

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 15 April, 1985.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have four students of Grades 10 and 11 standing from the Fort Richmond School under the direction of Mrs. Trumpt. They are in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

There are 36 students of Grade 9 standing from the Sanford Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Haws and Mr. MacDonnel. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Morris.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, just prior to question period, I would inquire from the Government House Leader, we have some seven or eight members of the Treasury Bench missing. We have not received any notification of any pairs, can the government Minister give us any indication as to whether or not members of the Treasury Bench are prepared to be here at question period?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe there are five missing at the present time. I believe most of them will be here shortly. I have not had an opportunity to consult with the Whip about those pairs that may be requested today, but I don't believe that all the members that the Opposition House Leader suggests may be away will be away for the whole question period. I know some of them were at caucus and may be inadvertently delayed for a few minutes.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Manfor - number laid off

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could direct my question then to the acting Minister responsible for Manfor. I wonder if the acting Minister

could indicate how many staff were given notice of layoff for a 13-week layoff in the lumber division commencing April 26th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

Manfor - estimated callback date

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister brings back that information, I wonder if he could endeavour to confirm information, which I understand was provided to the workers, in justification of the layoff, that they would not be called back until the sawmill was able to operate at least at 75 percent efficiency, and that the lumber division was currently losing \$50,000 a day. I wonder if he could bring back information in response to confirm whether or not that is factual.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'll take that question as notice, as well.

Regulations re Transportation of Dangerous Goods - re PCBs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would direct my question to the Minister of Environment, Workplace Safety and Health. With the news of the PCB spill at Kenora over the weekend, when will the Minister bring in his regulations on Transportation of Dangerous Goods?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We indeed have requested the Federal Government in having ongoing meetings with staff from our department and the Federal Government to pass the regulations as soon as possible. As you know, Mr. Speaker, and as all the members of this House know, we adopted here in Manitoba legislation, Transportation and Handling of Dangerous Goods at the last Session of our Legislature. We are ready to proceed any time. We are waiting for the Federal Government to implement its own regulations and when they do, ours will simultaneously come into effect.

Not all the other provinces in Canada are ready to implement their regulations and I presume that it is part of the holdup, Mr. Speaker, because I suspect the regulations themselves will be coming into play during the course of the year. But you will want to appreciate that there has to be a great deal of similarity in the regulations that are going to be passed by the various provinces if we are going to implement a uniform

manifest system for the transportation of dangerous goods across the country, which is going to be consistent in terms of the type of placarding, the type of licensing, and the type of training that the people will be responsible to monitor and enforce these regulations are going to receive.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I would address a supplemental question to the same Minister. What precautions are now in existence to eliminate environmental damage to Manitobans, particularly by vehicles that are travelling interprovincially? Are there inspectors to check these vehicles as they enter the province?

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member because I indeed would like to inform the people of Manitoba that so far we have received approximately some 20 calls of concerned citizens who feel that perhaps they've driven over some of these spilled oils or have been sprayed by some of them. Staff from the department is investigating every one of these complaints.

We have impounded one car at this point in time because the analysis has shown that it was sprayed with some contaminants and it will be cleaned by staff of the department. The rags and whatnot that are used will be drummed and arrangements have already been made that it will be put on the truck that is transporting these transformers. Staff from the department is going down to Kenora to inspect the transporter and the transformers so we will be satisfied that when it comes through that indeed it has been cleaned, that none of the transformers are leaking and staff from the department will be following this truck to monitor it as it crosses Manitoba.

MR. A. KOVNATS: To the same Minister, another final supplementary. The Minister suggested that there were approximately 20 people who were concerned. I don't blame them for being concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the lack of initiative of this government. But I would like to also, for my last supplementary question — (Interjection) — well, when will the Minister stop blaming the Federal Government and get off his seat and do something in Manitoba?

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

Does the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

Bovey Commission - recommendations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was hoping to pose this question to the Minister of Education, but I'll pose it to the Premier instead.

Mr. Speaker, last December a major report was released by the Ontario Government with respect to future developments in the universities of Ontario, known as the Bovey Commission. My question to the Premier: is it the government's intention to officially react to some of the recommendations that came forward by this report, namely, that there be higher

university tuition fees, enrolment cuts, and that there should be faculty hiring incentives?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll accept that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I'll ask a supplementary. Is it the government's intention to put into place a similar commission to study into the plight of Manitoba universities with respect to underfunding?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in absence of the Minister of Education, I accept that question likewise.

French translation of Statutes

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him if he could indicate whether The Highway Traffic Acts and The Summary Convictions Act, which were both pertinent to the Bilodeau case, have been translated into French?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney-General also indicate or give us a general indication of the number of the so-called 400 major statutes have been translated? What percentage or what state of progress is he in?

HON. R. PENNER: I'll take that as notice, Mr. Speaker, and hope to be able to provide that information within a week.

Sugar beet industry - assistance to

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. My colleague, the Member for Rhineland, is currently in Ottawa with a delegation of sugar beet growers attempting to sort out some policy that will keep that important industry alive here in Manitoba as well as in Alberta. Has the Minister had any success or has the Minister come to any policy conclusion that will support that industry in the same manner that the Alberta Government has indicated to the Alberta sugar beet growers? I'm referring to a \$10 per acre subsidy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta subsidy was \$10 a tonne not \$10 an acre. Sir, I have had a number of meetings with Ministers nationally, including one last week. We were going to meet with the Minister

from Quebec, and I received a phone call over the previous weekend that since they had not arrived at their position nationally that it would not be appropriate for the two of us, Quebec and Manitoba, to meet with him to find out and ascertain what the federal position is. I did at that time put forward to the Federal Minister some suggestions as to how assistance might be available in the form of a 0.5 cent a pound levy on sugar being imported into the province which could, in fact, deal with the question of assistance to the industry.

As the member well knows, the sugar industry in this country supplies only about 10 percent of our needs in Canada, and we could, in fact, have and should have a long-term national policy to support the Canadian industry. It would not have to be done by trying to have provincial treasuries compete against each other as we did in the canola, where Alberta put up support for the canola industry and Manitoba and Saskatchewan could not. We don't want that kind of policy, Sir, we don't want federal-provincial relations headed in the way of provinces bailing out the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister confirm that we have a little over 400 sugar beet growers in the province; we have a plant in the City of Winnipeg employing between 100 and 200 people? Surely, the priority of this Minister is to ensure that that industry stays alive in Manitoba.

I simply ask the Minister: will he not prioritize some of the dollars that this government is prepared to put on the table to lure new industries into the province, .5 million to borrow in? Goodness knows, what they put on the table . . .

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

The honourable member's question is argumentative. Would he wish to rephrase it to seek information?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, my direct question to the Minister of Agriculture is simply this, that critical discussions are taking place right now in Ottawa. What has the Minister done this morning to show support for the Manitoba delegates that are speaking to the Federal Government right now, along with my colleague, the Member for Rhineland, to put some support from the Manitoba Government behind this important industry in the Province of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, one has to look at the question in terms of the historical situation vis-a-vis the Federal Government and the industry. Historically, the Federal Government, through The Agricultural Stabilization Act, has supported this industry from years back. When prices, in terms of producer prices, have dropped below the cost of production, the Federal Treasury came into place and assisted producers. It appears now that there has been a change in federal policy whereby the Federal Government is no longer, or at least appears by the indecision, willing to, in fact, do what they done historically, to come to an industry that supplies 10 percent of our production and support that industry in times of low returns in the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, we met, and we were prepared to meet with the Federal Government, to ask them and, in fact, we raised this question months ago. Last fall, November of 1984, we raised this question with the Federal Government when we were signing the drought agreement in Regina to say that there were problems looming in the sugar beet industry, and what was required in this country was a national sugar policy and a determination by the Federal Government what their assistance policy would be under long-established legislation, The Agricultural Stabilization Act.

If the member opposite is now saying we should, in fact, while we are very concerned about the industry, bail out the Federal Government in this case, Mr. Speaker, that would not be prudent policy on behalf of Manitoba. It's really been a long-established federal policy through The Agricultural Stabilization Act to assist the producers in this country.

Boissevain Land Titles Office Closing of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Last week, the Attorney-General advised the House that he would be meeting with the First Minister on Friday to discuss the Boissevain Land Titles closure. Can the First Minister advise the House now whether he's been able to come to a decision to keep that office open?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General and I have had discussions; those discussions are continuing.

Grasshopper problem - seriousness of

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Members of the House will be aware that there was a very serious situation last summer with respect to grasshoppers in the southwestern part of the province, and the Department of Agriculture was, last autumn, warning that the situation might be worse this year. Can the Minister advise the House what his assessment is of the seriousness of that problem this spring?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, our assessment has not changed from last fall, and if the weather conditions are as such, there is a possibility of the infestation being 2.5 times that of the previous year. We, at this point in time, are still hopeful that the weather conditions are such that nature will take its course. Nevertheless, our staff is meeting with all municipalities in the Province of Manitoba where infestations might be increasing to set out and work towards a co-ordinated plan of attack with the municipal officials that wish to do that. We

have the existing policy whereby we do provide financial assistance to local governments in dealing with the question of infestations in public lands. We are, as I understand it, the only province that provides that kind of assistance presently. We will continue that policy, and I will undertake to get a further report to see whether any changes from what I have said now are taking place.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture. Is there any program in place now that is any different from what his department undertook last year?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there is a difference not in terms of program, but in terms of extension and advice in working with municipalities. We are, in fact, through our technical staff, have set out an organized plan of action in order to deal with the serious infestation should it occur, and those meetings had begun since the beginning of the year. This was a much more co-ordinated and extensive approach than we did last year.

MR. B. RANSOM: A further supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. The Keystone agricultural producers made some recommendations to the Minister with respect to this problem, one of those recommendations being, I believe, that the government should hire some students to monitor the situation so that municipalities, farmers, and indeed the government would be constantly aware of an emerging problem because the Minister is probably aware it can develop into serious proportions quite rapidly. Is the Minister accepting the recommendation that the Keystone agricultural producers put forward?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member raised this question earlier. I did certainly ask staff to look at the merits of that and see whether it was advisable and could be incorporated, and should be incorporated, in making sure that our assessment would be as timely as possible. I have not received a response from the staff one way or the other on the merits of it, it's being considered, and if the member wants a further report on it I will be pleased to do so.

Grenada Demonstration Inquiry Report

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. Last week he made a decision to stay charges against the seven demonstrators involved in the Granada demonstration. In view of the reports and comments of the Chief of the Winnipeg Police that the inquiry brought forward evidence that justifies more charges than had been laid, would the Attorney-General, rather than making a personal decision, have his Criminal Prosecutions Branch review the report and the views and comments of the police department and consider proceeding with the charges?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be clear that, while the ultimate responsibility for

prosecutions is that of the Attorney-General and ultimately it was my decision. It was a decision based on the recommendations of a commission of inquiry acting in a judicial capacity, served by counsel who heard evidence over a great number of days, far greater in fact than what ordinarily would be the case in a court of law because of the broader rules with respect to the admissibility of evidence.

It was recommendations of the commission who studied and restudied and restudied video tapes, photographic evidence, the evidence of a trained investigator formerly from the RCMP, and had available to it a monumental amount of evidence. It was based on those recommendations far more than would appear in an ordinary police report, far more than would be available to staff if they were simply to go to the police report.

They made those recommendations. I thought and still think that they were balanced recommendations because not only did they suggest that the charges presently outstanding against seven demonstrators be stayed, but that no further charges be laid because it was clear, if one reads the report carefully - I think I have - that other charges might have been laid not only against demonstrators but against certain members of the police, certain members of the so-called counter demonstrators.

It seems quite often to be the case, Mr. Speaker, and it's my view that in certain very specific instances where the question of restoring some element of harmony after a disruptive event of that kind, is best served by the staying of charges rather than retrying the whole thing through the criminal courts. It was dealt with, and I think very reasonably and adequately, by the commission of inquiry.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Attorney-General explain to members of the House why the individuals involved in this violent protest, as it has been referred to, shall be free of any criminal charges while other members of the public who may be involved in the same type of activity will be justifiably forced to face criminal charges? Why should these demonstrators and others go free?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I think one must go back to the finding of the commission of inquiry. For example, the majority of this commission - and that incidentally was joined in by the minority - has no doubt that the intervention of the counter-demonstrators was the basic cause of all of the trouble which arose at the U.S. Consulate on October 28, 1983.

As we have already noted, the demonstration would probably have remained as peaceful as it was when it commenced if the counter-demonstrators had not arrived and intervened in a manner in which they did. So you had a very peculiar set of circumstances; not the kind of circumstances which I expect are going to be a matter of common occurrence. When one deals with those kinds of circumstances, as one must quite often when there has been, say, picket-line disturbances, one has to assess what the criminal law policy is all about. It is, fundamentally, about restoring peace to the social order rather than perpetuating it. I came to the conclusion that this is one of the rare times when

MR. R. BANMAN: Al Mackling wasn't there.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes. I remember when Al Mackling, as he was then known, the Attorney-General of the time, at the time of the rock band melee out at the arena, and that was a lot of years ago. That was a lot of years ago. It shows you how infrequently this special power - which an Attorney-General has and which must I admit be used with discretion - is to be used, but the fact that it is used once every 10 years or so is hardly the type of thing which suggests that some kind of precedent has been set which will be ongoing with respect to all disturbances of the peace.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind members that questions should not be of an argumentative nature, and the answers to them should not be developed into speeches.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

Grenada Demonstration Cost of Inquiry

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney-General now advise the House of the full costs of the inquiry?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for reminding me, and I in fact will send them, across the way, a printout which has been provided by departmental officials.

The full cost of the inquiry, which includes some projected costs not yet paid, is \$105,584.02. Of that, I should note - and that is not a small amount - of that amount \$76,000 and change was for legal services paid to commission counsel. The commission itself was not paid anything more than their usual per diems which are very very low, so that you'll see the basic costs are really the single cost of the commission counsel.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the details that the Attorney-General passed to me did not indicate any rental for space. Could the Attorney-General advise whether the commission received free space?

HON. R. PENNER: Space was used which belongs to the Department of the Attorney-General in the Woodsworth Building.

Livestock Inspection Drought areas

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, last week, on April 11th, the Honourable Member for Arthur repeated a question to my colleague who took it as notice - the Minister of Housing - about drought payments, and he felt he wanted an answer. I want to advise this House and some of his honourable members that I gave him the answer on April 3rd, and I wish they would pass that information on to him.

Flyer Industries Tabling of Annual Report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister responsible for Flyer Industries and would ask him, in light of the fact that his colleague, the Minister of Finance, tabled the Annual Report for McKenzie Seeds, I wonder when he will be doing the same in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know when the annual report will be ready for tabling, but it will be done in the usual fashion within the time that those reports are usually tabled in the House.

MR. R. BANMAN: I wonder if the Minister could inform the House as to when the year end for Flyer Industries is.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I believe it's the same as it has been in previous years, December 31, 1984.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, which is?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Questions should not be asked of matters which are of historical record.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House whether the annual report has already been completed.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Unfortunately, in response to his previous question, fortunately there were some noises from some of his colleagues opposite - I said it was December 31st, the date which is the same as previous years. I'm not aware that the annual report has been completed.

American unlicensed varieties of wheat - insurance in Canada

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, a year ago, in Estimates, the Minister of Agriculture, when I posed a question to him with respect to American unlicensed varieties that were finding their way into Canada, the Minister at that time indicated that he and his department were cautioning Manitoba farmers against their usage. Just last week I read an article, a release from his department, indicating that crop insurance was now considering covering American unlicensed varieties as they were grown in Canada. Can the Minister tell me how he can reconcile the change in the period of a year and what rationale he used and the crop insurance people used to bring American unlicensed varieties under insurance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member should be aware that the Federal Government who has the authority in terms of licensing the new varieties of wheat through the Canadian Grains Commission did in fact license some varieties and have in fact through policy asked the Canadian Wheat Board to offer contracts in the production of those policies. They have allowed this to happen, and as a result they are paying for 50 percent of their premiums in crop insurance. We asked them whether they would in fact, since they're now prepared to license varieties, be prepared to deal with this question, and as a result we are certainly being as flexible as we can, not lessening our concerns with the unlicensed varieties that are now being allowed by the Federal Government. There are still concerns in the marketplace. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that I think some of these varieties have been overblown, but nevertheless I think time will tell how producers respond to that.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I suspected, by that answer the Minister proves he knows nothing about the grain industry in this province.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, the varieties that have been licensed are Canadian varieties. I asked him specifically about the unlicensed varieties that the department and crop insurance of Manitoba have sought now to insure. There is a distinct difference between American unlicensed varieties and the variety that was licensed. Would he care to change his answer in light of that knowledge?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to change my answer at all. If our crop insurance corporation in consultation with the Federal Government is insuring unlicensed varieties, it is with the concurrence of the Federal Government. If they're prepared to pay half the premiums on the unlicensed varieties and are prepared to allow them to be marketed, Sir, who am I to say that they should not be insured if they are allowing them to be put in the marketplace? I will take specifically the question to find out whether the member's assertions are in fact accurate that all varieties of unlicensed wheat are now being insured that are indiscernible. I'm not sure that is the case, but I'll want to investigate that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Order for Return No. 4/84

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Government House Leader. Last June 4, 1984, I filed an Order for Return asking for the complete advertising budget of the Jobs Fund from 1981 to that present time. Can the Government House Leader indicate when that information will be supplied to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question. The order is in the final stages of preparation; I expect it to be tabled within the next couple of days, certainly later this week.

Manfor - number laid off and callback date

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I see that the Minister responsible for Manfor is now in the House, and I wonder if I could pose the questions that were taken as notice by his colleague earlier in the question period.

I wonder if the Minister could provide information on what I'm given to understand is notices of layoffs that were given to employees in the lumber division of Manfor, effective April 26th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is correct. Layoff notices scheduled for April 26th have been given and that is part of a number of layoffs, some of which occur on a regular basis, for example, in the pulp and paper mill which are part of the maintenance procedures, other layoffs which are pending in the Woodlands division, as well.

Mr. Speaker, the particular layoffs that the Leader of the Opposition refers to in the lumber division are scheduled from April 26th to May 27th when it is proposed, at this time, that one production shift, 23 employees, would be brought back onto site, and the intention being that the remaining employees would be brought back, as and when, the production resumes. We believe that it would be prior to June 24th.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder the Minister could indicate, is it approximately 65 who have been given notice of layoff for 13 weeks but, of that 65, 23 are to be brought back May 27th, and the remainder by June 24th - is that what the Minister indicated? Is the figure "65" the correct figure, as well?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the total number of people that are to be affected is 79. Of those 79 all would be laid off, except for the 21 maintenance and three operators. So, in effect, we have 55 people that would be affected by April 26th, not the 51 that the member was referring to.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could elaborate, I'm given to understand that at a meeting in which the layoff was discussed with the workers on Friday, the indication was given that all of them would not be called back until the sawmill was up to 75 percent production efficiency; is that a part of the problem with respect to this layoff?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the figure is actually, I believe, 80 percent. When the mill resumes 80 percent of production all of the employees would then be brought back on.

Manfor - reason for loss of production

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate why the mill is unable to achieve the 80 percent production at the present time.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the production in the sawmill was scheduled to be up and running with the new equipment in place some weeks, months ago. The difficulty has been in the design and possibly the production of some very important technological equipment. One piece of equipment, in particular, had to be replaced and reprogrammed by the manufacturer.

Mr. Speaker, those necessary modifications are being undertaken. This is an obvious fall-out of some of the production problems that have existed because of the malfunction of equipment that was purchased, that was put in place by the contractors under contract to Manfor.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, am I correct then in saying that this is new equipment that has been installed, that is malfunctioning and is not able to achieve what it was expected to achieve? And, if that is the case, then who would be responsible? Does the government or Manfor have a callback on the designers, on the producers, on the contractors; where is the responsibility?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I assume it's like any other contract. The responsibility for ensuring that the material and the workmanship of individual pieces that are put in place by the contractor are the contractor's responsibility.

The contractor has assumed that responsibility and various contractors have had people on site attempting to rectify any of the problems that exist. As I had indicated, one piece of equipment, a particularly important piece which required programming, has been removed and sent back to the manufacturer for reprogramming. That's something that we had no control over, Mr. Speaker, and the individual contractor-supplier who is responsible will be obviously held responsible.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister says that he "assumes" that it's like other contracts where it's the contractor's responsibility; does he not know?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, if the member is saying, am I aware of the particular clause in the contract that signifies that, no, but I can assure the member that it is the case.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not, again, this figure is accurate that was given, as I understand it, to the workers on Friday, that the lumber operation is currently losing \$50,000 a day. Is that a correct figure?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I can't say at this point whether that is an accurate figure. I do know that production has been going on at approximately 30 or 40 percent of what was expected and that is under a manual mode.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I should indicate to the member, before he jumps to conclusions, that while the sawmill was down training and upgrading was undertaken

as well. At some point obviously a decision had to be made and this decision has been arrived at and, as the member indicated, meetings were held and people at the mill are aware of the reason and the rationale for the shutdown, and I think it's obviously in the best interests of the company to do that.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, this is obviously something of major . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry if I'm offending the Premier by asking some legitimate questions of his Minister. but if he's not concerned about the loss of \$50,000 a day, we on this side are, and I'll ask the questions.

Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering what the Minister can indicate is the course of action here to try and overcome this loss of \$50,000 a day of taxpayers' money.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, without assuming that the member's figures are accurate, which they have seldom been in the past, I have indicated that the problem does not exist because of anything that was done at the millsite by personnel employed by Manfor, Mr. Speaker. The problem is in the equipment - the manufacture of equipment - in some cases the installation by outside contractors. Mr. Speaker, all avenues will be explored to ensure that the taxpayers, the Government of Manitoba, are not held liable for errors, misjudgments and so forth that are the correct responsibility of the contractor.

Mr. Speaker, we, too, are aware of the cost and that's one of the reasons why we made the tough decision to implement this layoff. it is why it has been - well, not enthusiastically received - realistically been received by the IWA, the workers there, who understand that this is a necessary step to stop the losses while the equipment is put right by those responsible.

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to beg leave of the House to make a non-political, non-partisan short statement, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister have leave. (Agreed)

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yesterday the St. Boniface Saints beat the Red Deer team 6-0 in Red Deer, Alberta, and they went through a tournament undefeated to win the Western Canadian Bantam Hockey Championship, and I'm sure that all the members here would like to join me in congratulating them for winning their championship for the province.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, also, I'm sure that even though the Winnipeg Jets have not won a championship yet, I think that we'll all impressed with

the gutsy attitude of the players who eliminated a strong team in an arena that they have never won in, and this is despite their captain and leader, and also an all-star goalie, and I'm sure that all the members join me in wishing them luck for the rest of the season.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave to make a non-political statement, as well.

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

The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, this year the surviving prisoners of many different races, religions, and ethnic communities are commemorating the 40th anniversary of their liberation from Nazi concentration camps. Forty years ago, today, on April 15, 1945, the British Army and the Canadian Air Force liberated the prisoners in the concentration camp at Bergen-Belsen.

This historical occasion is being commemorated solemnly by former prisoners under the banner "Day of Liberation and Human Dignity" in the cities of the world in which they have resettled. Thousands will commemorate this special day in Canadian cities.

When Hitler set out to conquer Europe and started World War II, he filled the prisons and concentration camps with millions of prisoners of many religions and nationalities; Jews, Poles, Slovaks, Czechs, Russians, Ukrainians and others. In the Auschwitz concentration camp, alone, there were 48 nationalities represented among the prisoners. Millions of innocent victims suffered and died in such camps as Maydanyk, Auschwitz, Buchenwald, Mauthausen, Sachsenhausen, Gross Rosen, Dora, Flossenberg, Bergen-Belsen and many others.

Mr. Speaker, this occasion will also be of special significance to many thousands of Canadian families who, like my own, will remember relatives and friends who died in the holocaust, and I am sure by all those selfless and heroic men and women who made the liberation of the oppressed and imprisoned possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not also mention that this 40th anniversary coincides in our own country with this week's formal proclamation of the Equality Rights section of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We are, indeed, privileged to live in a country where every individual citizen will be regarded as being equal before the law, and will henceforth be entitled to its protection without fear of discrimination based on their race, national or ethnic origin, color, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if I could have leave of the House for a non-political statement.

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

The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This weekend and during all of last week, the championships for the ringettes were being held in Montreal and, on behalf of the members of the House, I would like to extend our congratulations to the Debs, the 18-years-plus, representatives of the Transcona-River East area under the name of Transcona Tempos who won the Gold Medal, and the first ever winners of the Governor-General J. Sauvé Cup; as well, the River East Falcon Belles, 15 to 17 year age group also won the Gold Medal for their age level; and the Assiniboine Park-Fort Garry Sixers who won the Bronze Medal as representatives of the Junior Belles.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think congratulations are in order for the tremendous showing of the Manitoba teams in this tournament, to the individual community clubs, and the Manitoba Ringette Association, for the support and financial assistance and the guidance provided to the players which brought this honour to Manitoba and, indeed, to their president, Mr. Bazinet, who has been working very hard for the organization.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: I would also like to leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

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

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Two weeks ago, Miss Laurie Gryder from Minnedosa outrolled all comers and became the Ladies Five-Pin Bowling Champion of Manitoba, now proceeds to the National Championships in May in Newfoundland. I would like to have the House join in congratulating her.

MR. SPEAKER: If there are no other non-political statements.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, this is the day for non-political statements. I wonder if I could have leave as well.

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

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: I would like to have this House acknowledge the efforts of a constituent of mine, Marcel Vandersteen, who attended the Special Olympics in, I believe, Denver, Colorado, and won the Silver Medal for cross-country skiing on behalf of Manitobans in the Special Olympics.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, regrettably the Member for Arthur is not in the House, because it might even be that, on this day, he too might be able to get in a non-political statement.

ORDERS OF DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would you please call Bill No. 22 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden, and following that, the referral motion respecting the Rules Report which we received on April 10th.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL 22 - THE MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 22 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

This bill, it was presented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, is a fairly short bill, but on the surface appears to do very little. We listened to the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Services and his comments when he introduced the bill didn't indicate that there was much to be concerned about. However, Mr. Speaker, I do find it rather amusing. One section in his presentation says, "the passage of this bill will enable the department to consult with municipalities to ensure that any changes in description are clearly understood." Mr. Speaker, I find that rather amusing, because I don't think that it would make any difference whether this bill passed or not. The department should, in any case, consult with the municipalities. There's no reason to have to pass this bill just to have the officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs consult with the various municipalities. I believe that consultation is an ongoing thing, that it has been occurring for years, and will continue to occur whether or not this bill is passed.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is something else in here that does concern me because I think it is the only part of the bill that really has any significance to it. That is, the act is amended by adding thereto, immediately after Section 14 - and I only say that because that's part of what the act is - "For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act according to their intent, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make such regulations and orders as are ancillary thereto and are not inconsistent therewith. And every regulation made under and in accordance with the authority granted by this section has the force of law."

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the entire nub of the debate. It's really a question of whether the Legislature should live up to the role that has been assigned to it by the present act or whether this Legislative Assembly wants to further delegate its power to the executive arm of government, and that is basically what the argument is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I have attended numerous legislative gatherings where we've had parliamentary conferences, where the subject has been debated in numerous areas and arenas, and there has always seemed to be a

concern about the gradual erosion of the legislative power of this Assembly, or any other Assembly, and the steady increase in power of the executive arm of government and that is what we see happening with this bill; where the power to amend the descriptions of municipal boundaries would be taken out of the Legislative Assembly and done purely by regulation.

I would ask the Honourable Minister, when he fulfilled his role in a previous role where he was very concerned about the activities of the Legislative Assembly and the role that the Legislative Assembly plays in the government of any jurisdiction, whether he had that same concern then that he has today. Because today he seems to be saying that we will remove that power from the Legislature and we will do it by regulation and we will have it done so that it can be done much nicer by staff, it doesn't have to be brought to the attention of the Legislature, and that way we will not have to have it out in the open.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the Minister that I do not agree with him on that particular thing. So that is one of the reasons why I will be opposing to the passage of this bill. That's not only the reason, Mr. Speaker.

From time to time in this Assembly I have raised the question over a number of years about a review of regulations. We have a committee of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, the Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee, Standing Committee of the House, that is charged with the responsibility for an orderly review of regulations and it should be done on a regular basis.

Here we find the Minister who is asking us to transfer out of the Legislature into regulation the power to change the legal descriptions of municipalities and municipal boundaries, change the legal description, and he is asking that it be done by regulation and orders of Executive Council; and at the same time and it's the same Minister who is in charge of Government Services who would not call the committee to review the regulations and the activities which would occur so that members could have the opportunity to review the work that was done by regulation if this bill was passed. So what he is doing is saying we won't bring it into the Legislature, we are going to do it by regulation, but at the same time I will not call the committee that reviews regulations so that the work that is going on will not have the opportunity to have the scrutiny of the members of the Legislature.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find it rather difficult to support actions of that nature because I take the work of an MLA to be a very responsible role, one that covers a multitude of activities, and if it is the role of the members of the Assembly to review legislation, to alter legislation so that we could properly describe in The Municipal Boundaries Act the legal descriptions of municipal corporations, then I think it should be done here; and that way everything is above board and out in the open where MLAs can see it and that way we would have our work done in a proper manner.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find it rather difficult to support the methods that this Minister is proposing, to take out of the Assembly an activity that properly belongs to this Assembly for I don't know how many years. He wants to have it changed so it can be done by Order-in-Council, and we know that regulations are not reviewed by this Assembly even though the law states

that they should be done so. So, Mr. Speaker, until we have that orderly review of regulations carried out by members of this Assembly, I find it unwise to put further authority into regulation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting this bill.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that the report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House received by the Assembly on April 10, 1985, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration.

MOTION presented.

PROPOSED MOTION ON THE REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON RULES OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this motion which I believe is one of the most significant to come before this Legislature in this particular Session, because there are several very serious sections of this report that are not only of concern to me but I think when drawn to the attention of members of the opposition and the general public, will cause some alarm.

Mr. Speaker, some of these are personal, and I will just make a comment in passing at this time, that it appears that the government doesn't want private members, and is attempting to curtail some of the traditional rights and privileges of Private Members' Hour and some of the historical rights associated with that.

But my main concern is the fact that here we have a report which openly admits that there has been no action taken on the crucial question of bell ringing. Mr. Speaker, it was because of the possibility and the use of bell ringing in this Chamber in the past one to two years that Manitoba was saved from the curse of official bilingualism. Mr. Speaker, if it hadn't been for the right that we had to ring the bells with the support of the people of Manitoba, we would now be looking at a fait accompli.

Mr. Speaker, there are provisions in the bill which I don't want to specifically name, but in fact the main one mentions that there has been no agreement on some arrangement, some development in terms of a trade-off between limiting the ringing of the bells and making use of a new rule which would apply specifically to constitutional amendments.

So we're back where we were about a year ago in the sense that all that has been accomplished by the government is that they have now a limitation and a discussion on some variations on that theme which are being referred to Committee of the Whole, but the public and the members of the official opposition and the opposition in general have no guarantees whatsoever that the government won't, in response to a Supreme Court ruling, bring in similar legislation to what they had before which is repugnant to everyone in the province except a few members of Cabinet, and then ram that through this House.

Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting in this Chamber and in the province for 10 months for a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I trust the honourable member does not wish to debate something which is still before the courts, which he knows is improper.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not debating it. I am simply referring to the fact that the government's proposals were referred to the Supreme Court, and that we have been waiting 10 months for an answer. I am not dealing with the contents of that package or the debate that took place in the court itself which I attended June 18th to the 21st of 1984, as I recall.

So, Mr. Speaker, sometime soon we will get the result and then after that we will have the government's response to that ruling. We don't know precisely what the ruling is, and I don't want to speculate at this moment, but I simply say that when it comes the government will then respond in legislative terms. It will put together some package, some legislation perhaps, some response, and then introduce it into this House.

Now if that package is unacceptable to members of the opposition, then we are confronted with a 15-minute limitation on the bells. Mr. Speaker, I say that is a very very serious thing indeed, because we're not talking here about an ordinary statute. We're not talking about whether or not the government needs some time to call in its members, because we are basically talking about the government of the province and the government of the day. Whether opposition members can all get here on time is an important question, but it is a secondary question.

So if we're confronted with a situation where the government wants to bring people in, people who are driving in or flying in on a crucial vote, then of course we understand that under those condition they may go the Speaker and ask for additional time. But that's not what I'm talking about.

I am referring to the fact that in a constitutional amendment which is a rare thing, which is something that may come before this House only once in a decade or once in a century, that the government now has the ability and we have no guarantees, Mr. Speaker, that they will not in fact ram it through. Mr. Speaker, part of the reason I am raising this point is that, like many other members of the House and like many other members of the public, I do not trust the government.

Mr. Speaker, we heard today questions that came from the Member for St. Norbert on what the Attorney-

General was doing in regard to the police report on Grenada; and I have asked the Attorney-General what he is doing in court in regard to Dr. Morgentaler; and there he had an approach of not enforcing the law. But when it came to the question of official bilingualism for the Province of Manitoba, he was ready to enforce it and force . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The Member for Elmwood has made a statement that, with respect to the charges against Dr. Morgentaler, I am not enforcing the law. Mr. Speaker, as is well-known to this House and to the public, Dr. Morgentaler has been charged on each and every occasion, and stands charged; and that statement is an untrue statement and ought to be withdrawn.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, we'll have an opportunity to debate whether or not the Attorney-General is properly carrying out his functions. I intend to argue in his Estimates that he is not, and I will also raise some points in succeeding days to see whether or not some of the information the Attorney-General has provided in this House is accurate or not, or misleading or not. So we will have a chance to debate that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: There was a statement made with respect to the Attorney-General about misleading the House which I ask be withdrawn.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney-General to repeat that because depending on what he says, I will decide whether or not I will withdraw the comment.

HON. R. PENNER: I would have thought that the Speaker decides that. There was an accusation made by the member that I have or may be misleading the House. That, as far as I understand it, is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Because I do not recall the exact words used by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I will consult Hansard when it appears.
The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point is that the people of this province and the members of this side of the House do not trust the government, and we don't trust the House Leader, as well, who is the man responsible for now piloting the language legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it was because of the fact that the opposition had a tool, a weapon, that we prevented this province from becoming officially bilingual. Mr. Speaker, it is because of the fact that the public gave its almost unqualified support - let me say, overwhelming support - to the opposition, that they were able, we were able, to ring the bells for a long period of time. Mr. Speaker, without that support, it would have been impossible for the opposition to put up that fight.

Now, I see the Minister of Natural Resources come in, and he doesn't like this sort of reference, because, Mr. Speaker, the mere ringing of the bells, of course, would cause anybody on the government side to take a fit.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise with regard to our rule and Beauchesne Citations regarding relevance. The items to which the honourable member speaks regarding limitations on the time provided for divisions, which I believe is the major focus of the last 10 minutes of his comments, Sir, are not addressed in this report, have nothing to do with this report. This report does not comment on those, Sir. That was a subject of a referral of a committee report last May and June which was debated here. Sir, that is nowhere contained in this report, and I would ask you to consider whether or not a motion to refer a specific report to a committee comes under our relevance rules. I submit, Sir, that it does.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, to the same point. While the Government House Leader technically perhaps has a point, but the Member for Elmwood, as indeed from time to time any member of the Legislature could avail themselves to being present at the Rules Committee hearings, is well aware that the question of making some special provision with respect to exempting the imposed restriction on bell ringing that was imposed by this government, Mr. Speaker, that there was considerable discussion about whether or not some specific exemptions should not be made for issues dealing with constitutional change.

Mr. Speaker, we agreed to not agree on the committee, and let me assure you that was the position of the official opposition on the Rules Committee because we were unable to arrive at a consensus which would exempt constitutional matters from the current restricted rules with respect to bell ringing. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is entirely irrelevant and therefore in order for the Member for Elmwood to express his concerns about this particular matter. Obviously, the Member for Elmwood, as indeed do all Manitobans, have a great concern about the new restrictions that we are operating under and the lack of any positive exemption for same in dealing with constitutional matters.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair likes to give all members a certain amount of latitude in making their remarks, particularly when they start the remarks. However, the reference to relevance is relevant in this particular case, and the honourable member should be aware that the committee report contains no reference to a limit as such. The report does contain some reference to time restrictions on constitutional amendments. If the honourable member wishes to restrict his remarks to that topic, they will be in order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to the fact that there are references made in the report

which mention that there is no agreed upon minimum time for constitutional debate, and that there are of course variations on the 15-minute limit, but there is also reference, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that there is now no agreed upon minimum time. I'm concerned about the fact that we were, a year or so ago, considering some arrangement whereby some procedure - whereby a number of days would be set aside - would be developed that would treat a constitutional amendment in a particular way.

Mr. Speaker, I'll give you some examples of that, some things that could be considered, some things that should be considered, and I'm saying to the government that it just isn't good enough to pass this package which has come through the House Rules Committee and then proceed merrily on your way. There is an urgent need for a formula for constitutional questions, and, Mr. Speaker, there are all sorts of possibilities that could be considered. There could be, for example, a two-thirds vote in the Chamber; there could be a binding referendum; there could be a reference built-in to the public and the people of Manitoba. There could be a system whereby the Legislature went so far, and then it was only after a general election that constitutional matters were introduced into the House.

Mr. Speaker, all of these things have to be considered, because all we're doing right now is that the government has simply said that, well, you know, we have time set aside for the Budget. We have time set aside for the Throne Speech, so let's set aside a block of time wherein we could debate a constitutional amendment. Mr. Speaker, all that does alone, and we're not even that far right now, but all we would have at that is we would take a legislative Session and tack on another 10 days or so and any constitutional amendment could therefore be rammed through. I say that isn't good enough, that the original proposal put by the government for 10 days to be set aside didn't go far enough.

But, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, we're nowhere near that. All we are at is that there would be a debate, and when the debate had concluded, there would be a vote, and the bells could be rung for 15 minutes, and then Manitoba would have a new constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough, and I would like to hear from the government side as to what they are considering at this point in time. I would like to ask them what they are considering above and beyond the existing set of rules that we have because they had deadlock on the committee and they had no recommendation to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out a very major difference between a block of time as we have on the Budget or on the Throne Speech compared to what might be available in regard to a constitutional amendment, and that is that in the former cases you have very wide-ranging debate. You have many other opportunities that would follow and flow from that debate that take place throughout the entire year, so that people can raise questions on the Throne Speech which they can then raise again on the Budget, or they can redebate during Estimates, or they can debate during Interim Supply and the same with the whole Budget Debate, wide-ranging but other follow-up opportunities in which members have the time to discuss in detail things that they raised in general.

Mr. Speaker, in this particular case, you would have a block of time set aside; there would be a narrow debate focussing on a series of recommendations, and when the debate is over the constitutional amendment would pass. Mr. Speaker, that I think is a very serious matter. So all we would get really instead of a five-month Session, we'd have a five-and-a-half month Session.

Mr. Speaker, we want and we need public input. We want the public to have an opportunity to decide and to participate in a decision making that goes into a constitutional amendment, because any change of that kind is probably binding for decades if not generations to come. We remember how interested the government was in that procedure last time, and we can only anticipate how interested they are again.

I recall very well when the Member for St. Norbert got up about a year ago and made his suggestion in regard to public hearings, I think the House Leader had a seizure of some kind. His mind stopped, his brain literally stopped functioning for a couple of minutes. He was unable to respond and he's never been the same since.

Mr. Speaker, we had public hearings and I believe that public hearings should be guaranteed to the people of Manitoba on a constitutional amendment. We had public hearings before. We had 500 briefs. We had 400 submissions that were made in person and 100 written and when the government took and considered all of that, they gave it short shrift.

Do you remember the famous one-and-a-quarter page document, a page of introduction and a quarter-page saying, we're going to proceed anyway? They didn't care. They weren't interested in what the public said — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources, he wants to know about relevance. I would invite him for a change because this might be the only time I do it - I don't know if I have ever invited him to speak; I usually plead with him not to speak; I usually beg him not to participate - but I'm saying to him, when it comes to amending the constitution, what does he recommend? He's a member of the Cabinet. He comes from a government that has only guaranteed this Assembly a short debate.

I would like to hear something fresh, some new proposal as to how we could allow a full participation, Mr. Speaker, because I remember when the Member for St. Norbert raised this point, there was some fancy maneuvering in the Chamber. He wanted public hearings which was supported by this side of the House and supported by the people of this province, and the government wasn't willing to consider that. They left things hanging, and things are still hanging even though the Rules Committee tried to deal with this difficult problem. Mr. Speaker, that isn't good enough. This is too serious a matter.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on to relive some of the innuendoes and threats that came from the government benches in regard to yourself, but I will simply defer doing that at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, no sooner was the matter discussed, no sooner had we talked about and debated and settled upon - like when someone sticks a gun in your ribs but voted down in the Chamber, the government had its way; the government had the majority - and they got their 15 minute limit on bell ringing which is where

we stand today. No sooner had we passed that than the government was short some members and had to appeal to the opposition and perhaps the Speaker, I don't know, but appeal to the opposition, and the opposition undertook a gentlemen's agreement whereby a few members of the Conservative Party didn't come in to vote so that the government wouldn't be defeated that particular day.

Here they were so concerned that the bells rang too long that on the first opportunity to demonstrate their concern, they themselves wanted the bells to ring longer, because this is a provision, Mr. Speaker, that helps the government. It's not a provision, the present rule, it's not a provision that is of any value to the opposition. It's a provision which benefits the government but does not benefit the opposition or the people of this particular province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply going to wind up my comment at this point and say that we were talking to the government and asked the government for a package - it was to be a package - and the package was that there would be some discussion of a limitation on bell ringing, and then there would be some provision for a new procedure on constitutional amendments. That was the package. One side perhaps wanted one and the other, the other, but it was a trade-off or a quid pro quo and we are not anywhere near that arrangement at present.

All we have, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time is a committee report, and the most important single item in this entire report is missing and I want to know what the government is going to do. I want to know what opportunities we're going to have in this regard. So I'm going to put that question, Mr. Speaker, to the House Leader. I don't know if he is listening or not, but I would like him to get up and tell us where we go from here in that regard.

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

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to say a few words with regard to the business before us because I think probably history will record that the members that sat in this Legislature during the time when the issue was debated will probably realize that while at the time it didn't sound like it was of a large historical significance, but I think people will find out in years to come that it really was part of the democracy in action and part of the shaping of the course of Manitoba's future.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it will provide some very interesting studies over the next 10, 15, 20 years for people who are taking political science as far as the one basic ingredient that many of us have a tendency of losing sight of, and that is the will of the people. All too often, many of us think that we know better and we're better at leading people, and don't realize that people will only allow themselves to be led if they agree in a large extent to what is happening. So, Mr. Speaker, I think it's going to provide a very interesting case study.

Unfortunately though, Mr. Speaker, I think this whole area of concern and turmoil that has been raised in this province could have been totally avoided if the

government had been a little more politically astute and really realized what was happening in the grassroots and what the average Manitobans' feelings were.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we are seeing happen here is a knee-jerk reaction to a large extent created by the outcry of some eastern media people and some people within the Province of Manitoba who didn't feel at the time that the system that we were working under, the Rules of the House, weren't working properly.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to take a different view and I would say that I think the Rules of the House serve the people of Manitoba very well. I believe that if it hadn't been for the rules at that time, being structured in a way, this government could have gotten away with things that 85 to 90 percent of the people didn't want to happen. I think that what we are seeing happen now is something which I, for one, would rather not see happen at all. I would have been just as happy to leave the rules in place exactly the way they were because I think that they have served us well.

Now, faced with the rule changes that we are, I have to say to members opposite, in repeating what I just said, is they would have been smart to leave well enough alone because they have already in their actions in the last six months, whether it be through the Throne Speech, through the Budget or through any speeches in the Legislature, not mentioned this one major issue once. Not once have I heard a member of the government, of the Treasury Bench or the back bench, say anything about this issue. That would indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, that they are awfully sensitive about it, they know they have erred dramatically when it comes to this, and now hope that by not saying anything about it, it's going to go away. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, and I say truly unfortunately, it won't.

The government is now faced with a dilemma. It was alluded to by the Member for Elmwood today who asked some questions with regard to translation services. But I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, sitting on the - we call it the Human Greed Committee - I don't really know what the real . . .

A MEMBER: That's Legislative Assembly.

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . the Legislative Assembly Management something or other - but that particular committee was informed the other day that the government is having difficulty hiring individuals to translate the existing statutes.

Mr. Speaker, we were informed that there is not really enough funds available and there are not enough people around to do the translating. The government, under the current conditions, is falling behind. How many legislative requirements without any Constitution requirements have fallen behind what was happening?

Mr. Speaker, the whole posturing by this government has to do with what this whole debate has always been all about. Mr. Speaker, I know while you are maybe getting a little nervous that I am straying off the topic, but one cannot deal with this particular issue. In other words, what is the famous bell ringing issue unless one puts it into perspective of what's happening? You have to debate the issue what brought us to the point we are at right now because had it not been for that one thing happening, had it not been for the government's

desire and bullying tactics in trying to rush through a constitutional amendment in this province, this rule change would not be before us.

So I say to members opposite that I think it is time that they really examine very closely the direction that they have taken. They set out to make a constitutional amendment in this province. They were caught by the people of this province with trying to do something which they were not in favour of. They were stopped, Mr. Speaker, from dealing with that subject matter not because the opposition didn't want it but because the majority of people of Manitoba didn't want it. Now, in order to sort of redeem their position, what they have done now is they have instituted or put forward some rule changes.

I say, Mr. Speaker, really, at this point in time, they should leave well enough alone. They are already, as I mentioned earlier, not talking about this issue at all. I think that before any major changes should be made to the rules, we should just sit back and allow the people of Manitoba to finally determine in the next election whether or not they were really happy, whether they want these kinds of changes or whether they want more of the same that the NDP have given them.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the debate on the motion at this particular time, but simply to indicate to you, Sir, and to the House Leader that there are different members of the opposition that wish to comment on specific sections of the rules changes being introduced and, for that reason, I have no further objection to seeing it go into committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried that the report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House, received by the Assembly on April 10, 1985, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: We are considering the report of the Standing Committee on Rules of the House. What is the will of the committee on how to proceed? Paragraph-by-paragraph, is that agreeable? Page-by-page?

A MEMBER: Paragraph-by-paragraph.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Paragraph-by-paragraph. Page 1, Paragraphs 1 to 5 were each read and passed; Page 2, Paragraph 1—pass; Paragraph 2—pass.
Paragraph 3 - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this section, but before I do I want to ask the House Leader a question. That is very simply there has been deadlock on the Rules Committee. We find ourselves in a situation that we were at a year or so ago. At that time, the House Leader made an offer to the opposition, which he subsequently withdrew, and that is that he said that he would recommend or allow or suggest that there

be a 10-day period of time set aside for a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a situation right now where we were once looking at a package, and now all we are looking at is a situation where we have "advanced" from a procedure whereby the bells could ring an unlimited time to a procedure where they could ring for a 15-minute period of time, but that was part of a package, and I want to know from the House Leader what he is now going to do in terms of "recommend to this House a new procedure for dealing with constitutional amendments." Because for all we know, the government will get somewhere in the next month or two a decision from the Supreme Court. The government will then package a response, send it to the Legislature, debate it for a couple of days and then call for a vote and within 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman, Manitoba will have a new constitutional amendment. Perhaps that will be the blackest day in our history. Perhaps that will be the back-door method of putting official bilingualism into effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Can the member make it clear to the Chair exactly how these comments are relevant to Paragraph 3, Page 2?

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll read the paragraph and explain how it is relevant. The paragraph reads: "Your committee considered the matter of a guaranteed minimum debating time for constitutional matters . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Perhaps you have a different report from me.

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Oh I'm sorry. Mr. Chairman, that's quite possible. I'm reading from Votes and Proceedings. Perhaps I could have the precise paragraph, I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. In the Votes and Proceedings we're on the final paragraph of Page 1. I'm reading from a different page. I'll go through the Votes and Proceedings paragraphs.

The final paragraph on Page 1, Votes and Proceedings—pass. Paragraph 1, Page 72 of Votes and Proceedings— pass; paragraph 2—pass.

Paragraph 3 - the Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, this is the one I was addressing. I had gathered we had passed 71 and were now on Page 72, but be that the case.

Again we're discussing here the consideration of a guaranteed minimum debating time for constitutional matters and, Mr. Chairman, I'm simply saying that I would like to know what the government is going to propose next. Perhaps their proposal is the status quo which is what is contained in this paragraph, because they have turned down, they have not been willing to consider various suggestions made by the members of the opposition. I mentioned before that the Member for St. Norbert had suggested public hearings. I think that has to be given consideration and has to be included.

They also, in my judgment, should consider a minimum length of debating time. That could be part of the proposal. A previous number suggested by the House Leader was 10 minimum days of debate guaranteed on a constitutional amendment. It's not a long time, Mr. Chairman, when one is considering the significance of what that amendment might contain, and I also believe that this also possibly should include a two-thirds majority in the House. I think that has to be given very serious consideration as well.

We're not talking about a statute. We're not talking about a private member's bill, or a government bill. We're talking about something that will affect the lives of the people in our province for decades and generations to come. So, Mr. Chairman, I am very curious indeed to know what the House Leader has, either in mind or up his sleeve.

He surely doesn't think, he surely isn't seriously proposing to this side of the House that the reason for the 15-minute limitation on bell ringing was that it have universal application, and that regardless of whether it was a private member's bill, a government bill or a constitutional amendment, they are all of equal status and equal significance, and that no distinction can be drawn between them.

So I'm asking him, he's heard what I have suggested, he knows what the Conservative party has suggested, I want to know what he is now suggesting in terms of dealing with the Constitutional Amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, all members of the Chamber are invited and notified of meetings of the Standing Committee of the Rules of the House. This matter was debated at great length. The proposal of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert and the proposal of the government were both debated and considered extensively by the committee. We could not come to an agreement. Members in that committee have in almost all cases in my memory come to agreement on matters such as this, and it was at the suggestion of members opposite because we couldn't come to agreement, that this matter be deferred past the life of this Legislature and that is in the committee report.

The details of those discussions, I think I would be wasting valuable House time to go into, they're all adequately recorded in Hansard. They take up many pages, and to attempt to recount the details of those discussions I think would be a waste of the time of this committee.

Suffice it to say in a nutshell, that the opposition and the government were in agreement on the basic principle as outlined by the Member for St. Norbert last June and concurred in by members on this side.

The other matter with regard to voting majorities, we obtained legal advice on from appropriate authorities and the committee was advised - and I may err in saying so - but certainly members on this side and I thought members on the other side perhaps somewhat more reluctantly, accepted that advice with regard to some constitutional imperatives respecting voting majorities.

I think it's fair to say however, Mr. Chairman, that the question of a minimum debating time was agreed upon; the question of a specific provision for public input was agreed upon. Both of those were referred to the committee by agreement last June, 10 months ago. The details as to how those mechanisms could be achieved and how they should be staged and what options were available, whether the committee stage had to be at one particular point in the process, was the subject of some debate and disagreement and was the nub of the area on which members could not agree.

I hope that, for the benefit of members of the opposition, is a fair recap, but to go into extensive description of the discussions I think, as I said earlier, would be a waste of time. It was discussed at I guess virtually every meeting except the last one.

So, it was discussed at probably half a dozen meetings, sometimes taking as much as an hour, and I think it would be unfair of me to recap all of that. But the government position has not changed. We welcomed that proposal. We thought it was a fair proposal put forward by the Member for St. Norbert. We were unable to hammer out what I consider to be the mechanics of the proposal and that's where it was left. It was at the suggestion of the Member for St. Norbert specifically that this matter not be dealt with in this Rules Committee Report and that further discussion of it be deferred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Paragraph 3, Page 72 - the Opposition House Leader.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the best way to describe the official opposition's position on this subject that admittedly is not being dealt with specifically by the rule changes before us, but the very reference to the fact that we were not able to deal with it is of course every reason to discuss it at this particular stage of passing the Rules Committee motion for changes to our rules, and to put clearly on the record, Mr. Chairman, why we were not able to put together an acceptable package.

No. 1 - we don't trust this government and this Government House Leader on the issue of constitutional change. That's No. 1, Mr. Chairman, and we have every reason to make that statement. More importantly, the people of Manitoba have every reason to expect us to put forward that position, Mr. Chairman.

When you think of the time - and the Government House Leader alluded to not wasting valuable House time just a moment or two when he stood up and spoke - that was wasted in this Legislative Assembly on an issue that at one point in time preoccupied that government and caused a record to be established in Manitoba for a Legislative Assembly sitting on the subject matter of bringing about not only legislative but constitutional change to language provisions in this province. For any member from that side of the government to talk about waste of time, then he should reflect on the time that he kept us here in the longest Session a Manitoba Legislature has ever experienced where virtually all other work of the Legislative Assembly was paralyzed, where we came in day after day after day confronting with the same issue.

And yes, Mr. Chairman, day after day of closure being imposed upon us in an unprecedented way; and day

after day of a reaction on the part of the opposition, the resorting to the tools available to us to block what obviously was not acceptable to a vast majority of Manitobans, namely the ill-considered provisions that the Attorney-General and the small group of Manitobans outside of this Chamber, had foisted on the government of the day to accept as government policy which now everybody wishes they had never even seen or heard of. Subject matters, my colleague from La Verendrye has already said, hasn't been broached during the course of this Session and will not be broached. Not a whisper, Mr. Chairman.

This question that was so important is now not a question to be talked about. More importantly, we learn that the common sense advancement towards providing the kind of French language services in translation of bills and in other spheres that had been begun and were ongoing and certainly received when presented by a saner government in a calmer way, virtually unanimous support in this Session in this House in the year 1980 after the well-known Forest parking ticket case, the Supreme Court decision that resulted thereof.

Those steps were then put in place by none other than my friend, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert we are now told, are not being proceeded with, and we are now being told - and I'm not saying it - members of francophone community, members of the SFM are saying that the services that were being provided by the Sterling Lyon government and the indications of a moving power to meeting those obligations are now for reasons of lack of staff, for reasons of lack of finances, and I will tell you the biggest reason, Mr. Chairman, and this is the real tragedy - and francophones of Manitoba understand it - this government now has been cowed into not doing anything in that field for fear of raising the debate that raged across this land for the better part of a year.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is the tragedy that has occurred with respect to that issue that is of importance in this province and that's the box the government finds himself in. — (Interjection) — Well, I am dangerously close to being out of order. I want to get back to the paragraph before us, the paragraph that indicates that your rules committee was not able to come to any agreement which I still strongly believe is felt, certainly by members in the opposition, more importantly by members of the general public, that want to see constitutional change be elevated to a higher category of priority when dealt with by this Legislature or by any succeeding Legislature.

The easy way of course to accommodate this, is to simply have the government acknowledge that they will not attempt to do what they once did. They will exempt holus bolus from any restrictions that the government has imposed on this House, admittedly with some concurrence on the part of the opposition because we certainly didn't want to seem to be blocking the normal business of the Legislative Assembly.

But, Mr. Chairman, let it be clearly on the record that at all times the official opposition never accepted the necessity of a restriction with respect to the important tool as was demonstrated of bell ringing, when this government brought into this Chamber a measure that simply didn't have the concurrence of the vast majority of people that we are charged with the responsibility of providing good government for. We could not have,

the opposition could not have rung those bells without the support that was demonstrated on a daily basis throughout the width and breadth of this province.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, brought about or suggested a relatively straightforward recommendation that any future constitutional amended resolution that would be presented to this Chamber, that there be a cooling off period even if we were under some duress being asked to limit the debate to 10 days; that perhaps after the fifth or sixth day the question could then be put to the greater community. That's precisely what the Member for St. Norbert was suggesting.

However, in the hands of this Government House Leader, it became a complicated mechanical procedure, the kind of procedure that we could not put our trust in. It was then attempted to decide to further limit that exercise in bringing the question to the public. Well it was at that point in time in the Rules Committee that we started losing faith in this government's sincerity and this government's capability of recognizing the very point that we were making.

We were not prepared to accept on this question any kind of restriction and when we got into the nuts and bolts of how perhaps the Government House Leader could accommodate the Member for St. Norbert, whether or not the period of public hearings had to take place before or after or in the middle of when the question was being raised in the House. What should happen if, indeed, the question was being raised and the House was not in Session. That, Mr. Chairman, to us was all skirting the important part of the question namely, that we simply did not accept any restriction with respect to our ability as an opposition, to take a question involving the constitution of this province to the people of Manitoba and taking whatever time - whatever time - it takes to reach a consensus in the broad general public.

Mr. Chairman, we were told the Government House Leader indicated that while they looked at the possibility of doing something extraordinary calling for two-thirds of the members to support a constitutional change, their legal advice was that it was not possible. Mr. Chairman, that just simply demonstrates to me again that they were in effect looking, not in the direction that they were being asked to look, to accommodate this full and free and open debate on the subject matter but ways of providing some mechanical restrictions to it, so that idea got tossed out.

Then there was the question of whether or not precisely how should the interruption that my colleague called for originally how that could be accommodated. We got a number of complicated suggestions about the fact that it could be introduced, or at public hearings, and the style or the nature of the public hearings were never even spelled out for us, but all of them had as an overriding principle behind them, the concept of formalizing it to a specific extent that could be written in rules, and that could then be ramrodded through this Session or through any subsequent Session, Mr. Chairman. It was at that point, Mr. Chairman, that the opposition decided that our original position was the correct position, that we accept the time limitations that we've already demonstrated will cause more difficulties for this government, caused the Minister of Health considerable difficulty on that one occasion when

he was first subjected to that restricted 15-minute bell ringing rule and was found rushing and puffing into this Chamber to try and save his government from going into defeat.

Mr. Chairman, it was the concern and only concern that deep down we had for members like the Minister of Health and other members of the House because, despite what we sometimes do on this side of the House, we are compassionate people. We have a love and respect for our members opposite, and four or five of us absolutely went out of the Chamber, out into the lobby, so that the government would not go into an embarrassing defeat the first time their imposed rule was put to the test, Mr. Chairman.

Well, Mr. Chairman, how can you trust a Government House Leader with the far more important issue of constitutional change? You know, Mr. Chairman, constitutional change is a different matter that comes before us only seldom. Unlike a bill, unlike other measures that we proceed with in this Chamber, they are reversible. Constitutional changes, even with the amending formula now available to us here in Canada, still make the procedure extremely difficult as our aboriginal friends are now finding out as they attempt in several conferences to bring about constitutional change.

So, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the paragraph that we're dealing with recommends that the matter with respect to minimum debating time for constitutional matters be now deferred should not be misread by members opposite and particularly by this House Leader that the opposition doesn't continue to and will continue to have a great deal of concern about this government's now considerably improved ability to attempt to bring about a constitutional change during the course of this lifetime, the lifetime of this Session or perhaps another Session to come, should they be so inclined to do so. We are not for one moment prepared to accept that, Mr. Chairman.

We take this occasion, the consideration of the rule change that's before us, to express our concern, a concern that certainly we continue to express to our constituents that this government has now put themselves in the position that should they be moved to bring about ill-advised constitutional changes that it is this government that has tinkered with the rules to the point that a constitutional change can in effect be brought in, in the space of a very short period of time, with the current restrictions on bell ringing in operation as they now are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, stripped of all the rhetoric, I was pleased to note that the Opposition House Leader did not disagree with my factual description of what occurred in committee, that the options were considered, we could not come to agreement, and that record is provided in the committee transcript.

The only disagreement then I would have with him, other than with some of the rhetoric of his comments, would be on the very last point he made. That was that somehow the limit on the time division bells can

ring somehow limits the amount of consideration that can be had in this Chamber. As I understand our past experience, the limit on division bells only limits the amount of time division bells can ring. It does not limit the rights of members to debate any matter or any question. When it was introduced, it was very clear that was the intention. I don't know how under our rules it could be construed as to limit debate.

So the rules that were in place before are still in place. At the suggestion of members of the opposition, we are not proceeding with something they asked for last Session. Now, I'm sorry, I can't construe it any other way. I am not going to be enticed into engaging in the rhetorical debate of the Opposition House Leader. The facts speak for themselves. We dealt with this matter, I believe, very honestly, with integrity on both sides, to try and find a solution. We avoided the rhetoric in committee. I don't think it serves any purpose here in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just speaking to this paragraph, members of the committee will recall that at the Rules Committee I indicated that frankly the original proposal of the government to limit debate was not satisfactory to me. We then went on to discuss my proposed amendment for public hearings after six days or five days of consideration by the committee. The Government House Leader indicated that although he agreed with the principle of public hearings he felt that public hearings could take place while the House was recessed.

I suggested what that meant, Mr. Chairman, was that, for example, the Government House Leader could propose a motion for consideration for public hearings during the summer, call a Session of the Legislature in September, limit debate to 10 days and pass a constitutional amendment. To me, Mr. Chairman, that is not satisfactory. That would be limiting the right of the people of Manitoba to participate in what actually might be - for example, the resolution that came before the committee while the House was in Session could be considerably different than what was the subject of public hearings.

MR. H. ENNS: That last resolution kept changing.

MR. G. MERCIER: That's right, Mr. Chairman, as the Opposition House Leader reminds me, the previous resolution of the government changed considerably from time to time.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I indicated that the original proposal frankly was not satisfactory, and with this interpretation of my amendment for public hearings, that was not satisfactory. We indicated quite clearly, Mr. Chairman, that this issue became to a certain extent one of trust in this government to amend the Constitution of Canada. We on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman, lack that trust in this government to reveal its true intentions and to carry out legislative activity in the public interest.

That view, Mr. Chairman, became strengthened in the last few days when I read the minutes of a Cabinet seminar of Thursday, September 15, 1983. You recall

that time, Mr. Chairman, September 15, 1983, the committee was in the midst of public hearings on this government's proposed constitutional amendment. Item (4) was one of the recommendations adopted by Cabinet as a three-year plan of action, Mr. Chairman.

"(4) The Cabinet decided that all new, non-economic issues, programs and legislation with the exception of outstanding election commitments which do not meet the test of importance to a key group, positive (non-controversial) and not expensive be deferred three years. Concerns of the key constituent groups are to be integrated into an overall jobs and economic security thrust."

So what do we have here, Mr. Chairman . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the honourable member, although he's not required to do so, if he would do me the honour of tabling that document when he's done reading it, since I was not a member of the Treasury Bench when that Cabinet meeting took place, and I have never seen the document to which he refers.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, when I have finished speaking, I would be glad to table what is entitled, "Minutes of Cabinet Seminar, Thursday, September 15, 1983," Page 2.

What I find disturbing, Mr. Chairman, about this governmental strategy, plan of action, is that we have a recommendation adopted by the Cabinet that any non-controversial issues will be deferred by this government for three years from September, 1983, until September, 1986, until after the next election. This government is attempting to indicate that they wish to have the trust and confidence of the people of Manitoba when what they want to do is defer any controversial item that they have until just after the next election, so the people don't know what they're going to do after the next election. — (Interjection) — The Member for Thompson has the nerve to ask some of our members about a hidden agenda, Mr. Chairman.

What is also very disturbing, Mr. Chairman, is that policies and programs are not to be done that are in the public interest, not to be done whether they're in the public interest but they must be the concerns of key constituent groups. Good luck, Mr. Chairman, if you're a Manitoban who's a member of a key constituent group, but if you're just an ordinary Manitoban you're out of luck because any action is going to be deferred.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very disturbing, cynical document. This is the policy that this government has been operating under, Mr. Chairman. I asked the Attorney-General the other day, was he going to live up to his commitment that he gave in September of 1981 with respect to amendments to The Human Rights Act regarding homosexuals, which he pledged to act to ensure that The Human Rights Act was amended, or was it going to be deferred? He didn't answer the question, Mr. Chairman. He said he didn't make any

comment about whether or not any amendments to The Human Rights Act with regard to that matter would be deferred, but now we know what the answer is. That's a controversial . . .

MR. H. ENNS: What paragraph is that?

MR. G. MERCIER: That's Paragraph (4), Mr. Chairman. It is going to be deferred for three years.

It raises the question, Mr. Chairman, what other decisions has this government made about programs and legislations that they intend to do, but they're going to be deferred until right after the next election that they are not going to tell the people of Manitoba about?

The Government House Leader wants us to make amendments to the rules that would allow the type of constitutional amendment to be made under the time period that I have referred to. If he had his wish, Mr. Chairman, he would want the rules of this House amended so that he could introduce a resolution respecting an amendment to the Constitution this summer, hold public discussions while Manitobans are away on vacation and on holiday, call a Session of the Legislature in September, impose a 10-day time limit on debate, and pass the amendment to the Constitution. Now, I suppose any action of course like that, Mr. Chairman, would be deferred until September, 1986, under the Cabinet decisions, governmental strategy and plan of action.

What is the Minister of Finance contemplating in the way of taxes? I suppose that's deferred. What is the Minister of Labour contemplating in the way of labour legislation? The other day he wouldn't give an undertaking to this House on labour legislation, which he would be introducing, would have the support of labour and management. I suppose his controversial legislation may be deferred or must be deferred until after the next election.

It goes on, Mr. Chairman, and a couple of other interesting recommendations that the government adopted in their strategy and their plan of action. In Item No. (9): ". . . that any other issues requiring a public response be scheduled within the master timetable to the greatest degree possible." The master timetable. — (Interjection) — 1984, and all of that, Mr. Chairman.

Now, does that seem to tie in, Mr. Chairman, with the hordes of communications experts and advertising and central direction of media advertising that has gone on in the last little while under this government? That's all within the master timetable.

Mr. Chairman, this type of document, "Governmental Strategy and Plan of Action," defer anything controversial, control the press, control the media through a master timetable which is all supported by the evidence of expenditures on advertising and hiring of communications experts, is extremely concerning to this side of the House. It substantiates, Mr. Chairman, the concerns that we have on this side of the House in giving to this government any degree of limitation of discussion and public discussion and public submissions on the rules of this House which will affect amendments to the Constitution of Canada and the Constitution of Manitoba.

We're concerned that a government in the height of the last constitutional amendment would be adopting

a plan of action, of government action, which will only be directed to key constituent groups, not Manitobans in general. Manitobans heretofore thought that they had a government and always had governments that acted in the public interest, but unless you're in a key constituent group you're out of luck, Mr. Chairman.

As all part of a public - Item No. (8) that I didn't read said that: "A timetable for all public announcements be set now for the next three years, and that the timetable include adequate time for preparation of effective communications." Mr. Chairman, that means hiring all of the communicators, hiring all of the advertisers, spending all of the public's money on advertising, the Limestone ads and all of that.

This is a government acting in this cynical, arrogant way, Mr. Chairman, without any concern for the public interest, only for key constituent groups that can reelect this government . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The item under discussion is a guaranteed minimum debating time for constitutional matters. Could the Member for St. Norbert direct his comments more directly to that topic?

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I began my remarks by referring to the proposal by the government to limit debating time to 10 days for amendments to the Constitution and our subsequent motion to amend that to allow for public discussions in the midst of those; that the 10-days debating time and the concern that we had on the Rules Committee on this side of the House when the Government House Leader wanted to interpret that to mean that he could hold public hearings prior to the Session of the Legislature sitting; and then developed a possible scenario of the Government House Leader holding public hearings on an amendment to the Constitution during the summer months and then calling a quick Session of the Legislature, invoking the 10-day minimum debating time and the 15-minute bell ringing limitation and having an amendment to the Constitution passed which might be contrary to the wishes of the majority of the people of Manitoba; and how we felt, Mr. Chairman, at the Rules Committee that we could not trust this government with that type of authority.

In dealing with that question of trust, Mr. Chairman, I have referred to the minutes of the Cabinet Seminar of Thursday, September 15, 1983, entitled "Government Strategy and Plan of Action," in which this government clearly decided at that time that any controversial item would be deferred for three years from that point in time, which would make it until September of 1986, immediately after, as they no doubt were considering then, an election in the spring of 1986.

Mr. Chairman, what we are concerned about is that this evidence of government action means that we cannot trust a government that is acting in such a cynical way, not dealing with decisions that must be made in the public interest of Manitoba, but only wish to deal with the concerns of key constituent groups, not the majority of the people of Manitoba or ordinary working Manitobans, but key constituent groups and by not revealing to the people of Manitoba what they really intend to do, what they would really do if Manitobans were unfortunate enough to have this government re-

ected. So they are hiding, Mr. Chairman, those plans of action after the next election from the people of Manitoba and we say, they not only cannot be trusted with the proposed rule changes that would limit debate on constitutional matters, they cannot be trusted to be the next government of Manitoba.

They are acting in an arrogant manner in hiding their real motives, their real actions for decisions, from the people of Manitoba, and this is pure and simple evidence of a concern that we have had on this side of the House for some time that is now confirmed by this document, Mr. Chairman.

In keeping with my undertaking to the Government House Leader, Mr. Chairman, I will table a copy of this document with the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You know, Mr. Chairman, from time immemorial governments are judged by how they treat the minorities in society and I suppose this government will be charged in the same way. We have heard our Government House Leader put forward his argument, you have heard the Member for St. Norbert put forward his argument and I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that how this government treats minorities, whether in this House or in the whole of society, will be very fundamental in the next election.

We note the history has been given to you. We are going back to '83, the debate that took place in '83 and '84, and the proposals that have come forward. You also have to note, Mr. Chairman, that during that great debate . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has met, considered certain recommendations of the Standing Committee on Rules of the House, reports progress and begs leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RES. NO. 6 - ROAD ACROSS RIDING MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa,

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba is asking the Government of Canada to agree that regional development is a "First Order" economic priority in this province; and WHEREAS the municipalities and communities of Rosburn and Grandview and others have been pleading for some 25 years and more for the construction of a road through Riding Mountain National Park in support of such regional development; and WHEREAS the lack of this highway corridor through Riding Mountain National Park between Rosburn and Grandview has retarded the tourism industry, agricultural industrial development and trade, social and cultural exchanges in these communities; and WHEREAS a road connecting these communities would provide important additional fire safeguards in Riding Mountain National Park; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislature recommend to the Government of Manitoba that it give consideration to negotiating with the Government of Canada the early construction of a highway to connect the municipalities and communities of Rosburn and Grandview, Manitoba.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Many many many meetings, discussions and resolutions raised have taken place regarding the matter that I am raising before the House today, the matter of travel through Riding Mountain National Park.

Mr. Speaker, it may be a regional problem, and many members in the Chamber and citizens across this province may not understand what I am talking about today because unless you live in the area and are faced with this problem of Riding Mountain National Park sitting where it is presently located, and if you wish to travel north to south across that park, the only way you can move from north to south is travel through Clear Lake at the eastern periphery of the park or travel Highway 83, which touches the western periphery of Riding Mountain National Park.

Mr. Speaker, the municipality of Grandview, the Grandview Chamber of Commerce, the town, interested citizens and groups, Tourism Manitoba for the Parkland Region have raised resolution after resolution asking for consideration of the matter that I am bringing before the House today.

The Community of Rosburn, the rural municipality of Rosburn, the business community of Rosburn and many many interested citizens have again brought this to the attention of the public, to Parks Canada, I daresay for at least 25 years that I know of, and to date have been able to resolve the problem mainly because of the fact that the Government of Canada, the Parks Branch, seem to think that if a road was placed or if a highway corridor was constructed through the park, it would destroy the ecology, the environment and the concept of the matter in which Riding Mountain National

Park was struck and most schools of thought, Mr. Speaker, seem to hinge around the factor that those people who are in charge of Parks Canada would like to keep a portion of this province, known as Riding Mountain National Park, as a symbol or as a sample of what this province was like in 1867 and before we became a province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is my responsibility and duty as the MLA for the area to bring the matter to the Legislature to see if I can get support here in debate for the wishes of the people. And this, basically, Mr. Speaker, hinges around the debates that we already had a few moments ago about the changes in our rules. This is a resolution that the communities on both sides of the park have been asking for many many years, and I think it's time that the House took a look and dealt with it.

Mr. Speaker, in the earlier portion of my resolution today I mentioned the fact that the government of this province has already asked the Government of Canada to agree that regional development is the first order of economic priority in this province. Those communities, Mr. Speaker, to the north and to the south of Riding Mountain National Park fully support the government's intention to further develop the concept of regional development.

But I don't see how, Mr. Speaker, you can talk about regional development in the region that I represent when you have this massive park dividing the communities to the north and to the south, and the boundaries of the constituency that I represent, Roblin-Russell, starts at the end of Dauphin municipality which is about 12 miles west of Dauphin and pretty well goes around Riding Mountain National Park all the way to Clear Lake.

Now how, Mr. Speaker, can a government talk about economic development or regional development in a community such as that when you have the park sitting right in the middle of the proposed development plan. Certainly you can develop it to the north, you can develop it to the south, but the whole province as an economic development plan certainly doesn't fit in to the wishes of the people from that area without some mode of transportation to connect those communities.

Mr. Speaker, over the years there has been travel by some of the pioneers of this province and others back and forth across the corridor in the Rosburn-Grandview area. There is a considerable amount of high ground there that was used by some of the early settlers and pioneers and even used up in the winter months, up as high as maybe 10, 12 or 15 years ago, until the time that Parks Canada felt that maybe by allowing this travel to escalate or continue that it might become a more serious problem than it was, so they have cut it off completely and it's not permissible any more to move across that area.

Mr. Speaker, the Parkland tourism group recently had a meeting. I think it was held in Grandview late January of this year. They passed a resolution endorsing this type of motion that I have before the House today. The development groups in the area have recently passed resolutions in support of a motion such as this. So, Mr. Speaker, the subject matter has gained a lot of attention from the local communities there and they're pleading today for this House to take a look at the issue and see if we can talk to the government

in Ottawa. It's a new government down there. There's some fresh blood in there.

Interestingly I was at a meeting the other night, Mr. Speaker, and I was told at this meeting that for the first time in decades, they now have a farmer representation in Ottawa. One out of every five members on Mulroney's side of the House are farmers, and in all the rest of the opposition benches in the House of Commons there is only one farmer, a chap by the name of Althouse who sits on the NDP. So maybe with that type of farm representation on the benches of the Mulroney Government, they will take a fresh look at this plan that I'm offering to the House today because they'll take a look at it from the interests and the eyes of being a farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I'll just list a few of the things that were drawn to my attention by a joint meeting of the councils of Grandview and Rossburn that was held not too long ago in drawing this matter to my attention. Here is what the resolution that they unanimously passed and gave the following reasons as to why we should be dealing with this subject matter in the Legislature.

It says, "This corridor," that I'm proposing today by this resolution, Mr. Speaker, "would provide an access reciprocally to the residents of those communities to market centres south of the park such as Brandon and Rossburn, and north of the parks such as Grandview and Dauphin, and also to excell the recreational areas in that particular jurisdiction. It will also eliminate the now extensive out-of-province shopping at such centres as Yorkton and Regina, which people who live on the north side of the park use from time to time as their shopping centres rather than trying to go around the park to the east or to the west.

"It would definitely stimulate tourist activities which is essential to the continual viability of our communities. It would provide for an important fire guard safeguard inside the park or as an access to fire stricken areas. It potentially would revitalize the dairy industry on the north side of the park with a cheese plant located in Rossburn but a short distance away and of course, farmers in the dairy business at Grandview or Gilbert Plains or the other communities along the north side of the park do not have access to the cheese plant in Rossburn.

"It would definitely bring peoples together from both sides to form social and cultural exchanges, sports events, exchange of students, etc., etc. It would provide for a now non-existent access to Duck Mountain Provincial Park to which the communities to the south are entitled. The cost of the construction of the road would be minimal because of the high terrain proposed for its course. It would definitely have no adverse effect on wildlife inside the park, but on the other hand it would create interest and appreciation of wildlife. And lastly, the road should be constructed because morally and economically it is the natural entitlement to the people of these areas."

Now those are pretty harsh words, Mr. Speaker, especially the last clause, but it gives you some idea of the anxiety and the concerns of the people who happen to live on the north and the south boundaries of this area of Riding Mountain National Park.

Mr. Speaker, another letter that crossed my desk from an interested citizen on the subject matter since the resolution was put on the Order Paper came from

a chap by the name of Clarke from the Rossburn area, who said, "that transportation within the province will require an upgrading of our major traffic arteries in order to keep abreast with a developing Manitoba industry.

"In order for our industry to develop and expand we must have adequate surfacing of our major road systems. When we look at any provinces moving ahead and encouraging development, we find that there is an adequate road network in place in order that men and materials and products can be moved from place to place with minimum disruption. We must remove the obstacle of Riding Mountain National Park," he goes on to say.

Mr. Clarke is a person who basically thinks that maybe if the matter is looked at and the location of this particular proposed corridor through the park, he suggests, Mr. Speaker, that they extend Highway No. 21 north from Oakburn and join Highway No. 10 at Ashville. This joining road," he said, "would enhance north-south traffic by avoiding Wasagaming which has two fundamental faults when one talks of commercial traffic. Wasagaming has the summer tourist congestion, and they have a weight restriction of 30,000 pounds on the road that goes through there."

Mr. Clarke goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "That the areas directly north and south of Riding Mountain National Park are of the same economical foundation." However, they are deterred by the artificial geographical barrier that has been in place, of course, since God put the park there. But he says, "The bottom third of Manitoba is the only viable area for industrial expansion and, with Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg forming two major east-west obstacles, we hardly require any more. If Manitoba is to become an effective province, we must ensure adequate arteries of highway traffic." And he winds up his letter by suggesting that if the road that I propose is not acceptable, he hopes that we can take a look at this other artery.

I've got another letter, Mr. Speaker, telling me of their support for this resolution, and they go on and tell me, while there is support of the proposal for the road connecting these communities, they feel also that possibly this 254, that I'm suggesting may not fulfill the needs as I have outlined. But, nevertheless, it's debatable and whether the road goes one route or the other, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the communities there would be that concerned. Either the route that I'm proposing, which would go from Rossburn north through the park to Grandview, or the one that this Mr. Clarke suggests of upgrading PTH No. 21 from the United States border to Ashville. He says, traffic coming east and west of this line would flow naturally over the route and provide access to many economic areas along the proposed route.

Mr. Speaker, if we're to develop this province north of the 53rd Parallel, then I think it will be necessary for us to have the best possible lines of communication, the best possible lines of transportation, the best possible routes for the public to move back and forth, if this province is to maintain the status that it should. That, of course, relates to the business community and to industry, and if we take a hard look at the options of either one of these routes, Mr. Speaker, we'll find that, if those roads were in place today, either one, that this would be a much different province and you

would find there would be a lot different flow of goods and services to people through this area, and the people that reside in these two areas in my constituency would not be expressing the concerns that I have.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you've ever taken a look at this boundary of Roblin-Russell Constituency. The Government House Leader I blame mainly for this, Mr. Speaker, when he was sitting at the table here as the Assistant Clerk of the House and we were adjusting the boundaries of our constituencies in this province, which is done by Statute every 10 years. I think these boundaries are struck by the Clerk, the Chief Electoral Officer and the Chief Justice of the Province. But why would any rational person draw lines for a constituency, such as, Roblin-Russell and start it up here, around 12 miles west of Dauphin, and then draw that constituency all the way west around Riding Mountain National Park back to Clear Lake and expect those people to be able to have a democratic form of constituency, to attend meetings, to get back and forth to meetings, to find what the north is doing, what the south is doing? It's practically impossible, Mr. Speaker, absolutely. People at Gilbert Plains are not going to drive to Rosburn for a meeting, you drive 100 miles or more to get around the park to go to a meeting. So, I don't think that the Chief Electoral Officer and the Chief Justice added many lines. I wholly blame the Minister, who is now the Minister of Municipal Affairs, for the ones who drew those horrible, cruel lines for Roblin-Russell constituency which makes it so difficult for us to operate as a constituency.

But, Mr. Speaker, he, in one sense, added another dimension to the problem, because before he sat down at the desk with his pencil and drew these hoary lines, the constituency was represented by the Honourable Member for Virden, now the south boundaries of the constituency were south of Riding Mountain National Park, and the other part that I represent was to the north of Riding Mountain. So we didn't have the problem then that we have now.

So, Mr. Speaker, I leave this resolution to the House. It's a very sincere resolution; it's one that the people there have been asking me to deal with for many years, and I hope that it gets the swift passage and the support that it deserves.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat surprised that there doesn't appear to be anybody on the government side who wants to support this resolution, at least so far they have given no indication of their support, and that is concern to me because, Mr. Speaker, this matter, I believe, was raised in the House quite a number of years ago when I was the member for Birtle-Russell. But, Mr. Speaker, I was not the first one to raise them. It has been raised, both in the Federal House and in this House on more than one occasion.

My first involvement in this, Mr. Speaker, goes back many years ago when the Honourable Member for Marquette Constituency, Mr. Nick Mandziuk who served his community exceedingly well from 1958 to 1968. In his 10-year period in the House of Commons, Nick was

one who was a very strong supporter of this proposal. At that particular time, Mr. Speaker, there appeared to be a master plan for Parks Canada in the formation station.

I believe since that time the master plan has been completed, and any appeals that have been made, and there have been numerous, appear to fall on deaf ears, because there seems to be a reluctance to treat Riding Mountain National Park any different than any of the other national parks in Canada. I think it should get preferred status because, if anybody looks at the national parks of Canada, I don't think you will find another national park in Canada that is entirely surrounded by agricultural land.

So, Riding Mountain National Park is indeed unique in our nation, and that, of course, causes this problem that we have raised in this House on numerous occasions, and in the House of Commons, because there seems to be a definite reluctance on the part of bureaucrats, and those who devise master plans, to make any exceptions or to even consider other factors in their decisions. I think the Member for Roblin-Russell has very eloquently put forward the argument for a strong case for a road in a north-south direction, a second road through that park.

Mr. Speaker, it was some 12 years ago, I believe, that the communities in that area, both in Grandview and in Rosburn, organized a winter outing where they used motorized toboggans, skidoos - as they're commonly referred to - and they held a regional outing one Sunday and there were some 75 skidoos that crossed from Rosburn over to Grandview; they had their lunch there and they had a very enjoyable social activity and then returned. Mr. Speaker, at that particular time, I think it took almost three months to get a permit from the national park just so they could go through the park, even though they promised to follow a trail - a trail which, Sir, I suggest was there 60 years ago. It was at that time an active route of commerce before the national park became officially a park. So they're not asking for something new, it was something that was already there many years ago, although we have to recognize that a road in the 1920s was vastly different than the highway is today. So the communities are asking for a means of communication that is so necessary and so desirable to make our community of Manitoba one where we can readily visit from one community to another.

Mr. Speaker, the member has mentioned the cheese factory in Rosburn, but Sir, there was also a secondary industry that was tried in the Rosburn cheese plant, and that was a whey plant there, and the reason the whey plant closed down was that it was too difficult to get sufficient material to make it operate on a 24-hour basis. So that part of it was closed down.

We do know the problems that MANCO has had with their fluid milk situation in Dauphin and they have a great deal of difficulty getting their surplus fluid milk to Rosburn, to the cheese plant, and that has caused a problem there. So the arguments put forward by the Member for Roblin-Russell are indeed real and valid and I would hope that this Assembly would endorse this resolution and make very strong presentation to the Federal House to bring this into fruition.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, the frustration that has occurred in the communities over the steadfast refusal

of the federal government to move on this has been one that has manifested itself in several ways. I have attended public meetings where people have become so frustrated that they have even advocated that the province take over the western portion of the Riding Mountain National Park and operate it as a provincial park, and to create an eastern boundary of that provincial park that we put a road through and that would become the boundary to divide the provincial park from the national park. Mr. Speaker, that type of proposal indicates the absolute frustration that exists with people when there seems to be no type of movement on the part of the federal government to accommodate the wishes of a community; and Sir, I don't think that is consistent with the democratic philosophy at all. We know that various federal members from that area have urged that this matter be considered and become a reality. So far, up till now, and it has been at least 25 years, they have failed to persuade the bureaucrats or the administration to move at all.

Now, I don't know if there's a different attitude prevalent in Ottawa today or not, but we would always hope that the Government of the Day, should have the control over the bureaucracy; that they should be able to implement programs if they deem it in the public interest. So far we have seen far more cases where the bureaucracy has prevailed, rather than the politician, and that has to be a concern to all of us; and more so, I would suggest, to members on the government side because they are the ones that are actively dealing day to day with problems and defying the frustrations that are brought up when they ask a Deputy Minister to implement a certain program and he can give you 50 reasons why it can't be done or why it shouldn't be done, and fails to bring forward one solid reason why it should be. So it does cause problems, Mr. Speaker.

I would hope that members on the government side will stand up, speak to the resolution and indicate their support for it. If that support is not there, Mr. Speaker, then I think it is incumbent on them to tell us why they cannot support it. That would be even more interesting because I can't see anyone in this Chamber not supporting a resolution of this type.

So, Mr. Speaker, I fully endorse . . .

A MEMBER: He's worried about the cost.

MR. H. GRAHAM: The cost? There would be a saving. The honourable member says, what would it cost? The present day cost to the people of the area is an extra hundred miles of driving every time they have to from one side, and it's only nine miles across. If the member says, what is it going to cost? I suggest to him there's a saving and it would be a saving to all of the people. It might cost the province something in lost revenue in gasoline sales, and maybe that's a reason why they wouldn't want to support it, but it presently costs a person an extra \$10 today to go from Rosburn to Grandview, a \$10 saving that could be saved if there were a road across.

Now there are people I know that would like to communicate daily between those two communities, but so far they have no way of getting across, and I would hope that there is a possibility of all members

of the House supporting this resolution and urging Ottawa, in the strongest manner they know how, to support this resolution and bring about the change that is so necessarily needed.

Thank you.

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

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have no hesitation in rising in support of the resolution that my colleague, the Member for Roblin-Russell has brought in because they will be supporting the resolution, I assure you, when we get to a vote. This particular road, Mr. Speaker, has been talked on for many many years, and it is timely that my colleague has brought this resolution in.

The stumbling block, as has been mentioned by my colleague, the Member for Virden, is the national parks and the bureaucrats involved in the administration thereof, because at one time not long ago, Mr. Speaker, they were on the verge of eliminating all the cottages in Clear Lake and Wasagaming townsite. They were all set to put a time limit on them and move them all out, and turn the whole park back to the bears and the bees. Well we know that there is a substantial investment in that townsite, and it provides a tremendous recreation area for, not only all of the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, but for many many visitors, our southern neighbours that come up here and enjoy the facilities in that park.

As it has been mentioned, the inconvenience and the additional expense of those people from Grandview and Rosburn communicating from north to south is a staggering cost, not to say anything, Mr. Speaker, of the time involved in travelling around that section of the park.

Now we know, Mr. Speaker, that there are going to be objections from the environmentalists and from the national park people, so this resolution is merely a first step into starting the process, getting the wheels in motion to try and accomplish what has been desired and what has been the right of those people for many years, the right of communicating north and south without the inconvenience of going that extra 100 miles or whatever is necessary to get around the park.

The Member for Virden touched on a very interesting point when he mentioned that this is the only national park in Canada that is completely surrounded by agricultural land, and the movement of those goods back and forth should be enhanced as much as is humanly possible. This addition of a nine-mile connecting road - certainly there is going to be some cost involved, you don't build roads today without spending money. But the arguments that are going to be put up by the environmentalists, and when they're in control - I know at one time that if you got caught picking mushrooms in the park they would practically jail you.

They maybe have relented somewhat now, because one of the officials has told me that if I picked a bouquet of flowers in there now it would be all right if I took them home to my wife and family, that I wouldn't be prosecuted for doing that, that they were there for us to enjoy.

But I know, Mr. Speaker, when they improved the road that is presently through the park joining up with No. 10, they had a monumental task in getting contractors to bid on it, because they had trees flagged and you had to move that tree out. When you had the portion of your contract finished, you had to put that tree back in the exact location and leave it in the exact position and condition that it was in. If there was a bird's nest in there, that had to be intact and those little birdies couldn't be disturbed during construction. That presented a job for the contractors, Mr. Speaker, because they just weren't too sure how many little birds they were going to run into in putting that improved section of the road through.

So we know there is going to be trouble with the naturalists and the environmentalists and the overall conception of that park, but that western section of the park, Mr. Speaker, is not enjoyed by anyone other than the bees and the bears and the elk and the beaver and the deer and the various other fish, fur, fin and fauna that thrive in that portion of the park. Surely it would be of benefit to all of the people of Manitoba if they were able to go in a little further into the park and enjoy those nature bounties that have been provided to us.

You'll get arguments from the park people about what it's going to do to the elk herd in there, that it's going to disturb them and all that. Well it has been proven that elk can live in areas where there is vehicular traffic. We're talking of providing more jobs and more employment, if it's necessary to put gates up and man them during the proper hours, so be it. There are more jobs created for the people in that area, and I'm sure they would enjoy that.

The Member for Inkster says we might increase taxes. I think if we just stand back, Mr. Speaker, the taxes are going to increase anyway, whether we built a road through that park or not.

But there is no question the people of that area have been deprived of a north-south access for a much longer time than is necessary. I think that the support of this House is warranted, and it appears obvious, Mr. Speaker, that we have support on that side of the House for this resolution, that we urge the proper authorities to start considering this because, as I say, it's only the first step. There are going to be many obstacles to be overcome in seeing that road be completed, but I think this first step, it's timely that it is being brought in now by the Member for Roblin-Russell, Mr. Speaker. I don't think members opposite can vote against it with good conscience, and go and face the people in that area to say that, no, we don't think you should have a road; we oppose that resolution of the Member for Roblin-Russell's in the House, because we don't think you should have a road there.

I just put that out, Mr. Speaker, because they will be going into those constituencies when the election is called, and trying to garner what few votes they may have left up there. I just want them on record, Mr. Speaker, as opposing the resolution put forward by my colleague, because the people in those areas have brought this to our attention for many many years.

As I say, the biggest stumbling block has been the Federal Government in the administration of Riding Mountain National Park. It appears there has been some relenting in the past few years of how the park should

be treated. I know the Provincial Government has taken a considerable band of land outside of the boundaries of the park to further protect the straying of the animals; this road is not going to interfere with that operation whatsoever.

It was an interesting thought that the Member for Virden brought forward about the western end of it being turned into a provincial park, although I don't think you might ever get the feds to agree to that. But should that come into being, it would certainly open up an area that's full of our heritage, and I think an access road there would allow it to be enjoyed more fully than it's enjoyed today. It would open up additional lakes that nobody ever gets into to fish, because there is no access and no means of getting in there.

As the Member for Virden stated, it takes you umpteen months to get a permit to take a snowmobile entourage through there from one community to another to show the feasibility of it, to try to provide a little easier access back and forth.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I fully support the resolution put forward by my colleague, and I urge the members opposite to bring it to a vote and support it to show the people up there that we're with them 100 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't planning on speaking to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I thought this was really an opposition resolution, primarily of interest to members opposite because they wanted to be on record recounting the failure of Conservatives over the last 50 years to deal with the problem they created.

You know, it's a rather interesting anomaly, Mr. Speaker, that the two members who spoke first to this resolution, who want this resolution solved, have been represented almost throughout their term in this Legislature by MPs of their own stripe in Ottawa who failed to deal with the problem.

But worse than that, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin-Russell has now been in this House just over 22 years, 11 of which the Progressive Conservatives were government. Half the time he has been in this House, his own party has been in power and they have done nothing to address the problem.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Minnedosa suggests that he wants us to demonstrate on this side the 100 percent support that colleagues on his side share on this issue. Mr. Speaker, if they were 100 percent behind it, you can be darn sure that between '77 and '81 they would have done something, not having come to their senses from '62, when the Member for Roblin-Russell was elected, up until '69 when they were defeated. So for seven years . . .

MR. H. ENNS: We put the road in and you took it out.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lakeside from his seat says we put the road in, you took it out. I suggest he tab his plumber's squad. Find that document that shows that road was ever in any proposals put forward by his government.

Mr. Speaker, what's even more interesting about this proposal - and I do want to treat it seriously but I have some difficulty, considering the tone adopted by the three members, particularly the first two, the mover and seconder, who spoke to this resolution - where did this problem come from? Who was the Federal Government in 1932? That's when this park was created.

A MEMBER: We didn't have any roads in 1932.

HON. A. ANSTETT: 1932.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He wouldn't know.

HON. A. ANSTETT: The Member for Sturgeon Creek's shorts are tight and his brain is having trouble functioning. He should have listened to his colleague who sits right behind him. He talked about the fact that up till 1932 there was a road through the park; it wasn't much of a road but it was a good road for the standards of that day. Now, the Member for Sturgeon Creek maybe didn't hear that from the Member for Virden but that is what the Member for Virden finished saying 20 minutes ago.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Have you even been to Clear Lake?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Of course, I have been to Clear Lake. This has nothing to do with Clear Lake. If the Member for Sturgeon Creek thinks this has something to do with Clear Lake, he should go back to his caucus and have the problem explained to him.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, this problem was created by a federal Conservative Government that failed to deal with the interests of two vital agricultural communities in our province in the '30s. This problem was compounded by the neglect of federal Conservative MPs and provincial MLAs in the early '60s when the Diefenbaker Government was in power. And, Mr. Speaker, from '77 to '81, people who were really in a position to do something about it, who had in the Clark Government MPs from Manitoba, who were representing part of the territory involved, one of them now being a federal Cabinet Minister and yet nothing's happening. Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed by this for members opposite. I have never read such a serious criticism by a provincial party of its Federal Government of the same political stripe. This is damnation of the worst kind.

Mr. Speaker, now I know why the two MLAs who sponsored this resolution are retiring. I don't think they could come back into this Chamber and admit to the total failure they have been in addressing this problem and, hopefully, the two who succeed them will be New Democrats who will help this government deal with this problem once and for all.

There has been a steadfast refusal by the Federal Government of both political stripes, Liberal and Conservative, to address this problem over 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I think the reason is because of their inability to see it as a more complex problem than it is. It's a very very simple question except for the fact that the Member for Sturgeon Creek, when he was in the Treasury Bench, and the Member for Lakeside, when he was in the Treasury Bench, were not prepared to commit public funds to build the road. They were not prepared to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that when this resolution comes to a vote in this Chamber, there will be some members in the opposition who will not be prepared to support this resolution as it is drafted. I suspect some of them would have a real tough time and be thoroughly embarrassed. — (Interjection) — The Member for Sturgeon Creek says I doubt it. I notice he very seldom has any difficulty being embarrassed. But certainly the Member for Lakeside, being a man of principle and the former Minister of Highways, knows some of the implications and knows the complications that would be involved in addressing this problem, and he knows why he was unable to take it and recommend it to his Cabinet colleagues for the four years that he was Minister of Highways or in the Treasury Bench. Mr. Speaker, a very very complicated matter.

Our government, on the other hand, has taken a very proactive approach to addressing this question. We have initiated discussions over the last three years flowing from discussions in the Provincial Land Use Committee of Cabinet that deal with all of the questions that need to be addressed on the impacts of the peripheral area around Riding Mountain Park.

There are questions that relate to compensation for wildlife predation on crops, there are questions that relate to drainage, the impact of the rapid shale loss on the edges of the escarpment and the filling of the water reservoirs with shale, the Edwards Creek PFRA reservoir just outside of Dauphin that's been filled with shale and the escarpment, the question of securing the water supply for the Town of Dauphin.

I am amazed that the Member for Roblin-Russell would not, as part of this resolution, express a concern about securing the water supply for the Town of Grandview which comes from this same area. The implications are not as simple as driving a road through. There are massive aggregate deposits very close to the road site. What are the implications in terms of the mineral rights and the access to those deposits? What kind of pressures would be developed? What are the implications, for example, for forest fire protection? What are the positives? And there are obviously some. As the Member for Minnedosa pointed out, what are the negatives?

All of those things are being assessed both by the Federal Government and by the Provincial Government in discussions that have been ongoing for some time. That is a positive way of addressing the issue rather than taking just a single focus and saying build the road.

There is a real problem with that kind of single-issue approach. The Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't know what the negatives are after four years of seeing the project turned down when he was a member of the former Cabinet. Then either his memory is short or he should pay attention a little better.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek to whom I gave credit for a slight bit of intellect has now fallen

into the same trap as his three colleagues who spoke earlier. He has broken this down despite my comments for the last 10 minutes which obviously haven't registered at all. He has determined, and this is a real damnation on his part, that it's just this simple question. So he, like his colleagues, wishes to damn the Federal Government who has been trying to approach this in a multifaceted, interdisciplinary way and examine all the ramifications but he doesn't want to do that.

If you could overcome all of the problems associated with building that road, if you could address all the environmental impacts of building that road, if you could see real economic benefits of building that road, of course it would be a good road, but nobody has found a way of addressing all of those concerns. In fact, what was interesting is that members opposite have failed as government and in opposition over the last 23 years, particularly as addressing the mover of the resolution, to even begin to do the assessment. It took this government and the Provincial Land Use Committee of Cabinet to begin those discussions with the Federal Government on the overall impact to the peripheral area and in the park on all of the various criteria on which that park impacts.

So we've been working on that. The Member for Roblin-Russell knows those discussions have been ongoing, because there was a gigantic seminar last summer right in Riding Mountain that began to address a lot of those issues. People from across the country, experts in parks management, experts in water control all attended that Biosphere Conference.

I don't know if the Member for Roblin-Russell was there. I'm sure that as an MLA of this Legislature he, as well as everyone else, as I did, received notice of it and an invitation to attend. If he really wanted to put the park in the perspective of all of his constituents and the rest of the people of the province, as well, he certainly should have been there. He should have been there to put drainage, domestic water supply, fire protection, wildlife, environmental preservations, all of those issues into the equation.

But, instead, we have a simple declaration that the road must be punched through, that we have to build that road. We are going to make a commitment, without having measured these things, without having that impact analysis, without knowing what kind of damage will be done, without knowing whether the economic benefits that will accrue to those communities, the whole rural municipal areas.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, on rough calculation, there are approximately 5,000 people within a 20-mile radius of the southern terminus of that road and about another 5,000 at the northern terminus, in the neighbourhood of 10,000 people. What are the economic benefits to those communities of putting that road through? I don't know. Mr. Speaker, what I find out today was that the Members for Virden, Minnedosa and Roblin-Russell don't know either. This is just a ploy, Mr. Speaker. They have said so. The Member for Minnedosa challenged us to go on the record, for or against, so that the people of those communities would know where this government stands when the next election comes. Well I'm amazed that these gentlemen have chosen to deal with a Conservative problem by challenging New Democrats to fix it.

But, you know, that's actually quite a compliment. That is quite a compliment. I have to pay the

compliment, on behalf of members opposite, to my colleague, the Minister of Labour, who as Minister of Natural Resources began those consultations, and established the precedents to initiate some work to look at the options, to do the impact analysis. Although I haven't had a recent opportunity to discuss this with the current Minister of Natural Resources, I trust that he is continuing those discussions.

They all relate, and I will certainly concede, in concurrence with the Member for Virden, that the federal bureaucracy's a very large and sometimes immovable bureaucracy, but we have had discussions with them about various impacts of that park and the peripheral parklands.

We've got some serious problems in the Turtle River Conservation District, in the tributaries flowing into Lake Dauphin, water supply for the Town of Dauphin. We've got particular problems with development in the Local Government District of Park, particularly that southern portion immediately adjacent to the Riding Mountain Park. What are the implications for enhanced seasonal recreational development in there if that road is developed? What kinds of new pressures would occur in those peripheral lands? I don't believe there has been any assessment of that, either by the province to date, although I hope that's ongoing, or by the Federal Government.

So, Mr. Speaker, we once again see here a simple solution to a complex problem, but what I am impressed with is the fact that those people opposite who were responsible for addressing this problem. In the case of the Member for Lakeside, from '66 to '69, and again, '77 to '81, those who were in the Treasury Benches opposite aren't jumping up and down with a quick solution and aren't yelling from their seats that they support this resolution. They recognize the complexity of the problem, and they recognize that it's not as simple as is made out by some members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just an issue for the Federal Government; it is an issue for this Legislature. It is an issue for members on both sides of this House to come to grips with, but they've got to do that in a mature way. They can't do it as a ploy to influence the next election, as the Member for Minnedosa suggested. I regret he suggested that, because I was hoping members on both sides could jointly come to address the broader picture collectively, and take a joint resolution, unanimously passed, to the Federal Government asking them to work with us to find a real solution.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

When this resolution is next before the House, the honourable member will have five minutes remaining.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the log on my left where there is a former member of this House, Mr. Henry Einarson.

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

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, for purposes of procedural convenience, if I have leave, I would like to

move the Supply motion now so that we can be in Committee of Supply at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House convene itself into a Committee of Supply to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the

Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Health; and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The time being 5:30 p.m. I am leaving the Chair and the House will resolve in committee at 8:00 p.m. this evening.