act governing the City of Winnipeg. So you have the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) making a grant to the City of Winnipeg for bus services and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings) making a grant to the City of Brandon for bus services. We are always worried whether the two Ministers collaborate and ensure, I trust, that—

* (1650)

An Honourable Member: Did that change six months ago?

Mr. Leonard Evans: —the approach is the same. No, it has not changed. I am just saying that that is always a problem. You want to make sure that one Minister is treating one jurisdiction in a comparable way to the other jurisdiction.

I just wanted to take this opportunity, while we were discussing Bill 34, to add to what the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) has said. I believe that it is a logical thing to do. It is not a partisan thing to do. I have certainly appealed to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) to take an interest in this and see whether indeed this transfer could take place so that the City of Brandon will be treated in terms of urban problems.

In concluding then, I would certainly commend this Bill and support this Bill. We have no problem with it in our caucus. I did make reference to the maintenance of the police force. That was dealt with earlier on in discussion. I am certainly pleased that this particular amendment is before us and will, hopefully, pass.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. John Plohma (Dauphin): We cannot rush these things unduly just because Christmas is approaching. There is a very serious issue here that I wish to speak very briefly about, Mr. Speaker, and of course the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) and the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) have referenced it.

It deals with the matter of the amendment that was included that would have provided an opportunity for all municipal corporations in this province to compete with one another to attract industry through industrial incentive grants, a proposal that the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) seems to support and one that he seems to support without having had—and he can clarify this if I am wrong—consultation with the broad range of municipalities in this province insofar as whether indeed it is in their best interests to have that.

I want to make a few comments on that issue because I note that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings) has said that we operate in an atmosphere of mutual respect with municipalities. That can be carried to the extreme where we would say that municipalities are elected bodies; therefore, we really

should not have any jurisdiction over them at all. Let them be accountable to the people in their areas.

That is not the way it works. The fact is municipalities were set up as corporations through The Municipal Act. They were created by the provincial Government through provincial legislation. Therefore, we ultimately have the responsibility to ensure that they are operating in a fair and equitable manner and in the best interests of the people of Manitoba.

Of course, if one were to provide certain powers to municipalities, it may indeed upset that equilibrium that exists at the present time and maybe most people would agree that municipalities throughout this province, towns and villages, are operating very well at the present time. There are always difficulties that arise from time to time but generally they are operating well.

It is something, I think, that would have to take a great deal of thought, a great deal of consultation, before we would start putting in a major and fundamental change to The Municipal Act without consulting with the municipalities throughout this province, and that being the authority to offer grants that would indeed result in two communities or three or four competing for the same industry to locate.

All municipalities would like to get industry locating in their area, within their boundaries. They want the jobs. They want the tax revenue that comes from it, and it seems the thing to do these days, of course. Everyone is talking about it—attract industry, attract industry—and we all want to see that development. On the other hand, we see a parallel that exists between the municipal situation under what this Bill had proposed and what exists across the country through the provinces and the federal Government, where we have provinces competing against each other for major developments.

That has been destructive, and I think everyone agrees regardless of political stripe across this country. Although they may not be moving too quickly on it, they believe that—at least they say they believe, especially those free traders who have negotiated with the United States. They say that they would like to eliminate these barriers between provinces and they would like to eliminate the process of having various provinces competing with each other through industrial incentives that cost the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

Now we want to move away from that system at the national scene and yet here we were with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings), the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) supporting him, going forward with an amendment that would have allowed this kind of a system to exist for municipalities. I find that inconsistent and strange that they would have done that, particularly without first consulting in great depth with the municipalities, towns and villages across this province.

So I am pleased that we were able, with the cooperation of the combined Opposition, to ensure that this Bill did not do what the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr.

Cummings) wanted to do without consultation. We saved their necks. Let us say, we saved their necks because they would have gotten themselves into so much trouble and we bailed them out. Quite often, we have had to bail them out to improve legislation, to make it better.

In fact, they do not know it, but what we have done is save their skin to a large extent. Later on, I think as they get a little bit longer in Government, if indeed that happens, they will thank us for the vigilance that we showed in the Opposition to improve this Government's performance during their time. They will actually want to take credit for it at some time and say, boy, we did the right thing. So it has been a very productive process that we have gone through.

So we will support this Bill and I will support what my colleague, the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), has said on this. As well, we will look to further amendments dealing with this issue of grants some time in the future from this Government, if indeed the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) prevails. But we will certainly want to make sure that everyone has their say on it first.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): I wanted to add something to this debate and to the points made by my colleague, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plozman). I think my colleague made the point that needed to be made about the appropriateness of this legislation, the appropriateness of the amendment to the legislation, which I think will have resolved the stated objectives of the Governments to allow institutions like the City of Brandon to provide money to non-profit, charitable organizations.

The Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) says from his seat, I will be sorry. I can assure him that the comments of my colleague are quite accurate. I consulted, unlike the Government, with representatives of the communities in my area including the mayors of towns, the chairman of the UVD of Cranberry Portage, representatives of the LGD of Consol, the City of Flin Flon, and I can say that there was no consultation. They were not aware of the implications of the amendments as proposed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings).

* (1700)

The fact of the matter is that the municipalities, the LGD's, the towns and cities in the province have huge disparities among them. Some municipal corporations are in a much better position to be able to support or provide business incentives, industrial incentives in their respective municipalities. What this does is create the prospect of regional growth in areas where there is already a very healthy existing tax base which can support municipal grants to all kinds of corporations and business entities, leaving those without sufficient tax base in a very difficult struggling position, and in a deteriorating position.

There is not a great deal of equity between some of our municipal corporations across this province and, when I spoke to representatives from the Norman

Regional Developmental Corporation and I spoke to the president of the Regional Development Corporation Association, I can assure you that they were concerned about this piece of legislation.

The stated intention—if you read the statement of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings)—for this legislation was simply to provide and assist the City of Brandon and like municipalities in providing grants where those grants were requested, I am not sure that the amendment was required at all, and I think that there are provisions in The Municipal Affairs Act to allow corporations to provide those kinds of grants. However, the amendment that is being considered here today makes more clear, more certain, the intent of the legislation, and that is fine. But let there be no misunderstanding about the concern that is in rural Manitoba about these kinds of amendments, about their impact, and let it also be said that there was no consultation, that the majority of municipalities were not aware of the implications of this Bill and that is all the more striking, given that Members on that side attended the Union of Manitoba Municipality convention, numbers of them, where the province hosted a dinner and this particular legislation was not raised at that time.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings) seems to have forgotten that the conventions of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and MAUM are specifically for addressing these kinds of concerns. So I think the amended Bill is appropriate and is supportable.

However, I would caution the Government that before they introduce similar legislation, and the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) laid open the correct point, and that is that if this is the intention of the Government to proceed to allow municipal corporations this latitude, then we need a full and open debate because, rightly or wrongly, this is an instrument of economic development policy. It will be used as such by the municipal corporations.—(Interjection): No, the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) is misunderstanding, as he usually does, the importance of the concept. This is not a simple administrative amendment. If the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) or the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings) believed they were simple administrative amendments, then they were wrong. They do not understand the implications.

So if the Members decide in their wisdom that is a goal which they wish for all municipal corporations, then let us have a serious debate about it. Let the municipalities in on the secret. Let them discuss the relative merits of competing amongst each other for business enterprise, for industrial development. I think it is a mistake in policy, and I would be proposed to argue at that time that this was a wrong-headed policy, but we will wait for that debate should the Government see fit to introduce such amendments again.

Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

**BILL NO. 40—THE CITY OF
WINNIPEG AMENDMENT ACT (2)**

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs) presented, by leave, Bill No. 40, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to speak to this Bill which represents a new frontier in cooperation between the Government and the Official Opposition on behalf and for the benefit of the City of Winnipeg, the taxpayers, the politicians, the administration and anybody else who participates actively in the City of Winnipeg.

The Minister has brought forward an amendment which, although it was minor in nature in some areas, had major repercussions in other areas. There was reasonable dialogue on some of the issues and cooperation on others of the issues. The points of the Opposition were collectively brought to the attention of the Minister. While we ended up agreeing to disagree on the implementation of certain and specific parts of the Act, nonetheless, it did get a very good airing at the committee stage. There were very good speeches in the House in relation to it and it was ultimately passed.

I am particularly pleased that we were able to strengthen the powers of the Auditor General in the City of Winnipeg, a position that I have been advised by the media that the mayor has seen the wisdom of and thinks is good legislation which is easy in hindsight. I suspect that the forced choice is never a very popular position but, when it is positive legislation that is designed for the benefit of the taxpayers in the City of Winnipeg, I think that it will prove to be very valuable.

In relation to the number of city councillors, I think that our message was clearly delivered to the Minister in terms of the necessity of bringing forward a total plan, one that will clearly delineate and identify the vision that the Minister has and that the caucus has for the type of city that they desire. Clearly, it will identify, I am sure, the reporting relationships, the structure and the totality of the package, as opposed to bringing it forward in a piecemeal fashion.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

(1710)

As well, I believe that the Minister, in the future, will bring forward briefing notes and/or explanations as to the proposals that he wants to bring forward, which I believe, as a newcomer to the House, makes sense. While I recognize that there is very little in this House that happens that actually makes sense and that is not an individual requirement on its own, it is perhaps a step in the right direction in relation to why things are happening. I certainly am prepared, and I know that my colleagues to the far left of the Liberal position are prepared to be reasonable and to be approachable in the future. Certainly, having learned the lesson of communication, we would be prepared to discuss the

amendments that we want to make in an open and concerned fashion. I think that if we can collectively agree to this type of a procedure on Bills and amendments, with adequate information flowing both ways, we will collectively come out with good legislation on behalf of the citizens of Winnipeg.

I will, without any further ado, suggest that the Bill as amended is a reasonable Bill. There are additional improvements, continued improvements that can be made to the City of Winnipeg. I am sure the Minister will be bringing those forward in the next few months and we will await for them anxiously to see what plans he has for the development of the city. Thank you very much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): I will just put a few words on the record on this very important piece of legislation. I think this is one of the examples where the people benefit from a minority Government. It shows clearly that when there is a minority Government that you have to listen a little more carefully and that the opportunity to influence and make changes on legislation that is coming forward as opposed to when there is a big a majority and they can just ram through whatever they want and they do not have to listen to amendments or points made in committee, that this is a clear example of the ability to alter legislation that is before the House, I think, to the benefit of the people of the City of Winnipeg and to the potential, the new City of Winnipeg Act, whenever it comes in.

When we are looking at the size of city council, and we know that we need to do that, we should not look at it in isolation of what the role of the mayor is going to be, what his job is going to be. What is the role of the community committee going to be? Are they going to take on any of the responsibilities that are presently held by the existing councillors?

The suggestion in the Cherniack Report was that if there was an overall plan that was followed and a good development plan for the city, which there is not at the present time or not one that is being followed, then perhaps they could have more responsibility in the area of zoning and development approval within the overall plan, as long as it was consistent with the overall plan.

Our main concern about this Bill has been the point that was made before, that it is piecemeal. We look forward to the full bloom of all the recommendations and all of the legislation that is going to be brought in, we believe, in the next Session. We will look forward, I hope, to having some opportunity to talk to the Minister perhaps prior to his bringing the legislation in and giving us some idea of what he intends to do in some of these very important areas.

There was one other point that I wanted to make and it was about the amendment that was brought in by my colleague there, the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus). We supported the expansion of the Auditor's role and think that it is needed, but I want to point out a concern and one that I would like us to watch very

carefully. The words in the amendment were I think that programs were to be evaluated by the Auditor and looked at from two points of view, economically sound and efficiency—economy and efficiency. Now those are very laudable things and those are things that auditors do not even have to be told to do. They like to do that and that is part of their job but, you know, there are a lot of programs that Governments both at the city level and at the provincial level run that are not either economic nor efficient. The welfare program is a very good example. If the Auditor evaluated that based on it being an economic program, economically viable or the best way of using that amount of money perhaps, or—

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, please.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert, on a point of order.

Mr. Angus: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it was brought to the attention of the Members in the committee last night that the Auditor's powers will not audit or evaluate the political decision to have a program, only the efficient implementation and the carrying out of management principles on those programs. So they will be looking not at the program.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member does not have a point of order.

Ms. Hemphill: I do hear that, and I understand the point that he is making, but I believe that I still have a point to make and that is that even though he is not evaluating the programs but he is evaluating economy and efficiency that some of the programs will not be economically viable or efficiently run, if you were just to measure in that way. I just want to say that there are programs that are social programs that the city runs that cannot be measured narrowly just from an accounting point of view saying that this is good use of the money, because they may decide on an efficiency criteria that it is not. So I just want to raise the concern that we will be watching that, and that they recognize that when decisions are made to have social programs delivered to give people equal rights or access that they are entitled to that and need not be measured on an accounting basis. That is the only point that I wanted to make.

We support the priority given by this Government for amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act and await with bated breath to see the full program come in in the next Session.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): It is a pleasure to stand on this Bill. It is an important Bill because it deals with 58 percent of the population of Manitoba. It is the most important Bill, I believe, in terms of some of the future issues that we must be facing in this Legislature, and I think it is important to put some of those issues on the table at this point as we pass this Bill in its amended form.— (Interjection)— No, I said one of the most important pieces of legislation. I did not say it was the most important issue, because

there are lots of important issues in and outside of Winnipeg.

It is important to put on the record a number of issues that have to be resolved, and I am sure the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) has been working very hard, but I think the Member's well-earned holiday is going to probably have to be cancelled in terms of all the things that he will have to deal with in terms of the whole areas outstanding in terms of the City of Winnipeg Bill.

The Member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst) once noted that the White Paper we produced was a waste of trees. Well, if the White Paper was a waste of trees, what was this Bill that the Minister was producing and the lack of any paper or any planning document whatsoever with the Government? One would think with the kind of talent that is allegedly in the Conservative ranks in terms of city Government, and the great numbers—well the Member mentions garbage, but I do not want to talk about the six-day garbage cycle. I think, with all the experience in the Conservative ranks on city Government, that we would have expected, quite frankly, a lot more.

We may have agreed to disagree on the issue, but one would have thought there would have been a lot more in terms of dealing with the very real issues that were identified in the City of Winnipeg during the public hearings throughout the early Eighties.

Hundreds of people, citizens of Winnipeg, asked the same question in the public hearings. Who is in charge? Who do we hold accountable in a democratic way when something goes wrong? Who makes the decisions? Who do we hold accountable? You can understand the people and citizens of Winnipeg asking those questions because, when it is a popular issue, I think we see the mayor, the present incumbent who is the mayor riding that popular horse and, when it is an unpopular issue, it seems to be moved over to EPC. When it is really unpopular, it is the old Board of Commissioners that is carrying the proverbial can, if I could use that term, in terms of the issue.— (Interjection)— That is right. The Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) quite accurately says that the political group that does make the decisions in City Hall is a coalition that is non-public, a coalition that does not run as a coalition at election time. It has been, I guess, called in a rather curious way the Gang of 19 by some observers of City Hall.

It miraculously every year comes up with the so-called positions of council—

* (1720)

An Honourable Member: The slate.

Mr. Doer: The slate. That is what they call it, the slate. Then it sounds like this gang not only can give positions at City Hall, but it could taketh away if one does not follow through.—(Interjection)— Well, the Member for Emerson (Mr. Albert Driedger) from his seat talks about the notorious 12, and I would like to thank him for that compliment, because it is the Gang of 12 that rode like 100, as our House Leader (Mr. Cowan) has

identified, right out of Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid.

The whole area of who is in charge has not been answered by this Government. That is a fundamental issue at City Hall. The people of Manitoba, the people of Winnipeg, want to know when they go to mark their ballot in the third week in October every year who do they hold accountable for the positive programs and who do they hold accountable for the negative programs. It is very important.

There are a number of other issues I would just want to put on the record over the next two minutes. Planning, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have nothing on the additional zone. We had a proposal to eliminate the additional zone. There is nothing in terms of municipal planning outside of the City of Winnipeg in terms of the adjacent areas. We placed in our White Paper the admission that there had to be greater planning in the Department of Municipal Affairs and in the City of Winnipeg. We could not preach to the City of Winnipeg in one way and zone in the Department of Municipal Affairs another way.

The end effect was this leapfrogging effect that has gone on for years. I believe it needs a coordinated approach from the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Cummings) to have consistent legislation with a consistent vision of what it is going to do to our green space and what that will do to valuable agricultural land around the City of Winnipeg. I think we have to deal with that issue in a very realistic way.

Mr. Speaker, we are waiting for the transportation policy of this Government. We are waiting for the reforms on election reforms in terms of disclosure and election ceilings. We are waiting for the Ombudsman to come in as recommended. We are waiting for the property assessment and the vision of the Minister of Urban Affairs or the Minister of Municipal Affairs on property assessment. So, as we pass this Bill in its amended form, there are miles to go before we sleep in terms of the Department of Urban Affairs.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), the Leader of the New Democratic Party, has encouraged me to rise to my feet to speak and I want to point out to my honourable friend, if he had stopped for one minute to think about what was happening with regard to this Bill, he would have recognized he was dealing with some short-term interim issues.

The fact of the matter is, when he was the Minister of Urban Affairs in this House, extensive work was required in order to bring forward a comprehensive Bill to deal with the problems facing the City of Winnipeg. It is not a question of in a matter of three or four months that we will come up with a comprehensive Bill, no matter how much experience you have in dealing with those issues. I might add that the Members on this side of the House have considerable experience as compared to the Leader of the NDP, who had none.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to suggest to the Members of the House that the fact of the matter is it does take

some time to deal with the very complex issues of The City of Winnipeg Act. It was ill-founded to start with, brought in by a Government who is more interested in ideology than practicality. It has created all kinds of problems over a long period of time and, as a matter of fact, the resultant Government in the City of Winnipeg has been in spite of The City of Winnipeg Act, not because of it, and that has been demonstrated time after time after time.

So the question of producing amendments to the Act to streamline it, to put it into a proper perspective to give the city the amount of ability that it is due, to recognize that, at the same time recognizing the provincial responsibility in the overall, is something that does not happen overnight. It does not happen in a period of two or three months and, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if we had brought in a Bill like that, we would have been roundly criticized, I am sure, by the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) for rushing something into the House, that we would have been bringing something in that had no thought, we did not have proper consultation. All of those kinds of things would have been flowing from the mouth of the Member for Concordia because that is exactly what had happened in a couple of other instances.

So we want to be sure that we are dealing appropriately with The City of Winnipeg Act. We want to deal with it properly. We want to make sure that the extensive repairs and renovations to the Act that are required will be dealt with in a proper manner. We are not going to rush into it. We are not going to rush into it, no matter what the Member for Concordia thinks we should be doing. This is a responsible Government, one that will deal with those issues but will deal with them in an appropriate manner.

Mr. Speaker, he mentioned that they were very proud of the fact that in their White Paper they wanted to do away with the additional zone. That was the biggest planning mistake that was ever made around the City of Winnipeg by a provincial Government, the biggest planning mistake that has ever been made. That is the cause of urban sprawl in this area. It was the question of the allowance of municipalities to leave the additional zones.

I served as a member of the planning committee for about six or seven years in the City of Winnipeg and I served as chairman for five. I know full well what the problems are, and I know full well what the impact was when successive provincial Governments, regardless of what the political stripe was, allowed municipalities to opt out of the additional zone. That was a terrible mistake. It should never have happened, Mr. Speaker, and we are paying the price for it now. So the Member for Concordia need not be very proud of the fact that they wanted to do away with the rest of the municipalities in the additional zone.

Planning is very important for the City of Winnipeg. A situation that has to be dealt with has to be dealt with comprehensively and has to be dealt with in a manner that will see appropriate directions take place in and around the City of Winnipeg, something that Government with their high-handed attitude toward planning never, never consulted with the City of

Winnipeg, simply imposed their ideals and then, when they got themselves in a difficulty, turned around and then had to try and negotiate their way out of it. That was the high-handed attitude of the previous Government that served no purpose, and they served no purpose certainly as far as the City of Winnipeg's planning was concerned. That is not something we are prepared to do.

We will deal with the issues. We will look at appropriate models and we will come forward with recommendations for discussion with those who will be faced with the implementing of them. We will not impose them unilaterally upon municipal Government like the former NDP administration chose to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the accountability provisions of the Act, I support the question of providing additional responsibilities and accountability provisions in the Act so that the mayor and the council will have to be responsible, be accountable in a public way. I supported those before the public hearing process of the Cherniack Commission and I continue to support them. I think they are important. However, we have to ensure again that we are not doing it on a band-aid approach, that when the revisions of the Act come forward they will be all-encompassing, deal with all of those issues and will not simply be stuck here and there, willy-nilly, so that the actual impact of them will not be significant.

It is important, very important that those aspects of accountability be done in a comprehensive way so that everyone is very clear as to how and where and when they will be accountable, and I think that the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) was running off a little at the lip when he was suggesting that some of these changes ought to have occurred in a matter of a few months.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): First of all, I will just make a couple brief remarks. Much has been said at the committee and second reading. Certainly everyone is on record. This particular Government is on record as supporting a reduction in the size of council. Through many discussions, the Opposition, both the Liberals and the New Democratic Party, are against that type of progressive legislation that we put forward to start.

* (1730)

There have been many remarks in regard to future legislation. I can assure the Members on the other side of the House, and I have said it many times before, that indeed there will be legislation come forward in the next Session. To get it on the record again, the number of councillors and the amendments put forward, the number of councillors were necessary because of the Boundaries Commission people who we are meeting at this present time, and the other amendments were requests of the City of Winnipeg.

There was some mention that briefing notes should be supplied. I did at the time of introduction to second reading. I did bring forward at least 10 or 12 pages of briefing notes explaining the brief legislation that we were bringing forward.

There was also mention that we, this Government—well, sure we were disappointed that the Opposition did not agree to the reduction of 23. We still feel that if you look at the maps and you look at what is going on that this was the way to proceed. We proceeded with two sets of maps. I think that probably we will carry on. I know we will carry on and go on record of promoting legislation that is progressive. We will continue to come forward. This 23 was a first attempt by our Government to change The City of Winnipeg Act. I believe the citizens of Winnipeg will make the message to the other side of the House. They will be the judge on whether the streamlining of 23 and the streamlining of the maps that will come out looking at the 29, when they see the disruption in the local community committees and the disruption in local wards, that the 23, probably the key would have fit better in the lock.

There was also a discussion in regard to the Auditor. I again, at the committee, I did discuss it with the Member. I complimented the Member for bringing forward this particular legislation. However, I did express my concerns to at least that any type of this legislation, with this particular manner, that requires the City of Winnipeg action immediately, should probably be in discussion with the City of Winnipeg.

I am not saying that we discuss to make sure that they agree, at least go forward to the city council and to the mayor and whoever are the principals involved and at least tell them where you are coming from, and at least indicate to them ahead of time what you are going to do. I believe that this particular Government will carry on with that type of rapport that is necessary when you are the Minister of Urban Affairs and when you are the Government and you are dealing with a major legislation that we will have to deal with in the upcoming Session.

I was glad that the business tax assessment was brought forward. It will probably straighten out many years of tax differences that have come up since 1938. I must compliment the Member, the New Democratic Party Member, the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), who did do some particular lobbying to the Liberal Member and discussions to explain and help explain the discussions that were—I should not use the lobbying, but discussions that were necessary to make sure that it was explained about the business tax.

I also must mention that there have been questions in regard to piecemeal legislation. The piecemeal that they are talking about are amendments that have been brought forward by the City of Winnipeg, the majority of them are. That will always be. Whether next year we have the complete legislation and the major legislation, there will always be legislation through the process as requirement of the City of Winnipeg. They will come forward. This is what you derive in your discussions with the City of Winnipeg and then you look at the amendments at their request. You do your research on what they request. They will always come forward. So to call them piecemeal legislation then of what they are saying out there is that once the major Act is completed that there will be no further

amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act. Well, we know there are always going to be those amendments coming forward.

It was mentioned about the Cherniack Report and the White Paper. We have started to look at all the reports that have come forward. We have looked at the White Paper, we have looked at the Cherniack Report, and we feel that there are further discussions that are necessary before this is proceeded with. When we started this Session, from the first questions that were brought up to this Minister, we discussed and we said that there would be no major pieces of legislation coming forward until we had a chance and, as mentioned by my colleague from Charleswood (Mr. Ernst), the additional zone people, we met with them, a short while ago. They are very, very concerned that they have not been consulted on different legislation that is going to be required for additional zones.

We have met with the official delegation, and we have also assured them that we will meet with them before any changes to The City of Winnipeg Act are put forward. We are not saying we are going to repeat everything that was carried out by the Cherniack Report, but we feel we have to go back and check over the different reports and bring them forward.

I have no problem in mentioning that there will be major legislation, and we are committed to that. I look forward to the cooperation from the Opposition when that particular legislation is brought forward in the next Session.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL NO. 55—THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 55, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

THIRD READING

BILL NO. 45—THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL CONFLICT OF INTEREST AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 45, The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Conflict of Interest Amendment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, if I can for a moment report from the committee stage on this Bill, I think there are many Members sitting in the House right now who were at that committee stage. This was a Bill that had aspects of it which were hotly debated. I do not have much to say except that we reiterate our

earlier comments that it is an important step in an important direction. It deals with a campaign promise which we made and which I personally made that we would toughen the conflict-of-interest law. So I do applaud the Government for bringing this in in the first Session.

I had proposed amendments which were not successful, which would have seen included the executive assistants and the special assistants in with the technical officers. I was unable to attend yesterday at the committee meeting in the morning. However, I did get a full report on what happened to my motion. Let me just say that I have not been in politics long, but I am learning the ways of some political Parties and politicians. I was indeed upset to hear that my honourable friends in the third Party had a press conference, basically on Thursday, at which they had suggested that this was a wonderful amendment and indeed their amendment, which it was not, and then had thrown themselves at the altar of hypocrisy the next week and basically—

* (1740)

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Concordia.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): If the Member for St. James wants to give lectures on the one hand about public practice and then make illogical and immature comments on the other hand, I think he should refrain from it. It does him no justice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Concordia does not have a point of order.

Mr. Edwards: In the words of Sir John A. Macdonald, I guess I hit the sore spot. In fact, it is very clear that not only was there a blatant misleading, I would suggest, of the press with respect to the amendment that went before the committee last week. Indeed there was blatant hypocrisy in the voting, not only against it but for an amendment which would see not only the special assistants and the executive assistants dropped from coverage by this Act but the technical officers. As I say, I am new to politics but I am learning how not to practise it.

The Act in and of itself makes important and progressive moves into this area. I believe that even without the amendments I had suggested this Act puts us at the forefront of this nation in terms of conflict-of-interest legislation. I am sure that there are further amendments to be brought to this area in this province and I am sure that there are new initiatives which we can look at in the future. I would suggest that one of the first things that we maybe look at is trying to make some better sense out of this Act. It reads with extreme difficulty and, I would suggest, is very complicated, and I think probably unnecessarily complicated.

I think it is important to make this area as clear as possible when you are dealing with such drastic and

onerous repercussions from an allegation and/or a finding of conflict and, to that extent, I have read this Act a number of times and I know that it can get very complicated. I think a lot of the terms in it are fairly vague and that worries me when you have such a serious piece of legislation which can lead to such serious consequences.

Let me conclude by saying that the amendments with respect to the tendering process, we were pleased to support. We think those are also improvements and we look forward to the compliance with those new additions to this Act. I have done some looking at some of the statutes which have come out of the United States with respect to the purchasing done by Governments. I know that we can still have some improvements in that area, but I think that this is an important step forward.

I see my honourable friends from the third Party writing furiously and conversing with each other and I am sure they are chomping at the bit to make some comments, I suspect, in response to some of my comments, and I do not intend to deplete the entertainment value of those comments from this House any further.

Let me conclude then by saying that we look forward to this becoming the law of this province, and we see it as an important step for this province. I think it puts us at the forefront in this nation and I look forward to even further improvements into new areas and, as I say, a general simplification of the Act, I think, may be in order in the future. Thank you.

Mr. Doer: I would like to say a few things about the Bill, but I would also like to address the issue raised by the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) and put it clearly on the record.

I find, Mr. Speaker, the comments—and I have not used this term in this House before—quite frankly, very arrogant in terms of their conclusions that were drawn by the Member for St. James. The fact of the matter is that there was a concern about Section D of that Act that was raised by both the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party in a legitimate way in dealing with the Premier (Mr. Filmon), who was presenting the Bill to this Chamber.

We are not a perfect Party. We are not absolutely perfect in terms of dealing with legislation and, because we are not perfect, we actually listened to the debate. We actually listened to the merits of the debate. We do not go in there all the time with our minds so totally made up that if we do not hear a good point we will not adapt in terms of the good point and adapt in terms of the policies that we will vote for or against. I apologize to this Chamber for that human imperfection that we do unfortunately have.

Any time we change where we are going to vote on a particular Bill because of a discrepancy does not mean to say that it is a "political" manoeuvre. We do make political manoeuvres from time to time. We all do as political Parties. But in this case, I want to be very, very careful in saying to this House that we actually listened to the debate.

The Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) put out a great argument in terms of the discrepancy between a technical officer and a special assistant. The Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) put out very good arguments about the way the special assistants and executive assistants were dealt with and, quite frankly—and I hate to put it in Hansard, but—the Premier (Mr. Filmon) made some good arguments as well in terms of this issue, in terms of some of the difficulties from a special assistant going to another area.

Also the same day, the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) raised an example in this House that fell into our lap in trying to decide what was best to do in this case, where a technical officer hired under Section 32 of the Act would have been hired under MAST to go to MAST even though the replacement was a patronage appointment, in our opinion, and we made those comments, but the example the Member for Fort Rouge raised, the person they were replacing would technically be in violation of Section D of the Act.

We did not say that we would not support the amendment from the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) or we would not support the proposal that was there. What we said is let us take some time as political Parties to make sure that, when we take the stroke of the pen in its final analysis, we are not disenfranchising people for a year in terms of employment that we should not be doing.

Because those groups are on the edge in terms of Ministers and senior staff and because we were not sure of that edge—and I think all of us should be honest about that in this House—we thought we should hold that over and take another look at it over a period of time. We suggested that be looked at in an informal way between the Government, the Opposition and ourselves, and we are perfectly prepared at the conclusion of the day that, if that has to go back into the Bill as another improvement into what is the best Bill in Canada, then we would do that. Let that be very clear.

I do not, quite frankly, understand why this became almost an intensely emotional issue. Quite frankly, it is not the leading issue on the mouths of people in the coffee shops and beer halls of Manitoba—and I should not even mention beer halls. If we are wrong on that amendment, fine. If we are right on that amendment, fine. I would just like to take a little more time on it, and I want to put that on the record.

Quite frankly, I thought the Premier (Mr. Filmon) did make a few good points on that issue and so did the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) in his question of the same day, and so did the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards). The Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) raised the whole hypocrisy of having technical officers included in the one-year prohibition and special assistants excluded.

I think we should look at that. So I think deleting it at this point makes sense, because all we are doing is taking that group of people out of that one-year freeze in terms of the provisions of the Act. We applauded at the time that this Bill was introduced, the introduction of this Bill in the Speech from the Throne.

It was unfortunate that the discussion degenerated into a Desjardins' Bill. I thought this Bill could have been dealt with on its own merit and—

An Honourable Member: You mention his name more often than anybody else.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a person who has spent 40 years in public service in two political Parties but is a person who is a friend of all of ours, I think you could say, I think he is a friend of all of ours. We know he put in hour after hour of personal dedication to the people of Manitoba, whether he was an alderman in St. Boniface, whether he was a Member of this Legislature, whether he is a Member of the Cabinet, the Minister of Health, whether he is head of the Health Services Commission, when he came back as Opposition critic in Health, and then as a Minister of Health and Urban Affairs and Sport. For years, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it was unfortunate that we could not have dealt with the Bill on its merit and had to try to tap in some partisan designation to this Bill.

Perhaps we can be accused of doing the same thing when we responded with the Downey amendment and, if I have offended the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey), so be it, but we believe that there have been too many untendered contracts from all political Parties, whether in Government federally or provincially. There will be time, from time to time, that Government will have to have untendered contracts to get technical advice and technical assistance in a very quick period of time.

* (1750)

If you had to hire a lawyer to do something immediately that technically you would not have it tendered, there are going to be other contracts that will have to be untendered. We picked the most recent example where 10 or 12 firms would have had the expertise and the quality of staff to do the same job in a non-urgent way that the Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey) had with an untendered contract to "Tory friends," as per his August 2 comments, we think were inappropriate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said all political Parties have done it, and I think we should have proper disclosure. Certainly, I know our old contact, David Walker, had an untendered contract in '83-84. The New Democrats have done it; the Tories have done it. I think, as each of the new people come into this Legislature, we should do as much as possible to change the behaviour and morality in the Manitoba Legislature.

We propose the provision to try to deal with the 5 percent, or \$1,000.00. Again, it was not a perfect proposal. Again, it was rejected because of the problems in terms of the time of filing versus the equity of the stock. Again, we respected the advice we received. We have said that in the committee. Again, we were trying to be flexible in terms of the merits of the debate, and I think that has been the bottom line of this Bill. I really think we should leave this Bill with that kind of perspective. I want to thank the Members—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism, on a point of order.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the glare from the halo over the head of the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) is blinding me, Sir. Perhaps you could attend to solving that problem.

Mr. Doer: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I thought there should be a separation between state and religion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister—

Mr. Doer: As an old member from St. Paul's, I take that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism does not have a point of order.

Mr. Doer: I want to thank the Members quite frankly for the good debate on this Bill. I really believe that is where we should leave this. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to thank them for the support in terms of disclosure of contracts of untendered nature because I think it will help the process. It is not perfect, but it will help the process.

We look forward to working with all Members to deal with the outstanding issues, that loophole of the 5 percent versus a straight cash amount. We also look forward to working with all Members in dealing with the other discrepancy that was left, the special assistants and the technical officer, that was deleted from the Bill. It is still an outstanding item in our opinion and we are willing to work with it in the interim months. Thank you.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): I just wanted to add a couple of comments to this debate. I think my Leader has done an excellent job in providing an overview of the circumstances surrounding the amendments and the necessity for this piece of legislation.

I wanted to perhaps correct the record, particularly for the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), who seems to have felt himself somewhat slighted by a press conference that I held in which I announced that the NDP intended to introduce three separate amendments to the conflict-of-interest legislation. One of those, Mr. Deputy Speaker, happened to be an amendment which the Member of St. James (Mr. Edwards) was introducing while I was giving the press conference. I learned somewhat later that the Member for St. James suffers from the vanity that only he could have an idea, an original idea.

The fact of the matter is that the Member for St. James knew full well that I and several of my colleagues were preparing exactly the same amendment as he was preparing. I did not know that the Member for St. James had prepared such an amendment. I had gone so far and my colleagues had gone so far as to draft that amendment. My colleague, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), attempted to show the Member for St. James that amendment. He pushed it away. He did not

want to know. Then he had the audacity to pretend that only he could have such an idea.

I recognize that ownership of an idea is a very attractive proposition at this point, but I want the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) to know and the House to know that there was no deception or hypocrisy on my part. I had on my own developed an understanding of what the amendment meant and really intended to introduce an amendment. I was convinced by my Leader subsequent to that that the inclusion of both special assistants and executive assistants in with the technical officers may not be the most appropriate. In fact, including technical officers may not be the most appropriate and did subsequently not support the amendment to treat executive and special assistants identically with technical officers.

If the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) wants to maintain that this was his idea and he has proprietorship over the idea, then he is certainly entitled to do that, but he would be in error if he was to conclude that. Thank you.

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): This was a very interesting debate on Bill 45. I think there was some good thought behind the Bill. I think there were some honest motivations on attempts to amend and improve this Bill.

I would like to correct an impression that the issue here is one of claiming ownership to a particular amendment. That is not what the issue is. The issue is where do you stand on a particular amendment and how do you talk to Members opposite in a committee and how do you address—in this case, it was the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of the province who was the sponsor of the Bill and he has put forward, even in the Throne Speech, that conflict of interest is, as far as he is concerned, a very important of the initiatives of his administration.

The grilling of the Premier that went on by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) was quite fair and right, but it led to an impression of where the Member for Flin Flon and also for the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), where they were going on this particular issue. It is very interesting that—I am sorry to say they will not be able to hear my words, I hope they will be able to view them in Hansard after the fact. The issue here is that it was quite clearly understood in the committee—and this is the point, I think, that the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) is making as to where the NDP was, and where the NDP was in support of the amendment that there would not be exceptions made and that political appointees, that people who are drafters of legislation, developers of policy and executive assistants and special assistants, none of which would be exempted.

It was quite clear cut. They spoke passionately. They questioned ferociously. We understood exactly where those two Members were from. Things changed rather dramatically after the Leader of the Second Opposition Party (Mr. Doer) entered the committee room. I would suggest, for all the flip-flop finger pointing that they do, that we can point to this one ourselves. I stand by

the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) on the fact that amendment should have been supported, as it said it would have been supported the day before. It is most interesting to see this turnaround and all sorts of justification for that turnaround, whether by the Leader of the Second Opposition Party or more particularly by the Member for Flin Flon who spent such an enormous amount of time in the committee, going after the Premier on that very point.

Those are the comments I wish to put on the record. I think this Act is an improvement. I think we can go further on it. I hope we will see attempts to improve conflict of interest down the road. Thank you.

Mr. McCrae: It may be of some interest to you to note that I believe all Honourable Members would agree to forego Private Members' Hour today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to set aside Private Members' Hour this afternoon? (Agreed)

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe also Honourable Members will agree not to see the clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed? (Agreed)

* (1800)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say a few words on Bill No. 45. I have listened intently to Members opposite as they have already presented a revisionist history of events as recently as yesterday with respect to Bill No. 45. I find it somewhat surprising that the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) would berate all those, the individual to his right and individual to his left, for claiming in a vain sort of fashion the propriety to the amendment which one wanted to bring in but the other one had beat, or vice versa, I cannot remember which.

Let me say I also have to comment on the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) in his true confessions when he finally revealed for the Chamber how it was or how it came to be that his Leader talked him into a common-sense approach dealing with one of the specific sections that have of course helped us over an impasse, helped us all over an impasse and led us on to the greater consideration of the Bill.

I thank the Member for Flin Flon in the approach to the particular problem that we were in and how graciously he backed down. I have to comment because I keep hearing this reference to the Desjardins Bill. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had not heard that commentary at all up until about two or three days ago when I first heard it mentioned in that context by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer).

Since that time I have heard nothing about Bill No. 45 other than it has the pseudonym of being called the Desjardins Bill. The genesis of that remark did not start on these benches. It started over there. Over and over the last three or four days, I just keep hearing this term come over and over again, particularly from the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer). The Leader, the Member from Concordia (Mr. Doer),

said that this was not a perfect Bill, that maybe some of the amendments that were coming forward maybe were not perfect. No truer words could he speak. There was not one of those amendments that was proposed and indeed one of them was accepted that were in any way anything other than not being perfect.

There were some major, major shortcomings with the amendments that were presented. As a matter of fact, had I been on my feet yesterday, I would have called as to the admissibility of that particular amendment because it is my view now, as it was then, that was out of order.

What we had happen yesterday in committee, we had introduced to a conflict-of-interest piece of legislation that is law another specific side issue which in my view is destructive of the whole legislative process. We know that when we make laws and we are talking about amendments that are intending to change an Act, an existing Act, that one just cannot introduce an amendment dealing with something almost totally unrelated. That happened yesterday.

In my view, it does not strengthen the particular conflict-of-interest legislation that we have governing individuals within this House, and indeed because of the due passage of Bill No. 45 will govern other people within the Civil Service. I honestly believe that good legislative process was not served well yesterday by bringing forward, by the joint agreement of the Opposition Parties, an amendment that called for disclosure of contracts and yet, I say for the record, disclosure of contracts should be somewhere in legislation. Again I will say for the record that we will do what we can to ensure that happens under the proper Act, that being The Financial Administration Act, but again I point out for the record that when you have Opposition Parties that in some cases are trying to make a political point, they would rather frustrate the process a little bit, frustrate the legitimate parliamentary process, rather than seeing it introduced in the proper position. That is how the citizens of this province, indeed legislators to come, end up with laws that quite often do not seem to work very well.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just wanted to put that on the record again to restate that the Bill as was proposed by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in itself tried to address certain situations. It did that very progressively and yet I think the amendment that was passed by the combined Opposition yesterday in my view took away not only from the intent, but in my view weakened a little bit the whole intent of the legislation that is on the statute books right at this point in time. Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 47—THE LIQUOR CONTROL AMENDMENT ACT (2)

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 47, The Liquor Control Amendment Act (2), for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have some very brief comments on this Bill. Again

we had some thorough debate and I thank all Honourable Members for the discussions we had in the committee stage. I think they were helpful and it led to some important amendments to this Act. I was pleased to see support for, in particular, the photo-card identification. From my point of view, that was a very important addition to this Act. The Honourable Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) also had some amendments to this Act.

We were disappointed, and I think we should register that at this stage, our disappointment, that the equality of appeal rights given to objectors was not achieved. The applicant still has superior appeal rights to that of an objector and I, for one, think that is wrong. I think that the arguments put forward by the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) at the committee stage, which were accepted by the third party, were not valid and took away I think from the very important statement which could have been made by giving equal appeal rights, and that is that an objector to an applicant for a liquor licence is treated with respect and with the full rights that an applicant has, and is seen as an equal party in the process of ensuring that liquor control is done in a manner in which we all can accept.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that was achieved and I think that our communities are crying out for involvement in the process of making sure that liquor establishments respect the residential identity of neighbourhoods and work together with the residents to create a community which all can accept and indeed in which all can take pride. We did not achieve that and I feel compelled at this point to register that disappointment. In particular, I feel compelled to register that disappointment with the New Democratic Party and in that vein I support this Act.

I think it is an important Act. I think that all of the amendments were excellent. However, it is unfortunate that we did not achieve the quality which I think would have sent a message to the residents in this province that they were important and they were equal in the process of giving liquor licences. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): First of all, we have spoken at different stages of this Bill, so my comments will be brief. We are pleased that the domestic versus imported provision has been withdrawn at this stage by the Attorney-General. I believe that two of our three breweries are in real difficulty. I know we have to deal with the GATT negotiations and I respect that. I really believe that the issues of the effect on those jobs, in our marketplace and the effects on our Manitoba economy, must be evaluated by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst), which we asked for some time ago and I would encourage the Government to proceed with that impact study.

* (1810)

We also asked the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) to deal with an environmental impact study in terms of the fact that the American beer cans are not now recyclable. We would ask that be incorporated

into their study as well as legal opinions on GATT because there is a discrepancy between legal advice versus selling imported beer which includes American beer in the liquor stores and being required to sell them in the hotel vendors.

Certainly, the experience in Alberta leads us to believe that any kind of market share that is similar to Alberta will mean that breweries will close in Manitoba. That also has implications potentially for some of the major sports attractions. Certainly the Jets are in negotiations with their commercial sponsor. It is certainly an asset for the community to have it here and we should not forget that as well.

We have already spoken about the issue of advertising. There is discrimination between the local broadcasters and out-of-province and out-of-country broadcasters. We would prefer a concerted effort on behalf of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), as Minister responsible for the Alcohol Foundation, to ask all Ministers of Health and all Ministers responsible for alcohol foundations to ban all advertising on liquor, as we have moved in the direction we have moved in terms of cigarette and tobacco advertising. Certainly, if we can do it with the new cable television stations and the Canadian television stations, which we do have jurisdiction under the CRTC and the Department of Health, then we can deal with our local broadcasters in terms of that discrimination in a way that is not the liberalization and the permissiveness that is being proposed in this Bill but is rather the discouragement of alcohol and alcohol consumption particularly to our young people where most of these ads are aimed. We would rather see that attempt on behalf of the Minister of Health over the next year. We know in Hansard that he is recorded as having stated that the AFM is opposed to this provision. Those are the experts. They said that in this Chamber through the Minister of Health. I think we should take their advice.

In terms of photo cards, we supported the Member for St. James' (Mr. Edwards) amendment, to get that on the record, because he is upset with us when we do not support his amendments. We thank the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) on his amendment and his advice.

(The Acting Speaker, Mr. Ed Mandrake, in the Chair.)

I say to the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) that I think we did not vote with the last part of his amendment because of the disagreement going on. I tend to believe that the equity provision may be the fairer one in terms of all the steps. We will look forward to dialogue in the future on that issue, because there was fairly strong argument in terms of the equity issue provided by the Liberal Members. I think the Member for Wolseley made an excellent case. We just want to do our homework.

I have to be honest. I know the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) could get a one year, or get a ban on advertising if he really put his mind to it. It is unfortunate that it is not a priority with his Government that alcohol consumption remains symbolically as a priority of our society with the liberalization of advertising. I would rather go to the banning way rather than the liberalization way as proposed by the Members opposite. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Acting Speaker, I just want to put a few words on the record here with regard to this particular piece of legislation.

When I met last year, actually during the election campaign at the same time as the Attorney-General, with the broadcasters, I learned for the first time that we were not able to do what it was that the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) would, in essence, like them to do. That would have been my first choice. If I could have blocked all liquor advertisement coming into Manitoba, I would have done so, particularly in the hours prior to ten o'clock. I do believe that advertising does encourage the consumption of alcoholic beverages. I do not buy the argument that advertisement just indicates what brand of liquor one should indulge in and I do not believe that.

I do not particularly like the style of advertising that we are using increasingly in our advertisements, particularly that kind of advertising which encourages young people to believe that the only way they can have a good time is to have a beer in their hands. I do not think that does anyone any good, and I certainly concur with the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) and I urge the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) to indeed meet with other Attorneys-General and those responsible for the Liquor Control Boards in their variety of provinces to see if we could come up with province-wide agreement to such legislation.

However, in the meantime, we have a serious inequity in the Province of Manitoba, an inequity that puts our broadcasters at a disadvantage to every other broadcaster in this country, and that is why I will support this legislation. I want to say very clearly that I would like to see the banning of alcohol advertising in the same way that we have abandoned cigarette advertising in broadcasting. I would like to see more money put into our school system to educate our young people about the drug called alcohol, which is indeed the drug that does more damage to human beings in our society than any other single drug. I would like to see a very careful monitoring of this legislation to watch indeed to see if it has had the effect, which I regret it may have, and that is to encourage more people to consume alcohol and that it will not simply be a choice of brands. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Mandrake): Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Acting Speaker, I want to preface my comments on this Bill by saying that I think we need to move to a different way of dealing with amendments to The Liquor Control Act than we have been dealing with them in the past. When I say in the past, I include not just the period that this Government has been in but also the period prior to that. I think we are in the unfortunate position of making changes which are ad hoc in nature, in large part in response to pressure from different lobby groups. I certainly respect the position of those lobby groups in arguing for amendments that are in their interest, but I really think we need an overall review of The Liquor Control Act in Manitoba that attempts to deal with

some of the issues that we raise every time we approach amendments to the Act in an ad hoc way. I think today's discussion and the discussion that is taking place in committee on second reading indicates some of the dilemmas that we are faced with.

Let us deal with the question of advertising, and I think that is probably one of the most important sections of this Bill. I am concerned about the impact that the move to open up advertising will have between seven and ten o'clock. I am particularly concerned too that the Government, the Minister responsible for the Liquor Control Commission (Mr. McCrae) has not built in a process to deal with some of the concerns that are there. It is a dilemma because, no matter what happens on this Bill, between seven and ten o'clock there will be continuous advertising on stations located outside of Manitoba, whether they are Canadian stations or American stations, and people will still see advertisements for beer, wine and for liquor generally.

So we cannot stop that flow. I think that is something that is taken as a given and, as the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) points out, there is a real dilemma in the sense that some people would perhaps prefer to be able to ban advertising totally, but cannot do that under the circumstances, and what does one do? Does one move towards getting rid of that supposed inequity as far as the broadcasters are concerned? But in also doing that also raised the problems that have been identified by a number of speakers of the potential of this kind of advertising to increase consumption.

I want to say that I am concerned that it will lead to an increase in consumption, especially amongst the young people. Because if one looks at the ads that one currently sees, it is clear they are lifestyle ads. The ads that are currently in place do encourage the association of alcohol with a certain lifestyle and I think that does lead to an increase in consumption. That is why, for example, we banned cigarette advertising completely.

I want to indicate that I am not a prohibitionist in terms of alcohol. I believe actually that in some ways we should be liberalizing our liquor laws for those who are going to consume alcohol. I think that is the route we should be going, but I do not believe in promotion. I think it is an individual choice. I think each and every individual will decide their own attitudes toward alcohol, and I think that is the bottom line that I would like to see us approach.

* (1820)

But we are not debating that, as I said. In many ways, we are debating a series of ad hoc amendments that arise from pressure from various different interest groups. I would urge the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) to completely review the Act because I find that there are many provisions that are totally antiquated. I, for example, note that there was a presentation in committee from an individual who runs a neighbourhood style, an English-style pub in the city, the King's Head. I have had the opportunity to meet with that individual who I know personally, and it is amazing when you look at the situation that he is faced with, the number of

different sections and subsections of the Act, of regulations, that have created difficulty in his establishing an English-style, neighbourhood-style pub.

In fact, the ironic part is that we have a number of establishments, and he knows of a number in particular, Main Street establishments, for example, within close proximity. I will give you an example of one which had 160 police visits in a period of six months, 160 police visits, and yet it does not apparently violate any of the liquor laws that we have. Even though it is running into serious problems with the law, that operation is not violating our liquor laws. Yet something of the nature of the King's Head where they have a much more civilized atmosphere in terms of drinking has no police visits, and yet they run into problems with the Liquor Control Commission.

I do not blame the Liquor Control Commission. They are only doing their job. What they are doing is they are enforcing regulations, some of which are antiquated and are in need of a review. I want to urge the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) to look at that as we do debate this here. I think it is an opportunity to recognize that we need something other than the ad hoc approach we have had. We have had the amendments proposed by the Government. I know there have been a number proposed by the Liberal Party as well and we have expressed a number of concerns during the debate, but I would suggest that the context for discussion of those type of amendments would be an overall review of Manitoba's liquor laws.

I think we can strike a balance between not promoting drinking on the one hand, as I have said, but also on the other hand recognizing that people want different options and alternatives when they do have alcohol consumption available to them. That is what concerns me, Mr. Acting Speaker. The bottom line for me is, as I said, I do not believe in promotion, but I do believe that there should be the opportunity, as is the case in many other provinces, for different types of establishments, different types of atmospheres. I do not really think you can categorize that as being liberal or non-liberal in attitude. It is really what I consider allowing some element of freedom of choice to individuals who are going to be consuming alcohol.

So with that in mind, I want to indicate that I, as do other Members of our caucus, have some significant problems with a number of the amendments proposed in this Act. I really believe that if this Act is going to pass that the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) should be reporting back to this Legislature at least on the advertising or the impact of that in terms of consumption.

I think the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) should also look at some other concerns I know that I have expressed in the past and others have expressed as to the impact that the passage of this Bill is going to have on the sponsorship of community events, because I know up until this point a number of breweries, for example, have sponsored community events and it has been a very significant source of income to those community activities. I would hate to see the increased level of advertising result in a decrease in the—I would consider that far better use of the funds available, which

is the sponsorship of community events. I hope the Attorney-General will be looking at that particular area.

I also hope the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) would discuss with the industry the type of ads that it is running, because I really believe that they should not be running the type of ads they are running currently, which are lifestyle ads and I think do have the impact of promoting use of alcohol, particularly amongst young people. I think there are other types of advertisements which they could run—supposedly their concern is brand competition—without running into these lifestyle ads. In fact, there are several other concerns that I think have to be addressed.

I do not think we should be merely by-passing this Act, which I assume is going to happen because of the support of the Liberals and Conservatives for the Act, be given a carte blanche to the broadcasting industry. I think they should be held accountable. In fact, I would have gone further and said, for the record, there should have also been some attempt to take what I consider is going to be a real boondoggle for the broadcasting industry. They are going to attain greatly increased revenues and transfer at least some of those revenues towards dealing with the alcohol abuse or dealing with drinking and driving, and some areas of public advantage, because I really believe in the bottom line what we are doing with this Bill is we are helping the broadcasters, we are helping some of the other lobbies that are out there. We are not doing very much though for the people of Manitoba, and I really once again urge that we have our overall review of our liquor laws to make them responsive to the people of Manitoba and not the lobby groups, as we have been doing over the last number of years.

As I said, that is not a criticism strictly of this Government. It is a criticism that could be applied to other Governments in the past. Let us bring our liquor laws into the 1990's by working with the people of Manitoba, rather than ad hoc changes as we do year in and year out. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Mandrake): Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): Mr. Acting Speaker, it is with pleasure I rise to address these amendments to The Liquor Control Act. I think that some of the things that were required to bring this rather patchwork quilt of a document up to date have been done. However, I think it really bespeaks the fact that we have a very old piece of legislation. It has not been thoroughly reviewed and revised in probably three decades. It has been added to. It has been amended. It has had band-aids put on it. I hope what we have here today will be amongst the last of a series of amendments before there is a thorough and complete and a restructuring of an Act reflecting a different time and develop an Act that is much more consistent in itself and, hopefully, more reflective of what the needs of the society are with regard liquor consumption and liquor control.

The amendments put forward by the Official Opposition, I am pleased to say, met with some support

from the Second Opposition Party, in particular the photo ID card which I think will make for a much better control of underage drinking and I think will be a boon to those who operate licensed liquor premises.

I would also like to say that the amendments which I proposed to try and encourage a greater degree of public participation, public awareness, public information, and the whole process of the licensing of liquor premises also met with some success. The issue was that, as it stands, today people generally do not know what is going on when liquor licensing hearings are held. The amendment that was brought in in which there will be in the advertisement a listing of the type of licence being applied for, the business name, the corporate name, the address involved, and the type of licence and hours with that licence are all very important.

Adjacent businesses and, more particularly, adjacent residents can be very negatively impacted by a new licensed operation going into place but without having had the opportunity to address it in a formal license hearing. This is a major step forward, something that quite frankly should have been done a long time ago.

I also wanted to see and hear that people who objected to the application for a liquor licence, be they private citizens, be they businesspeople, be they residents' groups, may they be interest groups such as parent-teacher associations, and groups of a like nature, will have the opportunity to not only object to that application but can object to it in the appeal levels. There are two appeal levels and that is to the senior level of the Liquor Commission itself and to the Court of Queen's Bench.

What happened in committee yesterday is that there was agreement from the Second Opposition Party that, yes, it should be allowed the appeal at the first level, the Liquor Commission. I am pleased for that support and I thank them. I think it was a step in the right direction.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

* (1830)

I was, however, disappointed in that they did not during the deliberations at the committee agree with going with the second step which would have offered equity all the way. In other words, whatever an applicant has available as a recourse to appeal, so would there be that same recourse available for appeal by an objector, somebody impacted by that liquor licence application.

I know that there have been comments made to me in private by the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer), and I appreciate those. I think what we will see is we will see the support from that Party in the next Session to a further amendment which will then make the Act consistent, which will give an equity to both objectors and applicants in the whole process of liquor licensing of premises in Manitoba.

I look forward to that future support. I think we made a major step forward. I think the amended Act as presented, as Bill 47, is an improvement but only a small improvement. We have a lot further to go and I

will look forward in a future Session to a complete overhaul of the liquor licensing Act for this province. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill No. 47, The Liquor Control Amendment Act (2). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: A voice vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A voice vote. All those in favour, say Yea; all those opposed, say Nay. In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

BILL NO. 12—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1988

Bill No. 12 was read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 14—THE REGULATIONS ACT

Bill No. 14 was read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 32—THE MANITOBA INSTITUTE OF THE PURCHASING MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION OF CANADA ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 32, The Manitoba Institute of the Purchasing Management Association of Canada Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): Mr. House Leader, honourable colleagues, constituents and friends, speaking as a salesman of long standing, it is high time that we recognized the valuable contribution that organized professional purchasing agents contribute to the business community.

Individuals who are purchasing agents and have studied the various courses on getting the best return on the investment for the dollars pay for themselves many, many times over. Everybody here would recognize the degree of professionalism that these people maintain, the high level of ethics that they maintain, and the concern they have for ensuring that they invest the monies that they do invest very wisely and ensure that there is an adequate and more than acceptable return on that investment for their contributors.

To honour them, to let them recognize, to identify themselves as an association to allow them to establish their own rules and regulations, their by-laws, to honour their own members by joining this group by certifying them as professional purchasing agents is a very commendable piece of legislation.

I applaud the initiative of my colleague from Lac du Bonnet for bringing this Bill in, and we on this side of the House are very pleased to support it and wish all of the purchasing agents, those who are part of the

association now and those who will become part of the association in the future, the best of luck in this particular proposal. Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 55—THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 55, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. McCrae: I am pleased to bring this Bill forward at this time with the cooperation of and in consultation with all Parties of this House.

As you know, the Legislative Assembly Management Commission carries out, in some respects, the business of the House and oversees the services provided to Members to ensure the adequate operation and smooth functioning of this place and also to ensure that Honourable Members can adequately represent their constituents.

The Bill before us provides adequate financial assistance in terms of access allowances so that Honourable Members, if they need to, are able to operate constituency offices. This Bill also takes care of Members' transportation needs so that Members can adequately represent their constituents.

For many years, I think, Manitobans have been fortunate in the sense of their elected representatives. There were simpler times, I should say, when an MLA's work did not always take up all of his or her time. They were able, some of them, to pursue other vocations which provided them and their families with an adequate living. Very often, Members would benefit from that type of income and perhaps use some of their own money to assist them in carrying out their duties as Members of the Legislature.

Times have changed. We live in a much more complex atmosphere certainly in terms of legislative affairs. Honourable Members, many of them, and myself included, may on occasion come under some criticism for not maintaining an adequate presence or an adequate representation in their communities. After all, our constituents want to see us. They want to be able to have opportunities to bring their problems to us, and being able to provide those communication tools to MLAs is essential for the smooth operation of a Legislative Assembly and for a Member to be able to do his or her work and to carry out his or her responsibilities to constituents.

So I put this Bill forward. It deals with transportation arrangements, it deals with travel allowances and access allowances and sessional per diems when Members have to spend so much time away from their home constituencies and here in the big City of Winnipeg. With those few comments, I put this Bill before the House.

I should say a word or two about the process. The Legislative Assembly Management Commission struck a subcommittee composed of Members, one Member from each of the three Parties represented in this Legislature, to look at the arrangements that we have and to look at them not only in a way that would allow them to do their work but also to look at them vis-a-vis arrangements in other provinces of this country. I think it has been well-recognized for a long time in this province that our legislators have not kept up with other jurisdictions in this regard. So that subcommittee reported to the Legislative Assembly Management Commission, which recommends, through this Bill, the initiatives contained therein.

I put this Bill forward with the cooperation of all Parties and I put it forward for the consideration of the House.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

* (1840)

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I have been asked by my colleagues in the New Democratic Party Caucus to speak to this legislation on behalf of all our Members.

Firstly, let me state that there is unanimous agreement among our caucus and, as I understand, among all three caucuses that this legislation and the increased services and benefits that will flow from it will help all of us to better serve our constituents. It will enable us to be more accessible to our constituents and will provide us with expanded supports as we seek to represent them and meet their demands on us.

I have specifically been asked to speak to this Bill because I, along with a small number of other MLAs in this Chamber, have seen the role of the individual MLA change significantly throughout our tenure as elected representatives. That change in role has had a profound impact on what is expected of us in this Chamber and, more importantly, what is expected of us in our constituencies.

In 1969, when I was first elected to the Legislature to represent the people of Brandon East, we were expected to be part-time MLAs. Our pay, benefits, and support services were structured accordingly. We were paid twice a year, the beginning of the Session and the end of the Session, that was it. We had very limited support services. Caucus staffing was almost non-existent. We did not even have our own offices in the building. MLAs did not have offices. Since that time, over the past 20 years, circumstances have changed dramatically and so have the salary, benefits and services we receive as elected officials. The change that we are now debating, therefore, is one more step in providing MLAs with the resources that they require to continue to be effective representatives. As well, they also reflect an even more dramatic change in our role as MLAs that is of more recent vintage. We are now part of a changed political landscape that has resulted in a minority Government in the Province of Manitoba.

Minority Governments, Mr. Speaker, are by their very nature different than majority Governments and our roles as MLAs change accordingly. I believe that our

responsibilities are more expanded in a minority Government situation. We are more visible as MLAs, and I found that our constituents expect more of us as MLAs under these circumstances. More is expected of us both in this Chamber and outside of it.

This legislation and the increased constituency access allowance is recognition of those expanded demands upon us. The increased constituency access allowance will enable every MLA to build better communication links with his or her constituents. It will enable many MLAs to hire part-time staff to help them with the increasingly complicated case work and research on public issues and legislations. Mr. Speaker, it will make us better MLAs while we are here.

It must be also noted that while the increased constituency access allowance is an improvement over our present allowance, it is mid-range with respect to similar allowances that MLAs in other provinces receive. I make that point because it is important to put these improvements in the appropriate context, and the best way to do that is to compare our overall package with similar packages in other provinces where the roles, responsibilities and expectations are the same.

I believe that the changes mandated in this legislation are comparable with our counterparts in the other provinces. For example, the severance pay provisions are very similar to those in the Provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, Prince Edward Island. Other provinces have other plans that are structured differently, but only New Brunswick and Manitoba had none at all. The severance pay provisions in this legislation are a reflection of what many other provinces have determined long ago, and that is that there should be some transitional support for MLAs as they move from elected roles to non-elected activities, whether that be in the private, public or cooperative sectors.

The new conflict of interest legislation, which is also supported by all Parties in this Legislature, also points to the need for some transitional severance pay provisions for Members whose employment opportunities are justifiably limited for a period of one year. In fact, these two separate pieces of legislation could be considered to be companion pieces to that extent.

The car allowance is a recognition that MLAs, like Ministers, Deputy Ministers, many senior staff, and many in the private sector are required to have a car to fulfill their work duties. The actual amount of the allowance contemplated in this legislation is less than the car allowances one would find in the private sector or even the Crown sector, but we have agreed that it is an appropriate amount within the overall context of this legislation.

Finally, there is an extension of the principle of reimbursing Members of the Legislature who represent constituencies outside of the City of Winnipeg and who need to maintain two full-time residences on a more equitable basis. In the past, the legislation and the per diem structure has not fully recognized the fact that many Members had to maintain two residences all year round and not just during the Session. They were losing

money because of that inequity and the establishment of the limited per diem for those Members is intended to correct that situation. The corresponding cap on the number of full per diem days in any one fiscal year will help to contain costs of the per diem system in the event of a lengthy Session.

As legislators, we have the responsibility to determine many of our own benefits, support services, and basic remuneration. Oftentimes, that is a difficult responsibility. These are not easy decisions, but the decision-making process can be made easier if one applies certain tests to ensure that these decisions that we make on behalf of ourselves are appropriate and defensible. I believe these tests to be, firstly, do the change benefits and circumstances help us to better serve those who elect us? That is the first point, Mr. Speaker. The second test, are the benefits and support services comparable to those in other provinces? In other words, are they within the standard marks? Thirdly, is there as much agreement as is possible among all MLAs as to the appropriateness of the increased benefits and services? In other words, is there general agreement among all the Parties that we are acting in a responsible way?

I believe that the legislation we now have before us passes all of these tests. It will enable us to provide better service as elected officials to our constituents who will assist us to better perform our duties as legislators within this Chamber. It will help us to better respond to new demands placed upon us as MLAs in a minority Government situation.

This legislative package and those other services and benefits, which are not being changed at this time, do fit well within the norms for other Legislative Assemblies. In some areas, we are better off, in others we are worse off, but for the most part, we are in the mid-range. This legislation, as I understand, does not change that long-standing situation.

Finally, there is unanimous consent for this legislation. All three Parties in this Legislature support and recommend this package and, as you know, unanimous consent in this Legislature is not always easy to obtain. This case was no exception because for the past few weeks there has been active discussions between all three Parties as to exactly what should be in the package and how it should be constructed.

During those discussions, many different ideas and viewpoints have been exchanged. Those discussions were just finalized a few hours ago. This legislation, which has been in a constant state of drafting and redrafting for several days, now represents the best consensus that we could reach. It is not a perfect package, but it is a reasonable and fair approach to Members' benefits and services.

More importantly and finally, Mr. Speaker, it is the continuation of an evolutionary process that has been ongoing ever since I first set foot in this Chamber. It is a reflection of changing times and circumstances. It is neither the first nor the last of such legislative changes. It is a necessary one if we are going to continue to meet the many new and unique challenges that confront all of us as elected officials in a rapidly changing world. Thank you.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my support and the support of our caucus to that of the other two Parties who have already spoken on this Bill. I am pleased to speak after the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), who brings to this House so much history and can look back over the years and watch how these supports have changed.

I can say as a new Member in this House, I feel, as I suspect many of the new Members have, I have been astounded at the breadth of the responsibilities that Members assume on behalf of their constituents and how little support is provided for them. So, I think this Bill is a very necessary step in providing the kind of assistance that Members need to truly be better Members. I heartily endorse the remarks from the Member for Brandon East who makes the point that this is an attempt to provide the kind of assistance that Members need to better serve their constituents.

I think there are three major parts to this Bill, and I want to speak just briefly on each one of them. The first is the changes to constituency access allowances. I think what we are faced with—both in a minority House, and I think just generally in Canada today—is an increasingly sophisticated electorate who is placing greater demands on individual Members. We are expected to act as interpreters for our constituents as they deal with Government, and as advocates for our constituents.

* (1850)

There is a tremendous amount of responsibility placed on an individual Member. I believe the additional support will allow us to communicate better. The electorate wishes to know what is happening on issues that confront us each day. It will help us to better serve those Members who are having difficulty in accessing services from an increasingly complex Government.

The second part of this Bill, I think, attempts to address inequities that exist between rural and urban Members, that certainly the travel enhancements, the recognition of the need for car allowances and the mileage limits that have been decided on are an attempt to recognize that rural Members do indeed incur greater costs in providing the same service that other Members of the House are expected to provide, and an attempt to reimburse them and provide some measure of equality for that.

Similarly the changes in the per diem rates, I think, reflect a very real expense incurred by Members who maintain two residences and often it is a little more efficient to maintain the two residences year round, rather than simply for the term of the Session. I think it is an attempt to assist them with those very necessary costs.

The third area though is one that falls more into the category of providing a benefit directly to a Member and, whenever we approach that question of providing support to individual Members, I think there is a certain amount of nervousness. I stand strongly in favour of the severance provisions.

I witnessed a Member who I was fortunate enough to defeat in the provincial election, who had served

this House for seven years, who had done an extremely good job and worked, I think, extremely hard on behalf of her constituents. On midnight on April 26, she was entirely without any benefit or any support or any assistance in making the transition from the service of this House and this province, while her assistants and the civil servants that served her and everybody else received very adequate and very appropriate packages that allowed them to make the transition from one career to another.

I think this is a deficiency in the support that is provided to Members of this House. I think that is recognized in other Legislatures and I think it is high time and I have no difficulty standing up and supporting that provision. I think it is a very necessary and a very appropriate enhancement. I think this whole package is a modest yet significant improvement in the services available to people in this province, and our Party has no difficulty at all in endorsing it. Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

Mr. McCrae: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of Bill No. 32, The Manitoba Institute of the Purchasing Management Association of Canada Act, and Bill No. 55, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bills 32 and 55, with the Honourable Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

BILL NO. 32—THE MANITOBA INSTITUTE OF THE PURCHASING MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION OF CANADA ACT

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Harold Gilleshammer: We are in Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 32.

Clauses 1 to 17—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Bill be reported.

BILL NO. 55—THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Deputy Chairman: On Bill 55, Clauses 1 to 9—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Bill be reported.

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House): Mr. Speaker, your committee has considered Bills 32 and 55 and reports the same without amendment.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River (Mr. Burrell), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS

BILL NO. 32—THE MANITOBA INSTITUTE OF THE PURCHASING MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION OF CANADA ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 32, The Manitoba Institute of the Purchasing Management Association of Canada Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Darren Praznik (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I will be very, very brief. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Members of the Liberal Party opposite and the Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) for lending their support, as well as to Members of the New Democratic Party for lending their support to this particular piece of legislation, and for assisting in getting it through on this rather busy day.

So again, on behalf of the particular organization, I extend thanks to all Members of the House.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

* (1900)

BILL NO. 55—THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 55, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): I would like to speak, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is passed.

Mr. Manness: I stood before you said "agreed."

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) have leave to put a few remarks on the record before the question is put?

Mr. Manness: Well, Mr. Speaker, I stood before you asked the question.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the Honourable Minister is not reflecting upon the Chair.

Mr. Manness: I stood before the question was put.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has leave.

Mr. Manness: That was leave. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise on this Bill. I certainly know the wrath I will incur in doing so. I am not rising certainly to speak in opposition to it because there are good parts to it, there are many good parts to it. But let me say that in my humble view that we are embarked on a little bit of a dangerous course in what we have attempted to do, and I think that we have to be ever mindful of the very genuine needs of all in society, and yet the very way of trying to balance our own needs against the very scarce resources that Government has available to them. I know Members opposite are also mindful of those events.

I guess I feel a little bit badly that we have to address a significant Bill of this fashion, in my view, in this method. I think we probably would serve the legislative process somewhat better if we had given a little bit greater opportunity to each and every one of our Members to address it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will support the Bill because there are many, many good portions to it, but I think it is only right at times that if you have things that are troubling you with respect to any bill that you put them on the record.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 38—THE MENTAL HEALTH AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader) presented, by leave, Bill No. 38, The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): A few brief comments I think are necessary at this point in time. During the committee discussion on this, we had an overall review of the need for this legislation in the short term and on an immediate basis, and also the need for reviewing perhaps some supplementary amendments to this legislation over the middle term and, if possible, bringing forward a more comprehensive review and rewriting of The Mental Health Act in the next Session.

I just want to put on record our Party's position with respect to this Bill because I had used my opportunity on second reading to address a number of peripheral issues and I wanted the record to be quite clear that we do support what is being done in this particular instance. We do look forward to either fine tuning these amendments in the interim term or working with the Government and the Official Opposition on the rewriting of the entire Act, so that the full Mental Health Act can be brought to be more in tune with today's needs and challenges that confront us as legislators and also confront those who rely upon that Bill to serve and to benefit them.

So with those words, we are pleased to support the Bill and look forward to a continuation of this process in working towards a betterment of the mental health system for all Manitobans, and working with the Minister and the Official Opposition in that regard.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to revert back to Tabling of Reports, a report that has just come down today. It is a major report.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member have leave to revert back to Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports? (Agreed)

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I thank Members of the House for leave. I today would like to present the Members of the Legislature, the province's Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1988. These accounts now include a new Volume III containing the Government's Summary Financial Statements. Over the years, many changes have occurred in the way the Governments deliver their programs. In times past, all revenues were credited to one consolidated revenue fund, from which they were appropriated for various Government expenditures. As long as the Consolidated Fund remained sufficiently comprehensive, budgets and financial reports covered all Government activities.

As Government activities and operations became more diverse, a variety of organizations such as funds, agencies and corporate enterprises were established outside the Consolidated Fund with their own budgets and financial reports. In recognition of this and to have comparability and consistency between Governments, the Public Sector Accounting and Auditing Committee of the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants has recently developed Public Sector Accounting Statement IV, which deals with defining the Government reporting entity.

This statement provides standards for defining the scope of the reporting entity in terms of those organizations whose financial affairs and resources should be included in the Government's financial statements. It also prescribes a methodology for accounting these organizations and statements, depending on the nature of the organization. The full implication of the new accounting standards will require a significant study analysis by the Manitoba Government.

* (1910)

These summary financial statements reflect some initial steps through a consolidation of Manitoba Properties Inc. and its relating holding companies, Manitoba Properties Management and Manitoba Properties Leasing Inc. It is intended that the inclusion of other Government entities will be phased into the summary financial statements over a period of time. In the interim, these financial statements will be printed in a new Volume III of the Annual Public Accounts Financial Statements, but the Consolidated Fund will continue to be presented in Volumes I and II of the Public Accounts.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Members of the House for granting me leave, but I know they have been waiting for this material for some period of time and I would not want it to come out tomorrow if indeed we are not sitting at that time.

BILL NO. 42—AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE ROYAL WINNIPEG RIFLES FOUNDATION

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): presented, by leave, Bill No. 42, An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate The Royal Winnipeg Rifles Foundation, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley): I would like to take a moment, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank all Members in the House for their cooperation on getting this Act through in an expeditious fashion. It is a very important Act for the fundraising in support of the Royal Winnipeg Rifles Reserve Unit, a very historical unit I might say in the militia and military history of this city. I am very pleased to see it move through in this fashion. Thank you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 48—THE EXPROPRIATION AMENDMENT ACT

Bill No. 48 was read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 49—THE PUBLIC WORKS AMENDMENT ACT

Bill No. 49 was read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 50—THE BRANDON CHARTER AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 50, The Brandon Charter Amendment Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): A short comment on the Act that we supported, and we are willing to pass it today and hope to look forward to having a new Bill come forward in the new Legislature. Bringing Brandon under Urban Affairs is the desire of the City of Brandon. So we support this Bill and look forward to next Session and new Bills coming forward.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General): Ever so briefly, I think before we move towards legislation to bring the City of Brandon under the Department of Urban Affairs, there will have to be some discussions and some consultations about that particular matter and that it would not be prudent to rush.

I know that some Honourable Members opposite have some ideas of their own, but those Honourable Members do not all live in Brandon and do not all have the communications with the people in the City of Brandon that I do.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) has said certain things about it. I do not think his mind is closed on the matter. I think he is still ready and willing and quite able, as we know, to listen to the input that might come forward from representatives in the City of Brandon.

It is not quite as simple as the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) has spelled it out. We know that there has been a resolution passed by the council of the City of Brandon but, if the Honourable Member for Selkirk is able to take the time perhaps during the recess to take a visit out to the brightest jewel in the Manitoba crown, the City of Brandon, she might discover that the representatives of the City of Brandon have more to say than just simply let us come under the umbrella of Urban Affairs.

With that, I ask the Honourable Member that maybe she will temper her comments some when we return after such a visit. If she does come to Brandon, I can assure her she is welcome and will be treated with all the respect that she deserves and she will be treated as an honoured guest.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 52—AN ACT TO INCORPORATE "THE WINNIPEG CANOE CLUB"

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 52, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate "The Winnipeg Canoe Club"; Loi modifiant la loi intitulée "An Act to Incorporate 'The Winnipeg Canoe Club,'" for third reading.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital): I have spoken in committee and in introduction to the Bill so I will not be repetitious, but I would like to put on the record that we all in public life should help recreational programs and clubs such as this.

I know a lot of them struggle such as the Winnipeg Canoe Club has lately and is finding new ground. That is why they are wanting to issue more shares. Fitness is one of the No. 1 priorities in this country, and the wide variety of programs offered by this and many other private clubs in the city should be supported just as eagerly and enthusiastically as we support our public institutions that are paid almost wholly by the taxpayers.

Certainly this one here is no exception, but I want it on the record, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill did come in at a late date and today is receiving final reading. I owe a debt of gratitude and I want to express my appreciation to all Members of the House and the Government for their assistance in doing that. I am sure it will be appreciated by the club and all its members.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, just a brief couple of remarks on this particular Bill. As a member back to 1954—I am no

longer a member of the Canoe Club, but in 54—and knowing what the Canoe Club has gone through all these years. I can remember as a young boy watching the Canoe Club fire from the golf course, and playing this golf course several times.

I appreciate what the Canoe Club has had to face over the many years and the sacrifices they have made and what they added to the community, especially the many people who have used this club in this particular area and then throughout Winnipeg. I appreciate the Bill brought forward by the Member and also congratulate all the Members for approving this Bill so quickly.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 53—THE MANITOBA OIL AND GAS CORPORATION CONTINUANCE ACT

Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General) presented, by leave, Bill No. 53, The Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation Continuance Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

* (1920)

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): I would like to speak briefly on this Bill. I think essentially the points I wanted to make on behalf of my caucus and myself have been made. The New Democratic Party will oppose this particular piece of legislation not because we want to be obstructionists, not because we want to oppose the Government's right to divest itself of this Crown corporation, but because we wanted the Legislature and we wanted for ourselves an opportunity to review in this formal way any divestiture effort on the part of the Government.

I think it was made fairly clear to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Oil and Gas. I think it was made clear by myself and by some of my colleagues, the comments of some of my colleagues, particularly the Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak), that the timing of this Government's effort to divest ManOil is most inappropriate. I think we can have every expectation that if the Government proceeds in haste to divest itself of ManOil because of political commitment, it will cost the taxpayers of Manitoba money. The Minister responsible has said that the divestiture effort is being undertaken because of the cost to the province because there may be a requirement to continue to invest in ManOil to maintain its value. He has indicated, I think, quite frankly, that the province and he as Minister responsible is looking at divestiture because of political commitment. I do not think politics should take precedence over reality and over pragmatism. If the market dictates that you not sell at this point, then you should not sell.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is shaking his head. The Minister of Finance, if he had a choice, would not sell his farm today if he wanted to. He would probably, in all likelihood, because of his interest in protecting his investment and his equity, would probably

wait to see what happened to grain markets if he had some reasonable expectations that the value of his land would increase because of grain prices or any other circumstances.

I think we have heard from many people at the committee that this is the worst possible time to divest oneself of this particular company. So if the Minister and the Government have any real interest in the taxpayers and not just an interest in ideology, then they would not be proceeding in such haste with this legislation. It is not necessary to do what they desire to do and it would give us another opportunity to review the circumstances of such a sale or such a divestiture. It would give us a chance to review, on behalf of the public, the ultimate cost of this action of the Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will be opposing this legislation, again not because of any intent to obstruct the Government's due right as a duly elected Government to proceed with their own agenda but because we believe that it is going to be denying us a right, because we believe that their intention to sell at this time, regardless of the consequences apparently, is wrong-headed and is ultimately going to cost the taxpayers a considerable amount of money. So we will leave it at that, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): I too wish to just leave a few words on the record with respect to this Bill. Again, I spoke on this during the second reading and in committee as well.

The Bill is essentially a Bill designed to facilitate the divestiture of a Crown corporation which—and since I was not in the House at the time and did not listen to the debate at the time but I had my reservations at the time, perhaps should not have been created in the first place. There are better vehicles for Government to be involved in in encouraging an economic sector or perhaps endeavouring to regulate an economic sector, particularly one that is of reasonable—I do not want to use the word small, but rather it is not an extremely huge player in the Manitoba economy.

We have to—and I wish to reiterate this, because I did mention this in second reading—be wary of low bids, particularly now during the time of the depressed oil prices. We also have to be wary of a divestiture of this nature where someone may come in with a bid and perhaps ask the Government to come up with some kind of loan guarantees in order to divest itself of the corporation.

I think that if divestiture is the aim, then divestiture should be made in such a way so that the person who actually is making the purchase assumes the whole risk in this particular instance. As I indicated earlier, at this point in time, the oil market is low. The Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) has indicated that this perhaps is not the best time to divest a company of this sort, that perhaps we should be waiting till a better time but I believe that we in the Liberal Party are on record as supporting the divestiture of this Crown corporation.

In fact, early on, when the annual report first came out, it was viewed quite positively. There was a flurry

of activity; many, many people had indicated an interest. Apparently now, according to my information from the Minister, the interest has calmed down somewhat. I think this interest is probably reflecting the fact that the oil prices are down and perhaps someone is looking to try and capture a good company at a cheap price.

I suggest very strongly that the Government in its interest to divest does not hurry into this divestiture but rather reflects on the bids and in its haste to privatize does not let itself yield good business principles and good business sense. I think what you do here is try and maximize the benefits but let us not give away the farm despite the fact that we wish to get—we have been on record as stating we wish to not be in the business of the oil business anymore.

But, I see the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) nodding his head in agreement, and this time I will not put words in his mouth. I will simply say he is probably agreeing with some of my comments rather than the entire comments that I have made. The last time I suggested this, he stood up on a point of order, stating that he actually was agreeing with the sentiments and not the actual facts. So this time I have given him ample out with respect to my statements. I just hope that he accepts the reiteration, the repetition, that the best price possible under the circumstances, and not any price under any circumstances but rather the best one, because this is we understand the Government of good business. We have been told, let us see that actually borne out in the sale and in the divestiture of this Crown corporation.

I see myself being given the "high" sign by my noble cousin. I have not used honourable cousin. I have not used that phrase here yet, but I will now and take his suggestions kindly.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I just want to put a few remarks on the record, particularly to rebut some of the statements made by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

Nothing is certain, absolutely nothing is certain. I think the Member for Flin Flon tries to paint the picture that we are at a low in the oil market these days, that indeed the price of oil can only go in one direction—up. I can remind him that if he would care to study the record and look particularly in the years 1977 to 1981, when not his predecessor but colleagues in his Party—I am thinking particularly of Mr. Saul Miller, at one time when he was berating the Lyon Government for entering into certain contractual agreements because the price of the Canadian dollar at that time was 85 cents.

He gave them a tremendous strong oratory as to why they should not be entering into certain negotiations, that the price of the Canadian dollar could go no lower. It could go absolutely no lower. Mr. Speaker, of course, the Canadian dollar subsequently fell to around 65, 67 cents.

I am not going to make the argument that the price of oil is going to drop below \$15, but I am going to make the statement that there is no guarantee that it will not fall further than it is right now.

* (1930)

Mr. Speaker, I think that our Party made a strong commitment to the people of Manitoba, that we would divest ourselves of the Manitoba Oil and Gas Company. I think that under the leadership of the sponsor of the Bill, the Minister of Northern Affairs, the Minister responsible for Manitoba Oil and Gas (Mr. Downey), we are living up to our commitment. It is a promise that we have made to the people and I am delighted that Members, particularly of the Liberal Party, have seen fit to support us in a promise, and a smart one, to divest ourselves, quite frankly, of a Crown corporation that really had no hope of profiting. So I stand in support of the Bill and hope that all Members will support it on third reading.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, let me just close debate on the Bill by saying that I have appreciated the comments of the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party.

There are a couple of things that have to be put on the record. I put it this way, that it is not and was not the mandate of the former administration to get into an oil company. They were not, they did not—I should not say they were not mandated to do it. I guess they are mandated to carry out the activities in the best interests of the taxpayers, and they saw that was one of their initiatives to carry out.

I say, Mr. Speaker, and I said it in committee that when you are dealing with limited resources and it is not the place of the taxpayer to be speculating in the oil business, and that is basically what you are doing when you have an oil company. You are speculating, first of all, that you are going to find oil; secondly, on the ability of the marketplace to pay the kinds of returns that are profitable. I again compliment the management of the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation. There was a sincere attempt put forward to try to accomplish that.

As my colleague has indicated, we have told the public what we are proceeding to do. Every attempt has been put forward, as will be indicated, when there is a final decision made as to what exercises were gone through to maximize the return for the taxpayers.

I say, having been a farmer all of my life, and I know many people here have been involved in the farm community, and that I have heard this saying many times that the price of grain could not go any lower. Well, Mr. Speaker, the price of grain did go lower. I have heard the Opposition Members say the price of oil should not go any lower. Maybe it should not go any lower, but it may.

We are dealing with, again, a speculative situation and I think that it is our mandate to, in the sale of the Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation, maximize its exposure to the people who are in the business to provide that maximized return for the taxpayers. I can indicate to the Members of this House, that exercise has been gone through. As soon as a final decision is made as to the particular situation of it, I will be making it public.

Thank you, and I thank Members for the support of this Bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before I recognize the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), I have a couple of statements I would like to make to the House.

First of all, I believe all Honourable Members would want me to express thanks on their behalf to the many members of the Assembly staff who have foregone annual holidays and who have worked some very long hours to enable this institution to function effectively over the last several months.

I believe we should all express our gratitude to the many people involved, the Pages, the Sergeant-at-Arms and his Deputy, the Message Room and Gallery Attendants, the House Messenger, the staff in the Clerk's Office, the Committee Clerks, the Journals Clerks, the Hansard Editor and the Hansard staff, the Deputy Clerk and the Clerk.

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I wish to thank you all.

In another statement I would like to make to the House, I would like—I guess it is not quite regular, but anyway, I would also at this time like to wish each and every one of you all the best in the upcoming holiday season.

It has been an honour for me to have been your servant during the first part of this Session. I could get emotional but, anyway, I have enjoyed working with each and every one of you in trying to leave this place a better place than when we first came. So, on behalf of everybody, thank you very much.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): I would like to take this opportunity to associate the New Democratic Party caucus with your word of thanks to those who serve all of us as legislators in this Chamber and outside of this Chamber, because many of the people who serve us from day to day are not known to us personally and we do not have face to face contact with them but they are indeed a very important part of our role and our work here. So it is a pleasure to be able to associate my caucus with those comments.

I also want, Mr. Speaker, to thank you for your commitment to the process of making this Legislature work well. We have not always agreed, but you have always been right, except in the odd instance when a challenge intervened. However, Mr. Speaker, we have watched very carefully as you have tried to strike the delicate balance that every Speaker must to ensure that this House functions smoothly and that we have all of our rights and privileges as legislators accorded to us, but at the same time we worked as a collective group to better this province.

We have appreciated your guidance. We have shown that appreciation in different ways from time to time, but I can assure you that you have brought to your role as Speaker a special talent and a special skill which has made this House and this Session a more pleasurable experience and a more pleasurable experience for all of us, and we thank you sincerely for that.

As well, with respect to those that you have identified in your comment of thanks, we appreciate the hard work that they have done. We appreciate the work of those at the Table. We appreciate the work of the Clerk who is not in the House, the Journals Clerk, the Messengers, the Pages, the Sergeant-at-Arms. We appreciate the work of those who have to listen long hours to what we have to say in this Chamber and first commit it to tape and later to paper through the Hansard staff. We appreciate all those who work to serve the province through serving this Legislature.

We enter this Chamber in many different ways and with many different objectives and goals, and I hope that those who have worked with us over the past Session will be able to share my sentiment when I say that we have indeed become friends with those who serve us, that we have gone beyond the working relationship into a personal relationship that has been in large part because of their patience and their willingness to put up with some of the things that we do and some of the things that we do not, and their guidance and that is sincerely appreciated. I hope that over the next while we can continue that friendship with those who will even be leaving us now to go on to other things and that they can feel that they are a special part in the life and the work of this Legislature. For that, we thank them sincerely as legislators and as friends.

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): I would like also to associate myself and my caucus with the remarks of the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) and others in this House. As a new Member in this House, I think I speak for all new Members who have very much appreciated the support that we have received from all of the staff in this House, the Hansard staff, whom we have had an opportunity to meet and mix with in the room beforehand, and certainly the staff at the table.

I must confess though, being one who haunts these halls on a Sunday, I have found the Clerk to be somewhat unapproachable at noon on Sunday when he is working in here, but the other six days of the week he has been extremely helpful.

The Sergeant-at-Arms, the Pages, all who assist us, have been willing to go that extra little bit to help us understand what we have to do as we go through the process of learning what it takes to make this House run.

* (1940)

I particularly, Mr. Speaker, want to thank you, because in what has been a potentially contentious and divisive situation, it has been in many instances your skill and your willingness to work a little harder to help all of us come to an agreement that I think is of benefit to all of us.

So I would like to thank you very much, and I would like to thank all Members of this House for what for us new Members has been an interesting and I think educational experience.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate in that I get two opportunities to make this little speech, but there are some things that I think I can add tonight.

Last week I took the opportunity after the review of the Estimates to make some comments about the value that I see in the work done by the people who serve this Legislature and on behalf of the Members of our caucus. I, at that time, expressed heartfelt and sincere thanks to all of those who take part in the workings of this place.

When you consider the way we do our business here, it is really quite remarkable the patience and fortitude that we see on the part of the people who work for this place. On behalf of our Members in our caucus, I am extremely mindful of that and I think, if I can speak personally for a minute as a former worker in the Parliament of Canada, I know sometimes what they have to go through to serve the people of Manitoba through us.

Mr. Speaker, when I was appointed Government House Leader back last May, I can honestly say I knew it was a big job, but I did not know how big. I have had a busy time for the last—since July 21 and even before that. In all of that time, I have enjoyed for the most part a very positive working relationship with all of my colleagues, certainly not only on my side of the House but other Honourable Members too.

At this time, I would like to pay tribute to the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) and the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) for what, on balance, has turned out to be one excellent Session in terms of the work of this place.

Some Honourable Members may not take that just in the spirit that it was intended. I say it was an excellent Session. It was a difficult Session. It was a long Session. But, you know, this is a minority Government, and I think this Session demonstrates very well that all the Members in this House recognize that we are a minority Government, recognize that the people of Manitoba regardless are entitled to the best possible service that we can provide them as their representatives.

It is in that spirit that I thank my opposite Members of the other Parties. It is in that spirit that I do so, and also each House Leader and each Party Leader has had to work with their caucuses and sometimes we have had to work hard to convince them that this arrangement that the House Leaders have worked out is the right arrangement or the best arrangement. That has been done and, for the support I have received from my colleagues, I thank them for that. With that, Mr. Speaker, I will resume my seat.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that when the House adjourns today, it shall stand adjourned until a time fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the Government.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, a motion on adjournment of course is in order and I know there has been flowery speeches made and I am sure that all of us—

An Honourable Member: You are going to ruin it all.

Mr. Doer: I am not going to ruin it with the Member because I think there are some things we should put on record. I know that Members opposite would be

disappointed if they had this approach. I know the Member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) is a little bit sensitive tonight. It has been exposed that he and his Government has hired his former nemesis, the former president of the Manitoba Telephone System, and I know he has been very sensitive.

But on a very serious note, when the Session opens, the Government presents a Speech from the Throne in terms of the aspirations and goals it has for the Session and, when the Session closes, it is appropriate for Members to comment on the successes and lack of success in certain areas.

Mr. Speaker, the Session is in its 102nd day, I believe, in terms of its sitting in this Chamber. The Government opened in this Chamber, if I can recall correctly, with a number of task forces and advisory committees and studies and other similar types of activity. This was their answer to the plan that they said they had for the people of Manitoba.

Many of these studies, we should note today, have not yet been completed. In fact, some of those studies were just begun a week or two ago in terms of the very major important areas of this province. Let there be no better example than the ballyhooed advisory council on the Department of Health and the health resources that the Minister had promised and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) had placed in his Speech from the Throne. It took seven months, Mr. Speaker, to have that task force to deal with the very important resources in our province in our health care community.

The question has to be asked, as we close today, why did it take seven months to deal with the most important issue that any Government must deal with, the most important activity that any provincial Government deals with in terms of affecting their citizens? That is the health care in our province which is clearly and close to one-third of the spending in our provincial Budget that we approved some time ago.

There are so many programs that are now suspended because the health care task force has just begun. We have lost month after month in terms of the citizens of this province and the programs that are very important to the people of Manitoba because of this advisory committee taking months to complete.

We are still awaiting the results of the Child Care Task Force. We are still awaiting the results of the women's task force that was conducted by Members in this Chamber. You could go through the list of items in the Speech from the Throne with the very many task forces that they had promised and studies that they promised. Unfortunately, seven months later, many of them are still waiting for tabling in this Chamber and tabling to the people of Manitoba. I think that is not very positive in terms of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is to be commended in a couple of areas, and I want to say that there are some positive developments. We have always found that the Government was attempting to deal with the effects of the drought in the agricultural community in the best way possible, and we would work with the Government in the most cooperative way in terms of

dealing with the federal Government and developing beyond our ad hoc programs in agriculture with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). We have a great deal of confidence to work with him with our advice in that area.

We also were positive about the initiatives that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) began in the mental health area and we would welcome the opportunity to continue, because it is only the first step in a long number of steps that must be made in terms of improving our mental health system and bringing our mental health system closer to the people in their communities in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, one of the areas that concerns us as we move into 1989, some week and a half away, is the changing situation with our employment and economic development in this province. We have raised month after month, when the statistics come out from Statistics Canada, the fact that there are more people unemployed, the September, the August, the October, the November, than the month before.

Economic development and job creation and a strong economy has a bottom line every month and that bottom line is the economic statistics that come out, not from the Opposition and not from the newspaper, but from Statistics Canada, showing the numbers who were unemployed a year ago and the numbers who are unemployed in the similar month of this year.

* (1950)

We raise that because we believe, in the months before the next Session begins, that this must be the No. 1 priority for the Government and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and his Cabinet. We believe that 7,000 more people unemployed in September is too high a number for this province. We believe that 4,000 more people unemployed in August is too high for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) in his own Budget that he tabled in this Chamber. We believe the 3,000 more in October is an unacceptable level, and the 2,000 more in November, Mr. Speaker, is again unacceptable in terms of the standards of this province.

When every other province but Manitoba and Saskatchewan is going down in their unemployment rate, the question has to be asked to this Government and to the Treasury Ministers: what is their plan; what is their vision; what are the programs that they have to take Manitoba into 1989 and to create jobs and economic development, not only for the people but for their children in this province, Mr. Speaker?

So I would say to the Government, please heed those statistics. Please be careful in terms of believing you are only on the right track because you are reading out your own press releases. Please look at those bottom line numbers in terms of the future facing Manitobans. Please develop economic development programs that will not only deal with the potential of the drought as it cycles into the economy of the province in a more dramatic way in the spring of 1989, but deal also with the winners and the losers in free trade, and deal with the other losers, potentially in terms of economic development.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that the social programs that were put in place to cushion the effects of employment should also be returned by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, it has been demonstrated by all Members of this Chamber that the Unemployed Help Centre is not only cost effective but it makes a lot of sense in terms of supports to people facing a very, very difficult situation. MLA's who are now Members of Cabinet have used the Unemployed Help Centre in Brandon. MLA's from all Parties have used the Unemployed Help Centre in Winnipeg. In the next couple of months, as you look at your estimates, please review that program and change your mind. You do not have to face the Question Period the next day. It always makes sense when you make a mistake to admit it and change your mind in terms of valuable programs within our province.

Mr. Speaker, we have raised a number of issues under the environment, and we believe that you cannot place the Department of Environment on automatic pilot. It is a very important portfolio. It does not run itself. It is a challenging portfolio. I believe that any person who is given that very important portfolio would face heat from day to day in terms of the very important issues that are facing Manitobans and their environment.

Mr. Speaker, we believe strongly that should be a separate department. We disagreed with the Premier (Mr. Filmon) when he amalgamated a number of departments together. That was the one major area that we believe that should be left as a separate department, Environment and Workplace Safety and Health. The environment on the outside in terms of people's safety; the environment on the inside in terms of workplace, safety and health, we believe should be in one department.

We believe that it is difficult for any human being to deal with the Environment and Workplace Safety and Health and a department such as the Department of Labour with all the adjustment issues that are going to be facing any Government.

I would ask this Premier (Mr. Filmon) to please look at that decision. Please change that decision in terms of the Department of Environment. Please have a separate ministry for the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health in terms of the priorities of Manitoba in 1989.

Mr. Speaker, we have identified issues from the first week and all Parties have identified issues from the first week dealing with the environment: Flin Flon, PCB's, Leaf Rapids, the City of Winnipeg environmental licenses, the whole area of the Clean Environment Commission, all very controversial issues, and the Rafferty-Alameda Dam which is probably the most important issue as we wait for the U.S. Corps of Engineer Report.

Again, who is watching our Manitoba environmental store? Mr. Speaker, we leave that question with the Premier as he approaches 1989, and the stewardship of this province which includes the major priority of the environment in terms of Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, we have promised before to be cooperative in areas where we can cooperate and to be positive in areas where we can be positive. We were pleased that in some areas in this Session we were able to put in some legislation that was positive for the province. I mentioned the knives in bars that has already had a very positive effect in terms of enforcement and crime prevention, Mr. Speaker.

I think that the amendments that have been made in the committees have been very positive amendments, whether they have come forward from the Government or the Opposition Parties and have improved the Bills that we are passing in this Chamber, many of them this evening.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has a lot of work ahead of it. Many of the Bills that we have passed today are bureaucratic Bills; they are technocratic Bills. They do not deal with the major issues facing Manitobans. There is a lot of work ahead of the Government in terms of coming in with their own legislative agenda, rather than the generally bureaucratic package that we have seen before us today.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party is a Party in this Legislature that pledges to work in '89 in a way that will be positive in a cooperative way with the Government where needed and critical where we think there should be improvements. That is the pledge we make to the Members of this Legislature and that is the pledge we make to the people of Manitoba as we approach 1989. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to put a few words on the record, I suspect the last words I will certainly make in the year 1988 that is on the record, since we will adjourn a few minutes from now.

Perhaps there is something good about a minority Government. I seems to me that in other years we have been doing this at three and four in the morning. So doing it at five to eight has got to be an improvement, certainly an improvement for the level of the debate, I think, that we are experiencing tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it has been a privilege to meet new people on the opposite side of the House, Members from Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) and Swan River (Mr. Burrell), Rhineland (Mr. Penner), Gimli (Mr. Helwer), and Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld). Of that group, the only one who I knew indeed before coming into this House was the Member for Rhineland (Mr. Penner) whom I knew in his former life as the president of the Keystone Agricultural Producers, was lobbied by him, Mr. Speaker, and the result of that lobby we saw in the Bill today.

I have enjoyed the brief moments that I have shared with those individual Members and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for making those moments often possible. I think in the past there has been a lack of collegiality between Members on all sides of the House. I think that any attempt to bring us together, usually in a social occasion which you have instituted, is a positive one in our relationships within this House.

Of course, I am delighted to have been joined by so many new Members on my side of the House. When

I last spoke I was one, and now I am 21, and so that obviously gives me some comfort as well as a great deal of support.

In terms of the New Democratic Party, there are no new Members in the House, but there is a new Leader and I have enjoyed working with that new Leader. I want to say to him tonight that I think his Party is being well-served by his leadership in this House.

We are entering into a season which for most of us is a joyous one, but not all of us, of course, are Christian in this House. And so we will not all be celebrating Christmas but, hopefully, those Members who will not, will enjoy our holiday in the sense that they will recognize, as we in turn have recognized their holidays, as a special moment in our lives as we celebrate the birth of the Christ child in our families on December 25. And for some, of course, January 6, because we have some Members of the House who indeed will not celebrate Christmas until January 6 as they are members of the Ukrainian faith.

* (2000)

I hope that all of you in this Chamber celebrate in a sense of peace, joy and love and that 1989 holds for you a sense of renewed family commitment, renewed dedication to the service that we are all engaged in performing, and that is the service to our constituents, those who elected us, and in turn all of those who live within the confines of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in all of those nice things that we say about one another, there is no one who I would like to pay a higher personal tribute to than you, yourself, Mr. Speaker. When I had the privilege of seconding your nomination as the Speaker of this Chamber, I said at that time that as a backbencher you were warm and open with all of us. And you have continued that warmth and that sense of collegiality in your role as the Speaker. I know that it has not always been easy, that there are times when you probably felt you would like to take your shoe off and bang it on the desk but you have refrained from that kind of performance. You have led us with dignity and I think with a spirit, every now and then, of mischief and a little bit of fun. We have enjoyed you in my caucus, and I think that all of us are very appreciative of your efforts and the excellence which you bring to the role as Speaker of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, when we return for the end of this Session and the beginning of the new Session, some changes will have taken place. To some degree, the honeymoon will be over, the lustre will be off of the new Government. Some of it has already been over for some Members of the Government benches but there will indeed be a need to be more proactive when you return on that Opposite side of the House. What we have seen since May 9 when the new Cabinet was sworn in and July 21, has been legislation which has almost always been reactive or housekeeping in nature. We have seen little in the way of positive growth, positive new changes for the citizens of the Province of Manitoba.

I would be remiss tonight if I did not make reference to our dismay at the lack of interest, lack of motivation,

lack of driving force in getting the Seniors Directorate up and moving. We hope that when we return, that White Paper, Green Paper, whatever it is we are ever going to get, will finally be ready and will be tabled in this Assembly.

We also had been dismayed at the lack of commitment to community health programs. Whether the Government chooses to believe it or not, there are many who feel that they have been cut off home care and that the services that used to be provided are no longer provided. We were equally dismayed with the lack of commitment to Klinik and the development of that community-based resource in the fullness of its capability. I know the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) would not forgive me if I did not reference, of course, the Municipal Hospital and the fact that this was a commitment of long-term standing of regrettably Government after Government after Government, for the last 20 years. These people who live in the Municipal Hospital, many who have lived there since 1953, are individuals whose care we must address and we must somehow, before this Session ends or this Government ends, make I hope a serious contribution to those individuals and ensure them of a more pleasant place to live.

We have watched the presentation of the High School Review, that like so many reports that we have received in this House, we see it going back for further review and further consultation, in this case, as with the report on multiculturalism, back to the very same people who made the report in the first place. And so round and round and round in circles we go, where we will stop nobody knows. The reality, Mr. Speaker, is that you have got to stop in order to have a reaction, in order to make a plan, in order to make things better. All we seem to be doing is going in cyclical fashion. I do urge the Government to put a stop to the circle and to actually step beyond the circle and cause something positive to happen, both within our educational system and within our multicultural communities.

We thank the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) for the funds that he has given today to the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry. We thank him even more for his statement today that he is indeed looking further at the need to develop this inquiry. I know that the cries from the other side will be spend, spend, spend. But if we are going to change the way in which justice is delivered to our aboriginal peoples, our first peoples, we must know of the defects in the system as it exists today. It is not provincial money but federal money. I think we should just realize the statistics of the 100 percent funding that is supposed to be devoted to Indian Affairs; 40 percent actually reaches the Native people and 60 percent of it is spent in bureaucracy. Now, there is something wrong with a system that works like that. There is something wrong with a system in which the majority of people in our jails are Natives. There is even something more wrong with this system when it is discovered that 55 percent of those people are considered to be functionally illiterate.

If we do not take the time now and indeed the money to make sure that this report is just not another one that sits on shelves, then we betray our first people,

our aboriginal people because we will not correct the wrongs, not that had been wrongs of this Government but had been wrongs of successive Governments of all political stripes, since the time that the first settlers came to this country and began to try to force their lifestyle upon the lives of those people who were already here.

Mr. Speaker, the environment has been an issue which has been constantly raised within this House. Under the previous administration in several years, we were listed as 10th out of 10 in the provinces of Canada. So the record of the previous Government was, to say the least, not very good. We must improve upon that record, but to do that we are going to need more positive legislation. We are going to need from our Environment Minister a program of action, a program that will bring our legislation into keeping with legislation in other parts of this country. He will have to work very closely with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner), because the Minister of Natural Resources' score card in terms of the past record of Governments is not very good either. The whole concept of an Institute for Sustainable Development is most welcome in our province but we are going to have to prove ourselves as worthy of having such a centre and, if we are going to prove that worthiness, we are going to have to increase and improve upon our ability to react to environmental concerns and react to the concerns of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, in closing tonight, I want to once again wish those of you who believe in the birth of the Christ child, a very happy Christmas. For those of you whose religious beliefs are otherwise, may the spirit of that Christ child, which is a spirit of love, come into all your hearts and may we tonight reach out in a bond of friendship, one with one another, despite our political beliefs and recognize that each Member of this House is here to serve to the best of his or her ability, and I thank you.

* (2010)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to make any lengthy contribution to this evening's wrap-up, but I think it is only fair to tell you that I have 9:20 p.m. in the pool today, and I do think that I would, on behalf of all of my colleagues, like to say a few words in conclusion and summary of the Session.

I want to say to both Leaders of the Opposition Parties, thank you for their criticism, which I take as constructive, for their contributions throughout this Session to the betterment of the operations of Government in a minority House. I think we do learn to depend upon each other and perhaps to be a little more open in taking advice, and I say to them that they had made a contribution in the passage of a number of pieces of legislation that was not able to be done in a majority Government in the past.

We have indeed in the past willingly accepted or seen Governments willingly accept changes which were errors in fact or precedence but, in this particular case, we have additions made as a result of perhaps difference

in philosophy or priority which have carried through the process of amendments in committee and through this House. I say to them, they are accepted in the spirit of good will on our part, and I believe they have added to some of the pieces of legislation aspects that I am optimistic to say that will improve the legislation.

I want to say to all staff in the Legislature and those who serve us who are not here tonight, add my words to those of the House Speaker, and all the House Leaders, that we certainly appreciate the contributions they make day by day, week by week, throughout the course of the Session. We know that we could not operate as efficiently and smoothly if it were not for their contributions and their talents that they lend to this endeavour, and I thank them very sincerely on my behalf and indeed on behalf of all of us in this House.

To the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) and the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs), who expressed concern about things that we have not yet been able to accomplish in our seven short months as Government, I say that one of the things that I have always felt is worth looking forward to is more things to accomplish. I think it is essential to all of us and for Governments to have unfulfilled ambitions and unfulfilled commitments because they give us something to look forward to each day that we serve.

I want to say as well—and I should see that some of the die-hards continue to be here to watch us. I say thank you for the media, for their attention and the contributions that they make to the democratic process. Obviously, those things that we do here would not be able to be communicated as freely and as easily to the public without their involvement and I say we are all grateful for that—at least I think we are.

Mr. Speaker, in attempting to ensure that I am close to winning the pool, I am reminded of the old saying that in politics it is not the number of words you use, it is the turnover that counts. Forgive me if I am recycling some of what I am covering, but I just say one thing to the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), that I am surprised at her suggestion that we have in some way had a honeymoon over the past five months. I remind her that today is the end of the fifth month, the last day of the fifth month and -(Interjection)- more laughter. I say that my colleagues are looking forward to the day when you really get your teeth into Opposition and you really put your full efforts behind this.

An Honourable Member: It is like shooting fish in a barrel.

Mr. Filmon: They have felt that there has not been enough of a challenge perhaps and we did not understand that it was that you were taking it easy on us. So now that we understand, we feel much better, much better about looking forward to next Session and indeed we hope that you will do your best and do all of the reading and preparation that I know that you were doing prior to this Session, but perhaps with the benefit of a little experience and understanding of the process that you have gained over the process of the last five months.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say congratulations to every Member of this House but, in particular, to the new

Members on both sides of the House. I know what a thrill it is and what excitement it is to be in your first Session of the Legislature. I know that—

An Honourable Member: There is a guy who is still in shock!

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I am serious. I know that they have enjoyed it. I have had the opportunity to speak personally with most of the newcomers and I know that they have felt that it has been a positive experience, although one did say that he enjoyed city council more. I cannot imagine why but, in any case, this is an important place. This is a place in which the laws that govern our province's future are passed. This is the place in which the decisions that will affect the lives of all of those we represent are made and this is the most important, in my judgment, responsibility that any of us could want to undertake in this province.

So I congratulate them for what they have done. They have made positive contributions, each and every one of them. I have enjoyed the opportunity to meet them and to work with them as colleagues in the Legislature. I apologize for anything I may have said that has offended any of them along the way. I know that they understand that this was all said in a spirit of good will and in the parry and thrust that goes on, but I say to them that they have enabled us to be a good Government and I believe that their efforts and their contributions have ensured -(Interjection)- Well, I am only saying by comparison.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Filmon: But, Mr. Speaker, I do wish to congratulate each and every one of the Members of my Government. I want to say that I have been proud of their efforts and I know that they have worked very diligently, that they have earned the respect of many, many Manitobans by their willingness to work hard, long hours and make a very strong commitment to the governing of this province. I am very proud of each and every one of them because I know that they have operated in a manner of sincerity and a desire to serve, and to serve this province well, and they have indeed done that and I extend my deepest gratitude and congratulations. I am proud of each and every one of them.

* (2020)

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you congratulations on a job well done. Yours is not the easiest job in this Chamber. It certainly requires a great deal of patience and understanding and I believe that the reason you are able to carry out your responsibilities so well is because you enjoy the respect of every Member of this House. Each and every one of us, whether or not we agree with every single decision that you make, are more than willing to abide by your decision because we respect you and we know that your decisions are made in that spirit of good will and commitment to the workings of this Legislature and indeed the democratic process.

So I thank you for your service in this Legislature and look forward to working with you again in many coming Sessions, Mr. Speaker.

I conclude by extending to all Members of the House my wish for happy holidays, for a very, very merry Christmas, and all of the very best of health and happiness in 1989 to all Members of this Legislature and to their families. Thank you very much.

Mr. Harry Enns (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, this House cannot adjourn for another 11 minutes.

An Honourable Member: Just to show you that it could be done.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that when the House adjourns today, it shall stand adjourned until a time fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the Government. (Agreed)

I am advised that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor is about to enter the Chamber to give Royal Assent.

ROYAL ASSENT

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. Roy MacGillivray): His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

His Honour, George Johnson, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words:

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed Bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

Ms. Deputy Clerk, Beverley Boziak:

Bill No. 6 - The Fires Prevention Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la prévention des incendies;

Bill No. 8 - The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine;

Bill No. 9 - The Statute Law Amendment (Re-enacted Statutes) Act; Loi modifiant diverses dispositions législatives (Lois réadoptées);

Bill No. 11 - The Child Custody Enforcement Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'exécution des ordonnances de garde;

Bill No. 12 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1988); Loi de 1988 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives;

Bill No. 14 - The Regulations Act; Loi sur les textes réglementaires;

Bill No. 15 - The Cooperative Promotion Trust Act; Loi sur le fonds en fiducie de promotion de la coopération;

Bill No. 21 - The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route;

Bill No. 23 - The Regulations Validation Statutes Amendment Act; Loi modifiant diverses dispositions législatives afin de valider certains règlements;

Bill No. 27 - The Private Acts Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant certaines lois d'intérêt privé;

Bill No. 28 - The Agricultural Producers' Organization Funding Act; Loi sur le financement d'organismes de producteurs agricoles;

Bill No. 29 - The Cattle Producers Association Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des éleveurs de bétail;

Bill No. 30 - The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1988; Loi de 1988 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité;

Bill No. 32 - The Manitoba Institute of The Purchasing Management Association of Canada Act; Loi sur l'Institut manitobain de l'Association canadienne de gestion des achats;

Bill No. 34 - The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités;

Bill No. 37 - The Crown Corporations Public Review and Accountability and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur l'examen public des activités des corporations de la Couronne, l'obligation redditionnelle de celles-ci et certaines modifications corrélatives;

Bill No. 38 - The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale;

Bill No. 40 - The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg;

Bill No. 42 - An Act to amend an Act to Incorporate The Royal Winnipeg Rifles Foundation; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Royal Winnipeg Rifles Foundation";

Bill No. 45 - The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Conflict of Interest Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les conflits d'intérêts au sein de l'Assemblée législative et du Conseil exécutif;

Bill No. 47 - The Liquor Control Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools;

Bill No. 48 - The Expropriation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'expropriation;

Bill No. 49 - The Public Works Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les travaux publics;

Bill No. 50 - The Brandon Charter Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Charte de Brandon;

Bill No. 52 - An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate "The Winnipeg Canoe Club"; Loi modifiant la loi intitulée "An Act to Incorporate 'The Winnipeg Canoe Club'";

Bill No. 53 - The Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation Continuance Act; Loi sur la prorogation de la Société manitobaine du pétrole et du gaz naturel;

Bill No. 55 - The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Assemblée législative.

* (2030)

Mr. Clerk, William Remnant: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bill:

Bill No. 35 - The Loan Act, 1988; Loi d'emprunt de 1988;

Bill No. 54 - The Appropriation Act, 1988; Loi de 1988 portant affectation de crédits.

Mr. Clerk: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills in Her Majesty's name.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

(GOD SAVE THE QUEEN WAS SUNG)

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that this House be now adjourned and stands adjourned until a time fixed by Mr. Speaker upon the request of the Government.

MOTION presented and carried.