



**Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

**31-32 Elizabeth II**

---

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable D. James Walding  
Speaker*



MG-8048

**VOL. XXXI No. 107 - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 14 JULY, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 14 July, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

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

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make.

Reports received today from the Manitoba Arbovirus Surveillance Committee have indicated significant increases in the Culex Tarsalis mosquitoes and have created a potential epidemic situation in the province for Western Equine Encephalitis. As of the second week in July, high levels of mosquitoes were identified in the traps in many areas throughout the province and virus activity in chicken flocks are now approaching or have exceeded 1981 epidemic levels. The total numbers of Culex Tarsalis mosquitoes caught in traps in Winnipeg, Oak Hammock, Portage la Prairie, Glenlea, Steinbach and Morden are particularly high.

Western Equine Encephalitis is a disease which attacks the central nervous system producing symptoms which vary from extreme drowsiness, headaches and nausea among adults to high fever and convulsion among infants. The young and the elderly are particularly vulnerable to the disease.

Although no human case of the disease has been reported at this point, personal protection is the best way to avoid contracting this disease.

I would strongly recommend that the following steps be taken by Manitobans:

Where possible, avoid being out of doors during the sunset hours when mosquitoes are more active.

People should wear long pants and long sleeve clothing to minimize skin exposure. Light coloured clothing is less attractive to mosquitoes. The use of insect repellent is strongly recommended.

Infants transported in carriages should be protected by netting.

Use well maintained screens on doors and windows.

The Manitoba Arbovirus Surveillance Committee will continue to closely monitor the situation and provide my department with up-to-date reports.

I've also, Mr. Speaker, discussed this with the Minister responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization and they've been alerted also.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Minister for his statement and his warning to Manitobans of the difficulty that appears to be developing due to the high population of encephalitis-bearing mosquitoes in the province at this time.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can look forward to frequent and continual reports from the Minister on the situation with respect to the incidence of encephalitis-bearing mosquitoes and the detection of the presence of the disease among the horse population of the province as well as the human population of the province in the next few days and weeks as we are now at that point in the year when we are at the height of the danger of such infection and such infestation, if we are in a point in the cycle where encephalitis recurs and returns to the province.

The last serious epidemic resulting in a public health emergency was two years ago and at this point in time all Manitobans can do is ask for very close monitoring of the situation, involvement of the Minister of the Environment, and preparations to be made to address and attack a public health emergency, should one develop. I would hope the Minister is putting that kind of a committee in place and is acting on what lead time is available to address an emergency if it develops.

With that word of caution, Sir, we acknowledge the Minister's statement and appreciate his warning message at this juncture and urge him to keep very close watch on the situation with his colleagues.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file the report of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Uniform Law Conference of Canada held at Montebello, Quebec, August, 1982.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to return to the item under Routine Proceedings for Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

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

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Your committee met on April 26, May 24, and July 14, 1983, to consider the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System.

Your committee received all information desired from Mr. Gordon W. Holland, General Manager; Mr. Saul Miller, Chairman of the Board; and members of the staff with respect to all matters pertaining to the Annual Report and the business of the Manitoba Telephone System. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the committee to seek any information desired.

Your committee examined the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982, and adopted the same as presented.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**MR. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for The Pas, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Mosquitoes

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and arises out of his statement of a few moments on the Culex Tarsalis situation, and I would ask him whether the Arbovirus Surveillance Committee is going to be reporting to his office on a regular weekly basis or on a basis more frequent than that? Can he advise the House what the schedule of reporting and communication will be?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, the arrangements that we have had is that they have certainly been instructed to report whenever there is anything new, even if it is twice a day if need be, not necessarily every week. I should say that the Minister responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization and the Minister responsible for the Environment also, the three of us, are going to monitor the situation very closely.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister whether there are, in his view, sufficient sentinel flocks in the field at the present time, or whether there are plans on the government's part to increase the number of sentinel flocks in position immediately?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, the committee met late this morning and I am awaiting a recommendation from them before I can answer this more thoroughly.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister advised the House that there have been no incidents of

encephalitis reported thus far this summer in human populations. I would ask him whether he can advise of the situation with respect to horses; the horse as a dead-end host, as he knows, is a principal indicator and offers a fundamental warning system for us where Western Equine Encephalitis is concerned.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that. The situation is now that there has been no known case of horses or humans.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** A final supplementary on this point, Mr. Speaker.

Is the Minister causing to be put into motion a steering committee or emergency management committee that can deal with a public health emergency if it arises? In that connection, is he now investigating, while he still has some lead time available, the requirements necessary to obtain whatever equipment the government may deem desirable to combat such an emergency?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, all I can say on this is again that I'm awaiting the recommendation and the information of what has transpired in that committee today, and that we've already made plans for the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures, the Minister of Northern Affairs, also of the Environment, and myself to meet later on today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Yes, just in addition to that, I will be meeting with the Coordinator for Emergency Measures Organization at four o'clock this afternoon to make sure that those plans are put in place if an emergency does result.

### Bill No. 107 - implications on CAS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, thank you, Mr. Minister. I wish to thank both Ministers for the information provided.

A question to the Honourable Minister of Community Services, Mr. Speaker. In the wake of the distribution in the House yesterday of Bill 107, accompanied by a press release which lays out the government's intentions in and with this legislation, I would ask the Minister whether this is a direct and a deliberate mechanism designed to enable him to take over the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, and achieve whatever ambitions in that field he may have?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, this is permissive legislation available to be used if necessary. We regard it as an interim measure pending major review and major change of The Child Welfare Act, which we anticipate for next year.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House whether the legislation was specifically aimed at the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg?

**HON. L. EVANS:** The legislation, of course, refers to all children's aid societies, but we are particularly concerned about improving the quality and level of care to the children in the City of Winnipeg. As members know, we've had many many difficulties over the past year or two and we have an obligation to improve the situation.

I would also like to point out to the honourable member and other members of the House that there are only three provinces in Canada who now have Children's Aid Societies: Nova Scotia, Ontario and Manitoba. My advice is, both Nova Scotia and Ontario Governments have the right and authority to appoint Boards of Directors of Children's Aid Societies if they so desire. So, as a matter of fact, this particular piece of legislation I believe does take off from the Ontario legislation in this respect.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the child welfare system, as the Minister well knows, is entirely different in Ontario from the child welfare system in Manitoba and that therefore no quantum leaps in transposition of policies and approaches can or should be made arbitrarily or unilaterally. In view of that, could I ask the Minister whether it is his intention on the basis of what is implicit in this legislation to dismantle the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg and replace it with five or six smaller agencies?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I have indicated in a statement that this is our intention, to follow the advice not only of Judge Kimelman, but also of Judge Carr, plus the Planning and Review Committee made up of my department and officials of all the Children's Aid Societies and other professional advice; that we can improve the system by going to a smaller type of family and child caring agency, so this would mean the establishment of five or six smaller community based organizations in the City of Winnipeg.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, then may I ask the Minister whether the interim proposals, so-called of Judge Kimelman, which have been referred to by the Minister from time to time as interim proposals, are not in fact final and definitive proposals and that all the discussion about interim proposals and further consideration was sheer rhetoric and a sheer smoke screen for a decision that was made by the Minister some time ago to reflect and implement the philosophy of senior officials in his department in the child welfare system and to cut off countervailing opinion in that philosophy.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I can advise the honourable member that we expect the final report from Judge Kimelman some time early this fall and, of course, the Implementation Committee, which will take about a year or close to a year to bring about recommendations for restructuring, and we'll have the benefit of Judge Kimelman's final report. But, as the honourable member realizes, and I believe we've discussed this in my estimates some weeks back, the advice we're getting from the community at large, it seems to be a consensus that has developed out there

that smaller is more relevant, is more effective, and I think that is the way we should wish to go.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, is the Minister going to pay the directors, which he will be appointing to the boards of children's aid societies and who will be replacing community volunteers?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, if it comes about that we would be appointing directors, it is not our intention to pay; it was not our thought that this was necessary. We're very keen on having as many volunteer groups, volunteers in the community as possible, participate on the boards of this or indeed any future child and family agency structure we might have.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Does the Minister seriously suggest to this House that he thinks it's going to be possible to get volunteers to serve in this system after he politicizes it to this extent?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm very serious. I believe that there are many good-will people out there who want to help improve the level of quality of service to children and their families.

### Bilingualism in Manitoba

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General.

In view of reports coming out of Thompson that he indicated that the committee hearings on bilingualism would be held towards the end of this month, and that they would run until 1:00 a.m., 2:00 a.m. or 3:00 a.m. in the morning so that it could be ground out, I simply ask the Attorney-General, what is the rush?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** First of all, with respect to French Language Services, the proposed resolution on French Language Services that will, as has been indicated, be referred to a Standing Committee of the House. What I suggested there is that if people come out to make their representations, we're not going to send them away when they're there to make their representations. That seems to be the decent and honourable thing, and it's a tradition in this House.

**MR. R. DOERN:** I was wondering then if the Attorney-General was considering running them 24-hours-a-day so that they could get out faster than when they came in?

Mr. Speaker, I then direct a question to the First Minister and ask him whether it isn't reasonable, in view of the pressure that the Attorney-General appears to feel about this question to grind it through the House, grind it through the public and grind it through the public meetings - what is the rush - I ask the First Minister whether it wouldn't be better to take time to hear the public during decent hours, from say 2:00 in

the afternoon or 9:00 in the morning until 10:00 at night, so that the government would have a decent public feedback and then the government could consider what the public is saying and give it proper and due consideration, so that they can make a good judgment and make a good policy. What is the rush?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it's clearly obvious that the Member for Elmwood hasn't had the opportunity to follow the informational meetings that have been taking place. There have been meetings in Dauphin, in Brandon and in Thompson, and I am satisfied the turnout was quite reasonable in all three instances. There's a further meeting tonight in Winnipeg, in which I anticipate there will be a fairly sizable number of people as well.

In addition to that, for the information of the Member for Elmwood, there is another committee of the House that will be receiving further briefs and further submissions.

Mr. Speaker, in four informational meetings and a submission to a legislative committee pertaining to this resolution, all items which are not required by the Rules of this House or by the rules of any Chamber; so, Mr. Speaker, rather than rushing it through, this government is taking lots of time. It's going out into the rural areas to hear from the people of the Province of Manitoba, such as what the comments we heard last night in Thompson, in order to hear from the people of Manitoba and proceed beyond that to have a legislative committee to sit and to ensure that people had an opportunity to make their presentations.

There is certainly no need for any concern on the part of the Member for Elmwood that every opportunity isn't being given by the Attorney-General.

### Sherritt Gordon Mines - NEED Program

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have recently taken several questions as notice that I would like to get answered today.

There is one question with respect to a NEED application by Sherritt Gordon. Sherritt had applied for a \$200 million Agassiz program of exploration and development which called for the Federal and Provincial Governments to contribute 37.5 percent each. That was \$766,275 of the costs with Sherritt putting up the remaining — (Interjection) — I was asked a question; I am trying to answer it. If you would kindly be quiet for a few minutes, I will answer the question.

If people wanted a question that was long enough for an Order for Return, then that's the way it would have been provided.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on a point of order.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that you have advised members often in the past that if they have a detailed answer the better procedure would be for them to table the information.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I believe it has been noted that a question asked in the House will be courteously answered in the House. However, if the answer were of particular length or unduly statistical, that it would be better for the Honourable Minister to table the statement.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With Sherritt putting up the remaining 25 percent or \$510,850, that proposal was rejected by both the federal and provincial governments because it didn't meet the qualifications of the NEED Program.

Then, as indicated in the question, there was a second proposal put forward by Sherritt, which proposed a \$2.7 million program. Under that program, the increase of Sherritt's participation went from 25 to 42.2 percent or \$1.1 million. The Federal Government would remain at 37.5 percent and the provincial government come down to 20.3 percent from 37.5 percent.

On May 16th, as recorded in Hansard, the Minister of Energy stated in the House that since the revised application now met the qualifications of the program, he was prepared to support approval of the project and so was the federal government. That is completely contrary to the suggestion in the question raised that day.

There was another question on July 8th with respect to how much of the \$63 million shown in Schedule A of The Loan Act 1983 had been committed to this point — (Interjection) — the Member for Turtle Mountain - and as of that date, 24.9 million had been committed; 23 million for Homes in Manitoba and 1.9 million to construct the Manitoba Fire College at Brandon.

He also asked whether funds committed will be accounted for separately, and the answer is because money is being allotted from the Jobs Fund for a number of different projects, it will indeed be necessary to account for each project separately.

### Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. I noted the other day in speaking to a gathering of fishermen, he indicated that the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation could stand with a review of its operations.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, is the Minister asking the Federal Government to undertake such an interview inasmuch as that it is a federal corporation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Manitoba Commercial Fishermens Federation articulated an extensive number of concerns in respect to technique or operation of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. I indicated some sympathy for a consideration of those concerns. I indicated that they used the term "inquiry" and I think that it's always useful for any corporation, for any government department to be subjected to a review of various kinds

to test whether the programs they have ongoing continue to be worthwhile, whether improvements can be made in them, and so I indicated some sympathy for a review, not an inquiry, and I haven't had an opportunity to talk to officers of the corporation subsequent to that meeting. I certainly intend to do so and determine how best such a review, in some of the areas that were highlighted, could take place.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that it would have to involve the Federal Government in reviewing one of its agencies.

Is the Minister specifically requesting the Federal Government to conduct such an inquiry or review?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, Mr. Speaker, not at this time. I thought that it would be appropriate for me to sit down with our member of the board of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and discuss the concerns that were evidenced by the fishermen and discuss those same issues with the manager of the FFMC before calling upon Ottawa for anything. It may be that the board of directors may themselves consider it appropriate to have some form of review made of some of the concerns that were evidenced by the fishermen themselves.

#### **White Motor Corporation - Brantford, Ont.**

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. It has to do with the White Motor Corporation that went into receivership in Brantford, Ontario a week ago or several weeks ago. I had occasion to speak privately to the Minister about the situation. My concern, of course, is about the many hundreds, if not thousands of Manitoban and Canadian farmers, western farmers with White equipment and the possibility of the difficulty that they may have in terms of warranty services, availability of parts, particularly as we approach the harvest season. Has the Minister alerted the Farm Implement Board that supervises or carries out the function of The Farm Implement Act here in Manitoba as to the potential problems that may arise and what, if anything, is the Farm Implement Board doing about this situation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for the question. It was as a result of his contact to machine dealers, one of whom I believe or maybe both, are from his constituency who raised the matter dealing with first of all the surcharging, either by duty or by federal sales tax, of implement parts being imported from the United States to Manitoba.

We have checked this out and it appears through the Farm Machinery Board - and we have contacted the dealers - if there needs to be further work to get a ruling on it so that this cumbersome procedure is avoided, we are prepared to assist and act on it. We are hoping by a matter of discussing it on the phone with the federal revenue people and our Farm Machinery Board and our staff that we will be able to accomplish this without going further.

The greater question dealing with the matter of availability of parts and primarily with the shut-down of the combine manufacturing plant in Brantford by White Motor Corporation, as the member knows, that corporation I believe is the second or third time that it has gone into receivership in as many years. We are attempting to make sure that there are parts available, but this is a matter that we have contacted the federal officials to see what more can be done.

But I should point out, should the company be totally foreclosed and the manufacturer close its doors and the manufacture of combines no more, there will be a difficulty in obtaining parts for warranties for those particular machines. But in fact our people have been in contact with federal people and company people to try and make this arrangement, and we are working on it as best we can in a difficult situation, knowing and agreeing with the honourable member that there is much of such equipment in Western Canada. Having been a purchaser of White and Cockshutt equipment ourselves, I certainly appreciate the problem.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear from the Minister that his affiliation with organized labour will not prevent him from carrying out his responsibility as the Minister of Agriculture. You know, Mr. Speaker, it's a classic situation, regrettably; all of White equipment, all of White combines were manufactured in Canada. That's not going to happen any more because the labour rates are so out of whack - \$15, \$16 an hour compared to \$7 or \$8 in the United States - so they are now going to be manufactured in the United States.

Now, without getting into that situation, the fact of the matter is there are over 6,000 combines in Western Canada. Will he make sure that those combines are going to be serviced under warranty and parts? I'll remind you, Mr. Speaker, and honourable members of the House that some of those combines are worth \$140,000 apiece.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Honourable Member for Lakeside would like the Government of Manitoba to either take over the Cockshutt manufacturing of equipment, which certainly one can examine, but I doubt whether one would consider such a proposal. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member well knows that one can put the kindest word on it, rationalization has been going on in the farm machinery and other areas of manufacturing and processing sectors where one of the levers being used by many large corporations is basically to say we will close our plant if you don't cut your wages in half. That is happening; that is happening in the United States in processing and the like.

We, as one province in this country, will do what we can in order to assure that the parent company lives up to its obligations under the legislation, and that parts are available for farmers who had the faith to purchase that kind of equipment.

#### **French Language Services**

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Last Friday he refused at that time to undertake to provide this House with a copy of the survey of polling done by the government on the French language question until, he said, a detailed analysis had been done - although he said the previous evening that 70 percent of those polled indicated support for the government's action.

Could he advise the House if polling is continuing, at least up until last Saturday, and whether it is continuing up until the present time and in the future?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** First of all, to clear the record, I certainly did not refuse to table the results of the survey. I said that when they had been presented to me, with all of the cross-references and so on, so that a complete picture as possible might be put before the House, that would be done.

Secondly, I should make it clear that the poll in question was taken at a particular time in order to find out what some of the concerns of the Manitoba public were about the question of French language services in various forms and molds. That has been done and hadn't it been done it was unnecessary, and in my view is unnecessary to repeat or continue that polling.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney-General indicate whether the government authorized polling to take place as of last Saturday?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Certainly not to my knowledge.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the First Minister. Could he indicate whether the government has authorized polling to take place up to and including last Saturday on this particular issue and whether the government has undertaken polls with respect to any other issues since they have been in government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, insofar as last Saturday is concerned, I'm not aware of any polling taking place last Saturday. It would be helpful if the honourable member could give us some particulars, either in the House or privately, and I could check out more carefully to ensure accuracy, but I'm not aware of any polling that was done in respect to this particular item on Saturday or any other particular item since the weekend.

Insofar as other matters of polling, there has been some polling done on various issues, as there was with the previous government too from time to time. We would have to obtain the . . .

**A MEMBER:** . . . your popularity to call an election.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, we will attempt to provide the First Minister and the Attorney-General with some evidence that we have of polling taken place allegedly last Saturday on behalf of the NDP.

I would ask the First Minister, in view of his answer, would he undertake to provide this House with details

with respect to the polling that has been taken by this government since they assumed office and the cost thereof?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I couldn't hear the honourable member's final words of his question.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, when we were in government, the former Member for St. Johns asked on numerous occasions whether or not our government had undertaken any polling, and we had not. I am asking the First Minister, in view of his answer, to undertake to provide this House with information as to the polls that have been conducted by the government and the costs of taking those polls.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** We'll take that as notice. I know that the Minister of the Environment has done some polling in respect to environmental issues, and there may indeed be some other areas of polling that have been done.

Again on the Saturday matter, if the honourable member would give me particulars, I would check it out. If it's government polling, if it's New Democratic Party polling, certainly that's outside the terms of reference of this Chamber.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Early in question period, the Member for Elmwood made a brief reference to the meeting in Thompson last night. He didn't ask, however, how it went. I was wondering if the Attorney-General could confirm that the vast majority of the 65 people present at the Thompson meeting indicated two things: First of all, they were surprised at all the hoopla about the issue; and second of all, they supported the government's proposals.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, I can confirm that indeed that was the case. Of some 16 persons who spoke - from diverse backgrounds I would gather from the nature of the statements - 14 were strongly in favour, or in favour of the proposal as it was explained and as it was set forth in the material that was distributed, the same material that has been distributed to this House. One thought we should be going further, and one was opposed.

I may say, Sir, that in all three meetings, while there have been concerns expressed and while in the other meetings more of those who spoke were arguably not in favour of the government proposals, all three meetings have been very civilized, have not been hostile in any sense of that term, but have expressed legitimately in most instances reasonable concerns that I think ought to be raised and ought to be addressed during the course of this debate and, indeed, are being addressed. I think that all three meetings testify to the fact that Manitobans, once informed, can carry on a reasonable level of debate. Not all will. There are those on both sides of the issue who are so utterly committed that they will see nothing in between, but most



Manitobans have shown themselves in these meetings, as they do otherwise, to be reasonable.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** As a supplementary, I was wondering if the Attorney-General could confirm that a number of people came up following the meeting and indicated that, while they had initially been opposed to the government proposals, once they'd had a chance to review the facts about it that they had changed their minds totally on it, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I could confirm that, Mr. Speaker.

### McKenzie Seeds

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. I wonder if the Minister of Finance could indicate whether the report on the investigation of McKenzie Seeds has been completed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** No, it has not, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** To the same Minister then, can the Minister indicate approximately how long before we have a report on the investigation?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** That's very difficult to say. The auditors are working on it. As the member knows, it is the Provincial Auditor and his staff who are proceeding. They feel that they do need some more time. The last time I talked with the Auditor about it, I believe, we had a meeting last Friday and he indicated that he felt that it would probably be at least several weeks from that stage for more information to be confirmed.

I think that if one knew ahead of time how long it would take, then one would be presumed to know what the outcome would be. Of course, that's not the way the investigation is proceeding. They are trying to determine all the facts and when all the facts have been made available, he will make a report. I can assure the members of the House that when I receive the report I will provide it to the House, if in Session.

### Snow and Ice Storm - Manitoba

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I have a question to the Minister responsible for telecommunications. Earlier this year, a severe ice storm took out several TV towers in the province and particularly the one at Baldy Mountain which covers the Swan River constituency. Since that time, the TV reception has been very minimal. There is no indication when the full restoration of service will return to the area and other parts of the province as well.

I wonder if the Minister could undertake a commitment to find out as to when full service may be expected in those parts of the province that are affected.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member for that question. I will take up with the federal officials and CBC as quickly as possible to ascertain when TV service would be fully resumed to that area. I'll report back as soon as possible.

### Wayside Parks - Mafeking community

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I thank the Minister for that answer. I direct another question to the Minister of Natural Resources. Now that the Minister has received - this is to the Minister of Natural Resources - in writing a proposal from the Mafeking community to undertake maintenance of the wayside park, I wonder if the Minister could advise us as to when that community might expect the return of the picnic tables and barbecues and toilets.

**A MEMBER:** Too many mosquitoes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, obviously the honourable member has particular knowledge of this question or this subject matter. The letter that the honourable member refers to has not been brought to my personal attention. I assume that it's receiving attention within the department. I'll certainly take that under advisement.

I would hope that honourable members would appreciate that great volumes of mail come to Ministers' offices that are not seen personally by them initially. I will check to see whether such a letter has arrived and personally take an interest in meeting the obligations that I have given to the House.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of the same letter that was directed to him. I sent a copy by Urgent Mail to him two days ago. So I would ask the Minister if he wouldn't undertake a special commitment to see if that situation can be resolved, because the tourist season is well under way and soon it will be over, and the community will have lost out considerably as a result of the inaction by this government.

### Civil Service Commission - hirings

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was asked several questions about Civil Service hirings. A quick overview has provided the following answers: Since September 1, 1982, there have been 382 positions that have been bulletined. Of these, bilingualism was required for four positions. Two of these actually were translators; it's certainly understandable why they would have to be bilingual. One was in Education, a personnel officer; and the other was an administrative secretary for a ministerial office.

Bilingualism as an asset was indicated for 19 positions within these hirings. As far as language requirements in Cree or other Native languages, actually the bulletins said, "Ability to communicate in Cree, Soto, Ojibway, Dene or Chipewyan would be an asset." There were a total of 16 positions advertised with this.

There was also a position advertised for the Department of Health where there was an indication that German would be an asset for that hiring.

### Safety of Glass Containers

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There have been some recent reports - my question is for the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs - in some recent reports about the explosion or an increasing incidence of the explosion of glass soft drink bottles, the most recent one having caused a near serious eye injury, and I'm wondering if the Minister's department is looking into the safety of containers on the shelves or in use in Manitoba today?

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

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** I'd like to thank the member for bringing it to my attention.

I must indicate we have had no reports whatsoever in our department of this particular problem. If you have some specific information, I'd certainly like to follow it up.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I'm aware that there is an existing intergroup committee that involves representatives from industry and the Minister's department that has jurisdiction or an interest in containers, and I'm just wondering whether or not he could look into the matter with them. In view of the report that's in today's paper and in view of the fact that the industry itself appears to be concerned about the increasing incidents, I wonder if he would take that as notice and look into it and bring back a report.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Well, actually, the committee, which was previously in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Environment, was an Environmental Management Division initiative and, therefore, is in the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health at this time.

As the member indicated, the committee is composed of representatives of industry and representatives of the government. The primary mandate of the committee was to determine ways by which promotion of glass bottles could be encouraged in the province - I might add recyclable glass bottles - so as to prevent a proliferation of non-returnable bottles. There have been ongoing meetings over a number of years in regard to that and the committee has been functioning at a fairly efficient level.

I will certainly ask Environmental Management Division officials to review these latest incidents, or at

least one of which we are familiar with, with that committee at their earliest convenience to see if, in fact, there are ways by which that sort of incident can be prevented in the future.

As well, of course, the Workplace Safety and Health Division would have a role to play in this and they are aware of the situation.

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Riel.

**MRS. D. DODICK:** A committee change, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Lac du Bonnet will substitute for the Member for Fort Rouge on Law Amendments.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A committee change on the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, the Member for St. Norbert for the Member for Virden.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, would you please call the second readings of Bills 71, 83, 93 and 108, and follow those, Sir, with the adjourned debates on second reading of Bills 87, 88 and then Bill 3. Time permitting, we can consider whether to do Bill 16 in Committee of the Whole, but I doubt whether we would reach that.

### SECOND READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS BILL 71 - THE CHILD CUSTODY ENFORCEMENT ACT

**HON. R. PENNER** presented Bill No. 71, An Act to amend The Child Custody Enforcement Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, The Child Custody Enforcement Act, which was passed on June 20th of 1982, increased the strength and powers of the courts when faced with the problem of enforcing Custody Orders. This proposed bill to amend The Child Custody Enforcement Act provides for amendments which are purely technical in nature and do not substantially change the existing law. I recommend it to the House.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?  
The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to allow this bill to go to committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**BILL 83 - THE BUILDERS' LIENS ACT**

**HON. R. PENNER** presented Bill No. 83, An Act to amend The Builders' Liens Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill covers two points, one substantive and one only a technical correction.

The substantive point is to remove Crown transportation contract work from the application of the act. This is complementary to a bill presently before the House dealing with highways and transportation construction contracts disbursements. That's Bill 85, which was introduced by the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

The other part of the bill provides a simplified procedure intended to protect suppliers involved in the performance of contracts with the government respecting the construction, repair or maintenance of highways, bridges and airstrips, etc. Consequently, those persons being covered by Bill 85 will no longer need the very specialized protection of The Builders' Liens Act.

Another section of the bill, and that's the technical point, arises from an oversight in the amendments made to the act last Session. You will recall, Sir, that last Session amendments were made to the act which provided that "certificates of substantial performance" should be given under the act rather than "notices of substantial performance," which was a term used in some sections. There are still references in part of the act to "notices of substantial performance," and the second amendment is to change these to "certificates of substantial performance" to be consistent with the amendment proved in the last Session.

I recommend this to the House.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to allow this bill to go to committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried**

**BILL 93 - THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION ACT**

**HON. R. PENNER** presented Bill No. 93, The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Act replaces or

would replace The Board of Internal Economy Commissioners Act, which until this time has provided for the management of the Assembly and its associated officers by a three-person board chaired by the Speaker, and consisting of the Speaker and two Cabinet Ministers.

This new bill will provide for a commission of eight members, once again chaired by Mr. Speaker, but including members of both recognized parties currently in the Legislature. The bill also provides for a membership on the commission in the event there is a third recognized party in the Legislature.

The major principle embodied in the changes to remove the management of the Assembly from the direct authority of Executive Council, and provide that the Assembly will be managed on an all-party basis by the members of the House. Representatives to the commission are appointed by the respective caucuses. Management authority, similar to that now used by the Board of Internal Economy will be given to the new commission.

In addition, Sir, the commission will have the initial responsibility - and I emphasize "initial responsibility" - for settling the estimates of expenditures for the Assembly; the Assembly Offices; the Provincial Auditor; the Chief Electoral Office; and the Ombudsman and their respective offices.

As is the case with estimates prepared by government, these estimates must still be submitted to Executive Council and the House for examination and approval. In other words they come forward through Executive Council.

The commission will be expected to make recommendations to the House with respect to changes in The Legislative Assembly Act, or any other statute insofar as these statutes may deal with the management of the Assembly; the provision of services to members; or the specific needs of various Assembly offices, or officers.

The other provisions in the bill provide the approximate equivalent of Ministerial authority to the commission - I think perhaps analogous would be a better word - with the specific intent that the Legislative Assembly manage its own affairs.

Members on both sides will, of course, appreciate that this bill is very similar to Bill 30 of last Session, which did not proceed. Several changes have been made with a view to accommodating some of the concerns that were raised last year. I trust that members on both sides will find that these changes have merit, and I hope that all members will find that the bill commends itself to their support.

I view this bill, Sir, as a progressive instrument which compares favourably with similar provisions in other jurisdictions and I take great pleasure in recommending it to the House. Instead of great pleasure, just pleasure; I want to save great pleasure for some other bill.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, certainly the bill, compared to the bill last year, has been changed to take into consideration some of the concerns expressed on this side of the House. We're prepared to allow the

bill to go to committee and we have some questions on the detail of the bill, which can be dealt with in the committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

### **BILL 108 - THE CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION ACT (3)**

**HON. R. PENNER** presented Bill No. 108, An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act (3), for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps prefaced by remarks by explaining the mysterious symbols 1, 2, and 3, as they have appeared throughout the course of the Session with respect to The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. The first incarnation of that, I suppose as No. 1, was a bill moved by the Member for St. Norbert which has since been dealt with, I think, on a procedural question.

This present Bill No. (3), Bill No. 108 replaces Bill No. 34, being An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, No. (2), I suppose, and Bill No. 34 and the result will not be proceeded with, but Bill 108 will.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed in 108, to The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, will insure that duplicate payments are not made under The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. Presently a person receiving social allowance from the date that a criminal injury was incurred to the date that an award is made for criminal compensation, receives payment retroactive to the date of the criminal injury under The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. The amendment will put a stop to these duplicate payments.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment states that anyone receiving a social allowance will not be eligible to receive compensation under The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act except to supplement social allowance. I think Manitobans may realize that if Manitoba pays social allowance the Federal Government cost-shares on a 50-50 basis. If Manitoba pays criminal injuries compensation the Federal Government cost-shares only about 10 percent of the cost.

There are already provisions in The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act that deals with the possibility of duplicate payments coming from Workers Compensation, or Canada Pension, or UIC, and this simply overcomes an hiatus, or a gap that was there with respect to payments being received under The Social Allowances Act.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, we'd had some discussion on Bill No. 34 during the Attorney-General's

Estimates. I take it as a result of which, he's had that bill examined and is now prepared to present Bill No. 108, which we are prepared to allow to go to committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Acting Government House Leader.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, will you please call the Adjourned Debates on Second Reading.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Bill No. 87, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert who has 25 minutes remaining.  
The Honourable Member for Swan River.

### **NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT**

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could bring up a non-political issue.

I wonder if we might undertake to . . .

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

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** . . . to make use of the air-conditioners at this point. Everyone has hearing aids on and that might make it a little more comfortable.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That may well be the wish of the members. I'm told that the noise emanating from the machines does interfere with the sound system and it's not possible. The members will surely have noticed that whenever there is a recorded vote that the air-conditioners are put on during that time. Perhaps the honourable member wishes to ask for ayes and nays on the question.

The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Bill No. 87.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. D. MALINOWSKI:** On the same matter, Mr. Speaker, maybe it will be possible that at least we will take our jackets off.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I'm sure that the honourable member is aware of our requirement in the rules for members to be properly dressed.

### **ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING**

#### **BILL 87 - THE WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Bill No. 87. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert has 25 minutes remaining.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I spoke briefly to Bill No. 87 yesterday and expressed our concern with respect to the compulsory aspect of this bill. In making it compulsory for the situations set out in the bill require

that there be a Workplace Safety and Health Committee, Mr. Speaker. We are extremely concerned about the situations that will, no doubt, exist where the appointment of such a committee is simply not justified and will add, as a result of other sections of the bill, an additional cost of doing business to Manitoba employers, which is the last thing that Manitoba businesses need particularly after having had experienced almost two years of this particular government and the tax increases and the payroll tax that have been imposed upon them and which make it difficult for them to compete with other jurisdiction and which as a result affect the workers in Manitoba by reducing the number of employment opportunities in Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are our concerns. We have some questions with respect to detail, which we will want to ask in committee with respect to this bill. We will want to hear representations particularly on this bill, both from labour and management, Mr. Speaker. I hope that both sides have been given a fair opportunity to consider this bill, Mr. Speaker, and to develop their concerns and their submissions that will no doubt be made to a committee of the Legislature on this bill. We look forward to hearing those representations from both sides and to asking some questions on the detail of this bill in committee.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## **BILL 88 - THE WORKERS COMPENSATION ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, Bill No. 88. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, this bill, as the Minister indicated in his remarks, deals essentially with two main areas. One is the increase in the benefits under the compensation benefits to workers who have been injured and are receiving those benefits. That is not unusual, Mr. Speaker. We dealt with that during our term in office at regular intervals. The benefits are increased by amendments to the act in the Legislature, which I suppose, Mr. Speaker, is a bit unusual. I suppose it is traditional. I think you would find obviously many other situations. There is provision for annual inflationary increases to take place in accordance with legislation which can be done by way of regulation, but I believe this has been somewhat of a traditional method of increasing workers compensation benefits.

We can only assume that those increases are in line with the increases in inflation, which have taken place over that period of time, and we will want to ask the Minister some questions about that.

The other main principle involved in this bill is with respect to access to medical files. The Minister and I had some lengthy discussion about that during his

Estimates. I had raised the particular issue and had indicated on my part a concern that I felt for some time that it is only equitable that a person injured should have the right to see his medical files, something that I indicated to the Minister certainly takes place in personal injury cases where a person who is claiming damages for personal injuries is entitled to see medical reports prepared by the other side. I think certainly in principle, it is a good amendment and one that I agree with.

There is a method of implementing it in the bill, which I think we will have to hear public representations on by interested parties, and ask some questions in detail on that particular aspect.

I want to indicate to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, a significant amendment that appears to have taken place with respect to the principle contained in Section 14 of the bill, repealing Section 33 where the last two or three lines of the existing section, relative to disability of less than 10 percent, has been removed from that bill. There is some current concern about the reasons and justification for doing that, and certainly the costs that are implied in that type of an amendment. I would ask the Minister to provide some details and some justification with respect to that particular area.

There is another amendment, Mr. Speaker, which certainly causes me a lot of concern with having seen the way the present Workers Compensation Board appointed by this Minister has operated. That is the amendment contained in Section 19, whereby the words "subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council" are struck out and will leave to this appointed board of the Minister's the right to fix salaries, etc., of employees of the Workers Compensation Board.

I am concerned about that, Mr. Speaker. I have expressed my concern in the past to the Minister. It is now five weeks since the Minister undertook, in response to the questions from me, to file in this Legislature a statement or details with respect to dismissals and firings and forced retirements and changes in personnel that have taken place under the Workers Compensation Board since this Minister took office, and we have not yet received that information. Mr. Speaker, there are not that many employees of the Workers Compensation Board that could in any way justify the delay that the Minister has taken in not providing members of the House with that information.

When we see in this bill a section which will give this board of his, which has increased expenses dramatically, the Workers Compensation Board, who are receiving extremely healthy salaries at the Workers Compensation Board, through the Workers Compensation Board have redecorated offices and have been involved in recarpeting offices, who are driving cars which the Minister, at least to his credit, undertook to examine at the end of the lease, and he wants us to approve a piece of legislation which is going to give these people the right to fix salaries and benefits, etc., without the approval of the Cabinet.

Now this Cabinet of course, Mr. Speaker, gives us little assurance of any credibility on this side of the House, and any assurance that their judgment will be done in an appropriate fashion. There are a few Ministers in the government, I think, who would be concerned with what the Minister's appointed board have done in the past and are doing and, no doubt, will propose to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a principle which we are not prepared to approve. Mr. Speaker, we have seen, and the Minister has provided me with a response, with respect to the number of cases in which his board - that he has appointed - has approved compensation, in spite of a unanimous opinion of a medical review panel. I had asked him that question previously and he undertook to provide me the answer and we find that under his board there are two cases, and under the previous board, which goes back to 1977 before we took office, there was one case.

So, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister says it's the same board, you know, but this is the same board that in 1982, in spite of there being some 4,167 less accidents in 1982 compared to 1981, there has been, according to the information I requested from the Minister, a major increase in claim costs in 1982 over 1981 of more than 30 percent.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a great concern about the method in which his appointed board is operating. This has resulted in significant assessment rates, Mr. Speaker, another factor in doing business in Manitoba.

We appreciate, Mr. Speaker, where there are genuine cases their compensation is deserved and should be given, and we were concerned about that, as we've said in the past and when we were in government we ordered a judicial inquiry. This Minister cancelled that judicial inquiry and meanwhile the government cancelled the judicial inquiry, the government of which the Minister is a part of. He cancelled that judicial inquiry; undertook a private inquiry, Mr. Speaker, and simply appointed this specially appointed board of theirs, which resulted in this increase in cost. It's resulted in this increase in assessment and we simply, Mr. Speaker, have very little confidence in the manner in which this Minister has exercised his responsibility with this board and the manner in which this board exercises its responsibility.

It's taken five weeks now and we don't have the information with respect to the changes in personnel that had taken place. Mr. Speaker, we do know that there were two people, who have referred to publicly, who have been fired by this board, who have served for 25 and 29 years respectively; one of whom has gone, as I understand it, to work for the Ontario Workers Compensation Board, who were glad to have him, happy to have him. There have been other very significant firings and dismissals and forced retirements.

No doubt the Minister is probably going to try to say that so and so is retiring as of the end of such and such a month, and so and so will retire at the end of such and such a month. But, Mr. Speaker, many of those cases, I'm going to suggest right now, have been forced retirements by this Minister's board. He will attempt, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and say I don't interfere. That's the board's decision. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that that's a proper exercise of a Minister's responsibility, because I'm sure he very well knows what's going on there and approves it. What's going on is destroying the careers of respected civil servants, who have served the public in Manitoba and the Workers Compensation Board, for years and years.

I say to the Minister, if he and the government was not happy with the manner in which they were carrying out their duties - they're the government, they can change the policies - they could change the legislation, but those people were operating under the legislation.

If you weren't happy with the way they were operating, you could change that. But it's a very cruel way, Mr. Speaker, to deal with people, particularly when they reach that seniority, or in that 55 to 60 year age group who simply in this economy cannot go on to find other jobs themselves and their careers have been destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, we're concerned about the manner in which and who this government is hiring to fill many of these positions, and what sort of partisan politics is involved in the hiring of the replacements at the Workers Compensation Board, which is not unlike a number of other departments of this government and the manner in which and the reasons for which people are being hired and fired.

So we have a great deal of concern, Mr. Speaker, about the administration of the Workers Compensation Board; although with respect to the principles in this bill, with respect to access to medical files, we are generally in agreement and we support increases in the pension benefits, which are done on a regular basis in line with increases in cost. But, we cannot support giving to his board the authority to proceed with the fixing of employee benefits, etc., without the approval of Cabinet even if it is a misguided Cabinet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker. I want to have this occasion to put on public record my appreciation of the services of a particular Mr. Hebert, who for many years provided confident and dedicated service to the Workers Compensation Board and to the people of Manitoba.

I did not know Mr. Hebert personally, Mr. Speaker, nor did I, over the course of my years as a MLA, have all that much to do with the Workers Compensation Board, representing, as I do, principally, a rural constituency; although many of my constituents, of course, commute to the city to work, or indeed, work on other jobs sites in different parts of the province.

But I can recall three specific instances stretched over a number of years where I had to call upon the services of Mr. Hebert, and on all three occasions I could not help but acknowledge the exemplary spirit with which Mr. Hebert responded to (a) first of all, a request from an MLA to look into circumstances of a particular case; (b) the dispatch and courtesy with which he handled the situation; and (c) the fact that he was quite prepared to what I would consider, go out of his way to see that full information, attention to the cases that I raised was made.

I recall one particular instance where the said Mr. Hebert drove out to the farm, to the ranch, to discuss a matter with me that involved one of my constituents who had been injured on a worksite coming from the community of St. Laurent. Mr. Speaker, I put further on the public record that it is this kind of action, of course, by the New Democrats that obviously will bring about the inevitable reaction when governments change.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind about the legitimacy of a government in removing policy people with respect to different boards, commissions that are appointed by governments who in their legitimate desire wish to have the policy of a particular agency so directed from a point of view that is more

compatible with the Government of the Day. Mr. Speaker, there is also no question in my judgment about the fact that certain categories of very senior public servants, such as Deputy Ministers, can indeed ought to be removed from time to time if they are, in the belief of Ministers or again Government of the Day, non-compatible with the positions, policies of that particular government. But what the New Democrats, of course, have introduced to Manitoba politics is something quite different.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the New Democrats doing this. Mr. Speaker, they raise this question at their conventions about how to turf out civil servants who are not of their political persuasion. I can bring you chapter and verse — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, I can bring for the Honourable Member for Thompson, I can show him the resolutions that were brought onto the floor of New Democratic Party conventions, the resolutions that were brought onto the floor.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Be honest, Harry. Were they passed?

**MR. H. ENNS:** They were not passed. Mr. Speaker, that introduction occurred in 1969 following the event of the first New Democratic Party Government to office.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand this government's feeling that after - what was it, in '69? - 100 years of Liberal, Conservative, or coalition, or Labour Progressive - not Labour Progressive - Liberal Progressive farmer governments that finally after 99 years or 100 years the New Democrats get to office that they would harbour this feeling. But to carry it out in the blatant way that it's being carried out in this case at the Workers Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker, does not go unnoted. It should not surprise least of all any members opposite, nor should it surprise some of the public servants involved that, of course, if they suffer a similar fate should the government change again.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to acknowledge the services of one Mr. Hebert to the people of Manitoba and more importantly to the injured workers in Manitoba in carrying out his responsibilities over the many years that he served with distinction the Workers Compensation Board of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Speaker, I too want to make one or two comments at this time on the bill before the House and also to reiterate the words of my colleague from Lakeside because I can't recall if I have met Mr. Hebert. It was maybe once over the number of years, and I likewise didn't have too many occasions to call on the Compensation Board for some assistance with a difficult claim or whatever in my area, but any time that I did have occasion to call it seemed to be Mr. Hebert that answered the call. He was prompt on two occasions and even going right directly to my area and visiting the claimant and settling the situation on all occasions to the satisfaction of both parties.

The Member for St. Norbert mentioned that a judicial inquiry had been ordered. I know the present Minister

feels that something should have been done long ago, but I would just add that the judicial inquiry that was under way that their government cancelled would have seen witnesses and taken evidence under oath which wasn't the case in the inquiry that he conducted, which prompted to me to say from my seat that maybe it wasn't as thorough a job as the judicial inquiry might have been.

I am glad to hear the Minister mention from his seat that the matter of the automobiles had been taken care of. I'm sure he will explain that more fully to us in his remarks, and also explain the two claims that were increased that had counted for the 30 percent increase in the claims paid, one year over the other.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time, there is no doubt Compensation Boards or other boards that have been in existence for a long long time do become lethargic, I suppose, in ways. Every now and then a bit of a shake-up is maybe necessary, but in the case of this particular board which is dealing with individual claims and has done so over many many years, it could have been done in a much more even-handed and satisfactory manner. I think a lot of the evidence that was given probably in the inquiry that was done may be subject to some second guessing and may be subject to some difficulty in having it all confirmed.

This is my reason for mentioning at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the judicial inquiry would have taken evidence from witnesses under oath. I think there would have been less chance of anyone doubting the results of that inquiry such as the case now. It seems to cast a shadow over whether that inquiry was really an in-depth one and made it necessary to take the strong measures that the government saw fit to take. But no one likes to see unnecessary dismissals for long-time employees without cause, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it would lead one to believe by the compensation that was paid to those members that left that maybe there was some feeling on the government's side too that there was some cause to compensate them in some substantial way.

We don't want to delay passage of the bill, Mr. Speaker. We hope that the Minister will listen to the presentations made when the bill is in committee. Hopefully, he will bring in some amendments that might relieve some of the concerns that the Member for St. Norbert expressed with regard to certain sections of the bill.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos:** The Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** I'll be closing debate, Mr. Speaker, if that is agreeable.

I just want to take a few moments to address some of the questions which have been put forwarded by the three previous speakers and, in specific, the lead critic for the opposition in matters of Workplace Safety and Health, and Workers Compensation, the Member for St. Norbert.

In his comments he indicated that this methodology of increasing benefits by way of legislative amendment is the usual practice in this province but, in fact, may not be - if I understand his words correctly - the most efficient way to do it. It's traditional, since 1972, to

make the record as explicit as possible. When it was brought forward, and I've taken the opportunity of going back over all the debates on these amendments because they were brought forward in 1972, 1974, 1976, 1979, 1981 and in this year, and during all those debates there were a number of common threads which surfaced. One is that there was a need to increase benefits to those individuals who were receiving pensions by way of Workers Compensation. That was a consistent and well-accepted premise by all parties.

There was also a question as to whether or not the government should involve itself in subsidizing those payments and, in fact, the government in one year, under the term of the previous New Democratic Party Administration, did in fact subsidize the increases in benefits. It did not, under the term of the Conservative Administration, and it has not under this term, as of yet, under this administration.

However, there was also another question that kept arising throughout those debates on every occasion, and that is, why was this system the preferred system? It was a confusing system, which it is; it is a system that is based on a somewhat convoluted logic. Certainly it was a system that was brought forward by the previous New Democrats in 1972 but, even the Minister of that day, and the Ministers following him, could not really explain why this system was better than other systems. Quite frankly, I can't explain it either.

We did take a look, when we were reviewing this legislation, at other ways of increasing the benefits. The Member for St. Norbert might be pleased to learn that his administration had given that same commitment consistently throughout its term, to take a look at different ways by which this could be accomplished, to no avail. We never heard of the results of those reviews if, in fact, they were taken, but there were certainly commitments to undertake those reviews on every occasion when this bill was discussed in committee.

The same situation exists today. If pressed, quite frankly, I would find it difficult to explain to you the logic behind this system, the rationale behind continuing it; but we decided to continue it because when we looked at the other options which were available to us we understood very quickly that there were significant cost differences in different ways of doing it. Now those costs have to be borne by somebody; they're either borne by individuals receiving the pensions, or they're borne by the industry which supports the pensions or, in some instances, they can be subsidized by government and by the people of the province through consolidated revenues.

But the fact is, any change would be a major departure and have significant cost implications. For instance, if you were going to look at an indexed cost-of-living increase on a regular basis you would be looking at an amendment which would cost probably \$30 million to \$40 million, perhaps even more than the present amendment which we have before us at this time. So, certainly, one wants to consider those questions very carefully.

So what we have done is indicated that there will be an entire review of the act that will take place over the next number of months and, indeed, years, perhaps a year, year-and-a-half.

**A MEMBER:** Publicly.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Well if the member had read the introductory remarks, or listened to the introductory remarks, which I gave upon presentation of second reading, he would find out that, indeed, it would be a public review; that it would be a Section 100 Advisory Committee Review that would be asked to undertake public hearings throughout the province; that its recommendations would be made public; and that its recommendations would be considered by government once that entire review of the act had been completed for the purposes of determining if more legislative amendments were necessary, or rewriting of the act was necessary.

We realize that will take a significant amount of time and have given ourselves a time line of approximately one year, a year-and-a-half, to complete that work.

**A MEMBER:** Who are you going to appoint to it?

**HON. J. COWAN:** The members asks who we will appoint to it. Well, that will be a matter to be discussed at the time of the appointment of the committee, but I have not heard any criticism from him, or from others, of the appointments to the Section 100 Advisory Committee on Rehabilitation which is now undertaking its work; and it will be appointed in much the same way that committee was appointed. So, if that is any assurance to him, and his silence is any indication that he approves of the methodology of the appointment then, in fact, I'm pleased to be able to offer that to reconcile any fears that he might have. But, certainly, he will have an opportunity to comment upon the methodology of appointment; to comment upon the terms of reference; and to comment upon the anticipated plans of the Review Committee when it is in place, and I welcome his comments because, at times, they are constructive and helpful.

That review will be directed to do a number of specific things outside of a general review of the act, and it will be made known to that committee that one of the concerns of this government is that the method by which we are increasing pensions under the present act is questionable. I hasten to clarify that. I don't say it's wrong; I don't say it's improper; I don't say that it will not be continued, but I do say that there are a number of questions as to why it is, and why it should be continued if, in fact, it is continued. They will be asked to address those questions and that will be a public report made available to the public, as will be the Section 100 Advisory Committee report. So, I look forward to that because I think it may provide us with an opportunity to improve upon the system.

In the interim, though, there is a need for increases and we are using the present system to implement those increases. It is, as the member indicated, traditional since 1972, with the exception of one year during the previous Conservative administration when they did not, every second year, increase the benefits. They did not increase them in 1978, waiting until 1979, and then they only increased them for a two-year period, even although three years had elapsed. So it put the person's receiving pensions one year behind where they had been previously in 1976.

It is a very complex system, I'll welcome an opportunity to discuss that in more detail in committee



with the Member for St. Norbert because he looks somewhat perplexed as to that exact situation. He indicates he's not, but if he has questions I'll be more than glad to try to answer them as best I can.

The member indicated that he was operating under an assumption that these pension changes are in line with what had been done previously, in other words, they are consistent. Well, indeed, they are consistent with what had been done previously, and using the exact same formula. So if, in fact, their government had been in office and been in the same position we would have been, as they did in 1981, they would have changed in much the same manner as we did in 1983, assuming that they didn't go for another three-year period.

He spoke briefly to the matter of access to medical records. This is indeed an area of concern. He spoke at that time and referenced our earlier conversations during the Estimates procedures. We in fact did talk about the matter of access to medical records during the Estimates procedures.

At that time, I indicated to him it was my opinion that his government had been made aware of similar requests throughout their term of office. He said that he did not know, and even now he raises his hand in a gesture of what could be perceived as being a lack of awareness, as to whether or not they were aware, or made aware of such requests.

Well as I indicated earlier, I went back through the records and right from the start they were made aware that there was strong pressure out there for access to medical records and the principles which he supports today are exactly the same principles, which I assume he would have supported in his own government, when he had an opportunity to implement this change. The fact is, they didn't. I think he has to assume some responsibility for the fact that they never dealt with those requests which were made to them on numerous occasions.

So I accept his support; I am pleased to have his support; but I don't want, in any way, it to be left on the record that this support has been - as a government policy on his side - of a longstanding nature. It was not. They had four years in which to make changes. They did not make changes.

This government, when assuming office, looked at this situation; talked with the College of Physicians and Surgeons about it; talked with other representatives of other organizations who had made the request previously, and found out that there was a difference of opinion as to whether or not it was necessary, firstly; and secondly, as to whether or not it could be implemented in a fair and equitable fashion.

So when we had an opportunity to make these changes last year we did not. We did not because we wanted a chance to review with the College of Physicians and Surgeons, their specific concerns about access to medical records, and at the same time to work with them to develop an implementation strategy, which we would then discuss with other parties to determine if it was acceptable.

In other words, we wanted to attempt to strike a consensus. We were not certain that we could do that. We were not certain that a consensus even existed or was possible, but we undertook those efforts. I indicated in my remarks upon presentation of this bill for second

reading that, in fact, we had found that consensus with the College of Physicians and Surgeons; that we felt we had a program that was acceptable to all parties. We said it was not a perfect solution, but it was certainly a much better situation than existed today and therefore we're recommending it by way of this legislation. We will have an opportunity by way of committee discussions to discuss that implementation strategy in detail.

I would sincerely and genuinely - as I always do - accept constructive criticism in this regard and I mean they, any party, whether it be members of the official opposition, or members of the general public, or any interest group, can make recommendations which will help us to strike a better consensus, I will certainly take those under advisement and attempt to implement them if it is deemed to be appropriate.

So there is room for improvement here. We know that and we're looking forward to that discussion and ways by which it can be improved.

The Member for St. Norbert also addressed the issue of disability of less than 10 percent claimants being included in the increases to pensions. This is indeed a departure of a significant nature from previous practice. Since 1972 it has been the practice of all governments not to include those with less than 10 percent disability in this increase in pensions.

When they were in government, I asked the then Minister of Labour, the Member for Thompson, if they could provide a rationale for not including those with less than 10 percent. He at that time, indicated that he could not. When I say at that time, I mean on several occasions, because it was a question that was repeated on a number of occasions. He indicated they would not. He knew no reason why they should not be included in the package and he would take a very serious look at it.

Well, as things would have it, he did not have an opportunity to complete that look, obviously. We have had that opportunity and when looking at it, we have to agree with him that we can find no rationale that would convince us that these individuals, receiving less than a 10 percent disability, should be excluded from the increases. As a matter of fact, we can find numerous reasons why we believe they should be included and that is why we have brought it forward by way of amendment.

It is an item that we could have approached in two ways, three ways, excuse me. The first would be to do nothing, as they had done, even although they could not confirm why it was they were doing nothing, nor could they provide or substantiate reasons for doing nothing.

The other would be to go all the way back to 1972 because these individuals, in fact, have not been receiving benefits which others have been receiving since 1972. If a person who has a 9 percent disability would look to another person who had 11 percent disability and see that the person having 11 percent disability was getting increases, while he or she with 9 percent was not, I would think in their own minds, they would think that it was an inequitable position or situation. I believe that it is and that is why we are attempting to provide more equity at this time.

If, in committee, the Member for St. Norbert can convince us that in fact that inequity does not exist,

or that there are compelling reasons not to effect this change, then I would be prepared to listen to those arguments that are made in a reasonable way. But the onus certainly should be on him to convince us that, in fact, there is an inequity in the system that we have and that there is no inequity in the system that existed previously.

I would ask him to go back and take the opportunity to read through the remarks made by his administration's Minister of Labour during the opportunities that we have to discuss this very matter because he will find that at that time, he could provide no rationale either.

In regard to the provision which provides for an exemption in respect to the Workers Compensation Board not having to seek approval for the establishment of certain positions, I would indicate to the Member for St. Norbert that that is a practice in every other agency of this sort. What existed previously was the anomaly. What we are trying to do is bring this agency more in line with other agencies. I believe he was the Minister responsible for MPIC at one time - no he was not, okay, I stand corrected - but he should have some awareness of MPIC; he should have some awareness of it.

They don't have to go to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council in order to seek approval to effect a classification, they don't have to do that, nor does any other agency of that sort. So we are attempting to bring Workers Compensation in line with that particular provision in other organizations of a similar nature.

He talked about the increase in claims costs and the increase in assessments and I don't wish to belittle those comments of his, because I think they are important comments and they do deserve further consideration, but I will tell him quite frankly that somebody has to pay for the accidents; somebody pays for the injury; somebody pays for the trauma; somebody pays for the rehabilitation; somebody pays for trying to make these individuals productive members of society once again. And for many many years there was no increase in assessments for the Workers Compensation Board and I went over that in great detail with him in Estimates.

What happened as a result of that is, the fund became less stable. There were more demands placed on it because of increasing wages and therefore the cost of claims were increasing. There were more demands placed on it because of an increasing awareness of the extent of industrial disease which had not been acknowledged in the past; there were more demands placed on it because we have a workforce that is becoming more and more educated in their rights and their responsibilities and are claiming more compensation.

At the same time the assessments, as a percentage of payroll, were going down for many many years. I will have the exact figures available to him in committee as I did in Estimates. That's not necessarily bad; it could mean a number of things. It could mean a more efficient operation; it could mean that the costs were, in fact, not rising as much as had been anticipated; but that was not the case whatsoever. What was happening, because they did not have the inclination to take an overview of the system, the gap between the assessments and the amount of money being paid

out was narrowing and narrowing until the fund, itself, would have been put in jeopardy had not this government, and the present Workers Compensation Board, had the courage to effect a change which was necessary.

We did that because we believe that it is not the worker who should have to pay for the injuries that they receive as a result of their work. That's a basic premise upon which we are making these changes; that it is an insurance fund; that it is an industrial insurance fund and, therefore, industry should have the responsibility to finance it in an equitable fashion.

I have not received any large number of complaints on the assessment increases. As a matter of fact, it has probably been brought to my attention more in this House by the Member for St. Norbert and his colleagues than it has outside of this House. That is not to say there is not concern about it, because most likely there is, but it is not the type of concern which has been manifested by calls of a significant nature or correspondence of a significant nature to my office.

So there have been increases in costs. There will most likely in the future be more increases in costs. Those increases in costs are necessary to ensure that a service is being provided to the workers in an equitable fashion. I find no one that argues with that point.

What I have not heard them say is the impact of not effecting these changes on workers. As a matter of fact, if they stand up and talk, they have a number of common themes running throughout the debate irregardless of whom is doing the speaking. They talked about the new board. That new board is doing an excellent job. That new board enjoys the confidence of the people whom it serves. That new board has done more to bring a progressive system of workers compensation to this province than any other board in recent history, and I commend that board for its work — (Interjection) — well the Member for Emerson says, and I quote him, "That's a bunch of bull," if I heard him correctly. If I did not hear him correctly, let him stand and correct the record.

Well, I will tell the Member for Emerson who has some interest not only in the general area of Workers Compensation, but in the interest of specific claims that that board has a reputation that it has gained in a very short period of time, not only among the workers of this province, but among the industry representatives of this province that is unparalleled. If he can provide evidence to the contrary, let him stand and do so. I will gladly entertain a question on that matter if, in fact, there is one they would like to present to me.

So it is a good board. The board is doing good work, and the board will continue to do good work. So they've talked about that.

**A MEMBER:** They're doing what you wanted.

**HON. J. COWAN:** They talked about the cars. Well he says, the board is doing what I wanted, and I'm not certain which one said that, but one of the members opposite said that. — (Interjection) — Perhaps I can just put it on the record as a general statement by members of the opposition that the board of commissioners of the Workers Compensation Board is

doing what I want them to. Well for as much direction as I give them, yes they are, because the direction I have given them is, do a good job in your job. They are doing exactly what I wanted them to do. As a matter of fact, they're going one better, they're doing an excellent job in the job which they have been directed to do. So they are, in fact, doing that.

As a matter of fact, I have to admit, I've been more specific in my direction. I said, serve those people who are most affected by your activities in an honest way with integrity and with courage, and they are doing that.

Now they may have very little confidence as members of the opposition in those comments, but that is their right and their privilege and I certainly accept their viewpoint as being that of one which serves their purposes. But my viewpoint, the viewpoint of members on this side of the House and the viewpoint of the general public is, in fact, much different than the viewpoint which they would have us believe exists out there. There is widespread satisfaction with the system now that had not existed for many, many years. It is because of a progressive government and a good board of commissioners.

They talk about that, they talk about the cars and, just for the information of the member opposite, I did ask the board of commissioners to review that situation. They did. They found that with the lease they had, it would be difficult for them to return the cars so they have, in fact, purchased the cars and made them available to staff for their use by way of their normal working requirements. So those cars are now in the hands of staff and are used by staff for normal purposes of the Workers Compensation Board. So we did the best we could on that, and the members opposite, I think, will be pleased to hear that. It is a minor victory, but a victory nonetheless.

The other thing they talk about is terminations and hirings and firings of the board by the board. What they are saying is that these things should not happen. By implication, that is the gist of their remarks. Well in fact, that Workers Compensation Board system needed review. They undertook two major reviews themselves, so they indicated in fact it had to have that review. They didn't act upon the one which they had completed under their term and they had a long time to act upon, but they did the review nonetheless by way of substantiating the many requests which were legitimate for a review of the system.

So there were some things that needed changes over there. Those changes included changes in personnel, as I am informed by the board of commissioners. That is not to say that the individuals weren't competent. That's not to say that the individuals did that work, but that was to say that there was a new policy evolving, a more progressive policy evolving which the board of commissioners in their responsibility felt needed and required new people to implement. So they have taken that action on a couple of occasions. If necessary, they will take that action in the future.

I am criticized as the Minister for not having involved myself in those decisions. Well no other Minister had involved him or herself in those decisions of that nature with that board. If they can indicate otherwise, I hope they would stand and do so because I have no record. As a matter of fact, it is common practice and tradition

that the Minister not involve himself or herself in the day-to-day activities of the board and in the hirings and firings. But I have not disabused myself of the responsibility that all Ministers have in any way.

I have indicated that as long as those additions and deletions are done in a manner which is consistent with common practices, then I will support them. Where it is indicated that they are not done in that way, then I will take action. To date, it has not been shown to my satisfaction that they had not been done in that way in any instance. In other words, there have been firings; there have been hirings; there have been terminations; there have been transfers; there have been retirements, but they have been done in a consistent manner for the betterment of the system. For that reason, I will not involve myself in the individual or specific cases, nor would any other Minister, under those similar circumstances. I have confidence that we have assumed the Ministerial responsibility which is accrued to us in this regard and that, in fact, work is being undertaken there which will benefit the system in the long run.

But what they don't talk about - because I've told you about the three things which they do address - what they don't talk about is the effect of the changes on the workers of this province. You don't hear them very often, and it's indeed a rare occasion, when they talk about the service, the better service, that these changes are providing to workers.

Now, I'm not saying that they don't care about the workers, I wouldn't say that; but I am saying that they have not given us any evidence, by way of their speeches today, and they have taken the opportunity to speak on many occasions on this, as to the extent of their concern for the service of the workers under this system which was designed and implemented to serve workers and to serve industry. They have been very narrow-minded in their focus; they have been very very focused in their discussions, and that has been on three issues which have excluded the impact on the worker from the first speech they made to the last speech they made.

This side, this government, this party cares about the workers of this province. We care that this system be efficient and effective for them.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister, in his remarks, is carrying the debate to the point where this party cares about injured workers, and it leaves the distinct impression that the party on this side does not care about injured workers. I want it to be on the record, Mr. Speaker, that this party cares as much about injured workers and those in the workplace as any other party in this country.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member did not have a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that there was no point of order, it is good to hear them say that. And one can only criticize him now for having taken so long to say it, but it is good at last to hear them say that, and the record will, in fact, indicate as to the extent of their caring for the worker, the record of the past and the record of this government.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Speaks louder than words.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Speaks louder than words, as the Member for Thompson says, and I'm glad to have him there to prompt me to make that comment.

I don't want to belabour the point; I do want this to go to committee, but I did think that those comments were necessary and I know we will have many more opportunities to discuss many more changes in the Workers Compensation system.

I do want to make one final point. The Member for St. Norbert, in his address on this bill and the previous bill, said that he hopes there will be opportunity for representatives to participate in the committee hearings. Well, in fact, this will go to committee. In fact, there will be an opportunity for public participation and, in fact, when the bill was first introduced for second reading, notice went out, both bills, notice went out to a large number of individuals, both in industry and in the labour movement, as well as, the general public and the medical profession, indicating that these bills, in fact, were before the House - the member asked for a list, I'll have the list available for him in committee - that these bills were before the House, that there would be second reading. We sent them a copy of my remarks on second reading; we sent them a copy of the bill, and we indicated to them to be aware that there would be an opportunity to make representation to the committee.

They had asked us to do that during our consultation, especially on The Workplace Safety and Health Act; we gave them that commitment. Further to that, today and tomorrow, staff will be calling those same individuals indicating that this bill will most likely be before the committee in about one week's time, which would give them ample opportunity to review other comments and to prepare their remarks. So we appreciate the need to have them involved; we have involved them in regard to the preparations, specifically of The Workplace Safety and Health bill and, to a lesser extent, of this bill; we will continue to involve them, and we believe that they have a very prominent role to play in building the consensus which will provide the type of progressive changes which we feel are necessary.

For that reason I commend this act to the House and look forward to those discussions; I look forward to the further involvement of the members of the opposition, and to those other members of the general public and interest groups who wish to speak on this matter.

Thank you.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL NO. 3 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Bill No. 3, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day the Acting House Leader, the Minister of Natural

Resources, got rather agitated about standing the bill at that time. I'd just like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that part of his high-handed attitude in this House, thinking that he can run everything, is what actually created part of the problem.

It is part of his actions, actually, as Acting House Leader, that has created a lot of the acrimony that we have in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I'm glad that we have a system here that allows every one of the members to participate, irregardless of what the Minister of Natural Resources thinks.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing the amendment, or the six-month hoist, in this bill here, I was one of the first people to speak to Bill 3, initially, and that was in December, and I believe that I probably am the first one that is going to be speaking on it the second time around now. As the member indicated, there will be many more speaking on it.

The thing that I wonder, the Minister of Agriculture the other day, when he addressed this bill, when he spoke to it, I thought it was a very weak presentation, his arguments were very weak. I would think that possibly the Minister would be receiving the message somewhere along the line that this bill is not acceptable to the members of the opposition, nor is it acceptable to the people of Manitoba. This is the only bill, Mr. Speaker, that has received a six-month hoist, and I wonder why the Minister initially wants to proceed with it so actively.

I was doing some thinking on the matter, Mr. Speaker, and the same Minister presented a bill last year; he had to withdraw it. He had to go through the embarrassment of having his bill withdrawn, tried to do some work on it and has resubmitted it, again, and I hope, and I fully intend that, if it is at all possible, that he will have to withdraw this bill again. I think it is a very poor bill and I think the Minister, himself, realizes, Mr. Speaker, by us putting the hoist on this bill, that this bill is not acceptable and, if he could save himself the embarrassment, I think he would withdraw it, and he still might have to.

We've done a lot of work since I spoke on this bill in December. At that time we were working on some statistical information that we were trying to get which, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, is something that this Minister has not done at all. He has never gone out and actually checked with the municipalities that are involved; he has not been pressured by any farm group, but during the election that was part of their platform, that they would change The Farm Lands Protection Act in such a way that it would be acceptable to the public. Without rhyme or reason he brings in this bill.

So what we did — (Interjection) — the farmers, and the municipal people, that public. So what we did, Mr. Speaker, we went out and we got ourselves information. Through our people, we contacted 117 municipalities, and LGDs, 92 of these responded, and 25 did not respond. As a result of the information that was gathered initially - I think out of the 92 that responded we only assumed that the 25 that didn't respond were not concerned. They probably didn't have any foreign ownership, or non-Canadian ownership but it worked out that 2.37 percent of agricultural land was owned by non-resident foreigners across the province, 2.37 percent. Total non-resident Canadians that own land is 2.15 percent.

When we go through the figures here, and when the Minister presented his information initially he had three of the municipalities from my area involved that he was using as an example. He was using actually erroneous information that he'd never really compiled properly. He used percentages of 20-25 percent in some municipalities, for example De Salaberry and Franklin. I think he used almost 50 percent in La Broquerie, and used that as a basis for bringing in this legislation. I would just like to indicate to the Minister that in the RM of De Salaberry for example, which is the highest one, with the exception of La Broquerie - the RM of La Broquerie is unique - but the RM of De Salaberry, I believe, is the one that has the highest percentage of foreign owners, or land that is owned by foreigners, and that works out to not 20-25 percent as the Minister indicated but 11 percent, 11.3 percent to be exact. With the RM of Franklin, for example, he also used a figure of 20-25 percent in his introductory remarks, in his propoganda that he put out at that time, and that works out to 9 percent that is owned by foreigners.

Now these are the municipalities that are basically affected, and I find it most interesting, I'm trying to find out what the Minister's trying to accomplish by bringing in this bill. You know, the municipal people would like to know, and the farmers would like to know, what actually is the Minister trying to accomplish.

Then I read in an article in the paper just recently. It says "farm lands ownership remains hot issue," and they quote the Minister to some degree saying "Agriculture Minister Bill Uruski said it would combat growing absentee control of farm land, and the speculation which was driving land prices beyond the reach of aspiring young farmers." And I assume that is what he was trying to accomplish with this bill, or is trying to accomplish with this bill.

Then it brings me to some interesting statistics, and I'd like to use these at this time, now, Mr. Speaker. In the Stats Canada release of July 8, 1983, Stats Canada has put out Index of Values of Farm Lands and Buildings per acre by Province, 1982 - advance information. Preliminary data indicates farm land values rose 1 percent during 1982; farm land values increased in Alberta 1 percent; Saskatchewan, who has legislation of this nature in place, increased 7 percent; and Quebec increased 10 percent; farm land values decreased in British Columbia 7 percent; and in Manitoba 10 percent.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** 10 percent!

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** And that is without this Minister's legislation; and this kind of legislation is what they have in Saskatchewan and it's up 7 percent. So that shoots the argument all full of holes, and it indicates further these preliminary estimates are based on the combination of Farm Credit Corporation and Provincial Government data. His own data, I assume, that he has been submitting shows the decrease in the price.

I would like to consider further the area of — (Interjection) — yes, I think the Minister of Natural Resources should be reading those stats because I think, like all member on the opposite side, the Minister presents a bill and they all follow like sheep, without really finding out what it's all about. And that's what's happening in this case, because it the members of the

government, the Minister's colleagues, would check and find out statistics of this nature, for example, that there is no concern out there for this, then possibly we would not have to sit here through the months of July and August in this heat, then we wouldn't have to sit here in this heat and debate this bill all summer.

Coming back to the RM of La Broquerie, for example. Mr. Speaker, initially the RM of La Broquerie was owned almost totally by foreigners. The RM of La Broquerie was owned by Americans, or the Davison people, in fact, they still own some of it, but the majority of that land has actually come into private hands; a lot of that land is now in private hands.

Mr. Speaker, when I went around to the municipalities and asked them what their concern was, many of them could recall back to the time around 1925 when, apparently, there was a problem at that time with a lot of foreigners owning land. That has been a self-correcting mechanism, as it is doing right now. This bill is basically a non-issue, but the issue that we have . . .

**MR. H. ENNS:** We don't want you to treat Canadians like you do Bulgarians.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** The concern about foreigners owning land here is not an issue; it is not an issue to the farmers or to the municipalities. What concerns us most, Mr. Speaker, is that this Minister is trying to control Canadians from owning farm land, and the first issue of that blossomed the other day when some people from Alberta wanted to buy land here. This was their homeland, they were raised in the province, they are living in Alberta and they wanted to buy land here. Surfaced on the news the other day, and the law is not in place yet.

If we look back at history, and I'd like to go back into history a little bit, initially when my parents had the opportunity to emigrate to this country - that was quite a few years ago - at that time when they settled in this country they didn't have land. The Hudson's Bay Company and Canadian Pacific Railway, I believe, owned most of the land in the southern region at that time. And what happened is they made deals; it was basically a few landowners that we had at that time. And what they did, they went and made deals. I can recall my grandparents making a deal with the Hudson's Bay Company for certain 160 acres; and, in fact, the Hudson's Bay Company, at that time, and I think the Canadian Pacific Railway, as well, at that time went out and made deals. They supplied farmers with breeding stock, for example, and then made a long-term arrangement whereby gradually they could work off the price of the land and ultimately own it. So this thing has been developing without any major problems, except in this Minister's mind, except in this Minister's mind.

Now, when talking to the council members, especially from the RM of Franklin, which is one of the key examples that he's using, they support the idea of foreign ownership. I am not arguing the fact that the foreigners should not be controlled to some degree, but I'm just using the argument that the councillors are using. They say that these people have come in when prices were high; paid the price, and maybe in

some cases even drove up the price, but the farmer that sold it didn't argue with that because he sold for the best price he could get, and I want to get into that area a little later, as well.

But what happened, many of our young farmers could not go out and borrow money to start a farm operation, and they went to these foreigners and made a deal with them; they rented, they turned around, they didn't have to have the capital outlay that is required nowadays, and have been farming successfully since, and it's working relatively well.

So that concern has never been very obvious, when we look back to the comments that the Minister said why he is bringing it in, so that young aspiring farmers can buy land. Well, look at what the credit situation is right now. The FCC is out of money, guys can flock down there in droves but they can't borrow any money; MACC, there's so much red tape involved you can't get any money out of them for six months. So all the arguments, the weak ones that the Minister was trying to portray, based on erroneous information and facts and figures, are not really valid. That is why I would suggest to the Minister, withdraw the bill until there is a concern. There are many concerns in the farm community, but this is certainly not one of them.

In looking through the various speeches that were made it seems that the only group that I can recall that has expressed interest in this bill has been the Farmers Union, and these have been the pet advisors to the Minister of Agriculture in all his activities — (Interjection) — yes, incidentally it's just indicated, you know, they can't even run their own operation and they're advising the Minister. On talking with one of the members from the Farmers Union, Mr. Speaker, they indicated that they would like to see even more restrictions.

That bothers me, that kind of thinking. These are farm people themselves that are bringing forward these kinds of comments, only a small select group. This is where the Minister gets his advice from.

To illustrate, Mr. Speaker, the fact that I think this Minister is not reading the public at all, the farm community, we have the same situation with Bill No. 90, The Manitoba Cattle Producers Association bill where he is totally going to be hamstringing the operation when he passes Bill 90, again, a matter of not getting in contact with the people. The livestock people are very upset with that, and they will be voicing their opinions quite strongly at committee meeting when we get to that stage.

The Minister, in speaking to the bill the other day, illustrated 12 different transactions where there had been a certain amount of speculation involved. In some of the speeches from the members opposite this has been a concern. The Minister of Natural Resources raised high points about the speculative end of it, in terms of farm property. I find that very interesting, and I want to relate possibly some of the situations that I've been involved with through the real estate, and myself, personally, in terms of value of land. If the Minister is concerned about the value of land at this stage of the game, the high price of it, let him go out and try and buy land. Land that was advertised for \$800-\$900 an acre is selling for \$500 and \$525 an acre. I can take him out to the RM of De Salaberry and give him cases of that. Certainly not economic conditions

at that time warranted it, but, Mr. Speaker, interest rates had a bearing on bringing the price down; economic conditions in the farm community had a bearing on bringing the price down; availability of money certainly has a bearing on it, because what happens now, people that want to sell, or have to sell, either through death or sickness in the family, whatever the case may be, cannot continue the farm operation, are put in a position where they have to take a lot less money because people are not paying the price.

The area of speculation - and I want to continue with that aspect of it - the concern that the people opposite have regarding speculation, the possibility that somebody would buy 160 acres of land, turn around and maybe sell it and make more money on it. I'll tell you something. I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture must have heard about capital gains, because evaluation day was in 1971 and if you turn around and sell your land for a higher price you are faced with capital gains; and I personally have a case with my own right now where I put a valuation on in December 31, 1971, and I sold my dairy with 230 acres to my brother in 1976, and about a year ago the Federal Income Tax Department came out and started doing an investigation. They checked through the whole thing and they said - listen to this - they said I'd sold too cheap in 1976, to my brother; or I had evaluated it too high in 1971. So they re-evaluated it based on 1971 values, brought it down, then turned around and are nailing me with capital gains. I sold it too cheap. There are safeguards and mechanisms in place right now that anybody that is making speculative gain on property is going to get clobbered, and I take exception to that. What happened, initially, when the PC Government was in power for a few months - unfortunately it was only a few months - they were proposing that a once in a lifetime sale should be able to take place for a businessman or a farmer, and that would have been a good rationale. That, of course, never did come to fruition and, as a result, we still have the capital gains aspect of it.

But let's look at the plight of the farmer in terms of trying to sell. He works hard all his life, most of them on a low-income means. Most of the money that they generate off the farm gets put back in the farm, with the one thought that when they sell their farm that they can retire; that they can retire with dignity like anybody that's been working 30-40 years and has a pension setup and what have you, but that has been taken away. This Minister is going to cut it down even more so because now he's cutting out the available people to buy. He says non-farming Canadians cannot buy; Europeans cannot buy; certain Manitoba corporations cannot buy farm land in Manitoba and, at this rate - and I mentioned this in my speech in December - one has to think that if he can cut off all avenues of purchasers, that ultimately the people, the farmers will have to come to him and ask him to buy it because that's what happened in the prior administration when they were in government.

We beat this government in 1977, to a large degree, based on their land policies at that time. I've learned, Mr. Speaker, not to underestimate the NDP thinkers, because it didn't work that time. What I think they're doing, they're using a back-door approach to it now. Cut off all purchasers, all avenues of purchasing, cut off money, ultimately anybody that wants to retire, or

has to retire, who's he going to sell to? We're almost there right now because the prices are dropping dramatically.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get into a little different area if I can. Related to this Bill No. 3 is Bill 23 and Bill 24. I was looking through these things the other day and then we also have The Conflict of Interest Legislation, or disclosure aspect of it, and when we consider what these three bills are going to be doing I would almost believe that maybe the Attorney-General would be in conflict of interest because what he's doing is building a bureaucracy and a business for the lawyers; because if you read Bills 23 and 24 that are related to this one - and we want to debate those at length - it is going to be a lawyer's heaven; it is just going to be fantastic when you look at the amount of stuff. In order to buy land relatedly and, Mr. Speaker, I know that I'm supposed to be speaking to Bill No. 3, but Bill No. 23 and 24 are all tied in and there's reference to these bills, there's reference to the No. 3 bill in these bills, but the amount of affidavits and the paper work that has to be now piled out. I suppose it's in keeping with the fact that the Conflict of Interest Legislation, which automatically holds everybody suspect, every municipal man is guilty and, in this case, they say everybody that is buying land, they hold him suspect that he might not be a full-fledged farmer. The documentation that has to be gone through here is unbelievable.

I wonder if the Minister has ever given any consideration to the effect that this is having on small communities. He's talked about absentee ownership, that this is having an effect on the rural area. The effect it is having by controlling the purchasers of this land, bringing the price down, is having a much more dramatic effect on small communities than the absentee owner.

In all cases, if a foreign owner invests in land here he makes sure somebody is going to be operating it, and rental, in most cases from foreign owners, is cheaper than it is from the local individuals, allowing our young farmers to, again, have a better chance to get involved in farming.

So where is the rationale in the argument of the Minister of Agriculture for this bill? Mr. Speaker, there is virtually none and, because it his bad legislation is why we're digging in on this one, why we've given it the six-months hoist, and will continue to fight and debate this bill until the Minister will withdraw it. If he thinks it's hot in this House here today, it will continue to be hot for as long as he leaves this bill on the Order Paper.

I would ask the Minister, certainly there must be other things that are more important than this piece of legislation. The farm community is hurting; we're looking at \$6 million more being put into MACC; these are concerns they have, people going broke, not this kind of dumb legislation.

The other aspect, why single out the farmers? If this is the philosophy of the NDP Government, why don't we apply the same philosophy then to businesses? In terms of business, we go out and we promote throughout the world wherever we can, "Come and locate in Manitoba;" we don't care where the parent company is, just come and put your money into here, get things going here. Why single out the farmers? I have difficulty with that.

The Minister has presented no rationale for the requirement of this bill. I think our role as opposition is . . .

**A MEMBER:** Speculation they don't like.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** . . . I have covered the aspect of speculation. There is no room for speculation with capital gains nowadays, very little, in fact, the price is down. The Minister brought forward 12 cases where somebody had made more money; they'd bought and they'd sold for more money. I can show him hundreds of cases where farmers are getting less now than they paid for it, a lot less. So his total rationale is out of the window.

We feel, as opposition, that if there is bad legislation that we have to stop it, in spite of the attitude of the Acting House Leader from time to time on the other side who says, our will will be done, especially his. No, it is not going to be that way, Mr. Speaker.

I would suggest to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that I have, reconsider your position. Reconsider your position; withdraw the bill; let us proceed with the other business of the House, and there's a lot of important business ahead of us as well; withdraw this one. You know that being the first speaker on the hoist, that there's many more to go and, as far as arguments are concerned, we will repeat them and repeat them because the Minister obviously isn't listening. Nobody needs this legislation. His arguments are all wind and rabbit tracks. He cannot substantiate the bill, and we ask you, Mr. Minister, withdraw the bill; withdraw the bill.

Nobody wants to be here in the heat of this summer. I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture has fairs that he wants to attend, and functions, as all of us would like to do. Nobody, Mr. Speaker, wants to be here at this time of year debating legislation, and certainly not legislation that is meaningless, that is going to accomplish absolutely nothing, except create more problems for the farmers.

I think the Minister of Agriculture is not representing the farm people properly. He has never given real concern to them. He lives under a sheltered umbrella in his own operation and, as a result, doesn't care what happens to the rest of the farm community.

With those remarks . . .

**A MEMBER:** That's indecent Albert.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** . . . it's not indecent, that is a fact, because people can't wait until this Minister of Agriculture is going to be removed. In fact, they can't wait until the government is going to be removed.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to just indicate to the Minister, save us the agony of debating this bill, withdraw it now, because many people are going to be speaking on it.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## COMMITTEE CHANGE

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Riel.

**MRS. D. DODICK:** I have a committee change. In Law Amendments, the Member for Rossmere will be substituting for the Member for Osborne; and on Statutory Regulations, the Member for Thompson will be substituting for the Member for Kildonan.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour. The first item on the agenda for Thursday is Adjourned Debates on Second Readings.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, by common agreement, we are prepared to call it 5:30.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Is it the leave of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed) On the understanding that the members are to resume in committee this evening, the Chair will accept a motion to adjourn.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that the Law Amendments Committee will meet this evening, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that the House do now adjourn.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before putting the question, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Not a point of order, Sir, I would just like to make a suggestion, if possible, for you to take under consideration. The air conditioners in the room I know are noisy and they're on all morning until we come; but I'm just wondering if you, Sir, could consider, if the House and other members would agree to it, to leaving them on because we all do here have ear pieces, and we can hear the debate through our ear pieces. I would just ask you, Sir, if you would consider that if it's a hot day like this tomorrow, or another one?

**MR. SPEAKER:** For the information of the honourable member, the suggestion was made earlier today and a preliminary test determined that the noise of the air conditioners interfered with the sensitive sound system. However, there is to be another test made and we will try to find a way that at least one air conditioner can operate while the House is in Session. I will advise the House accordingly tomorrow morning as to the outcome of that test.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. (Friday)