



Second Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 55 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

LIB - Liberal; ND - New Democrat; PC - Progressive Conservative

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	LIB
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	ND
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	ND
CARR, James	Crescentwood	LIB
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	LIB
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	ND
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	LIB
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	ND
CONNERY, Edward	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	ND
DOER, Gary	Concordia	ND
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	LIB
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	ND
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	ND
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	ND
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	LIB
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	ND
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	ND
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	LIB
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	ND
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALLOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	ND
MANNESSE, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	ND
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	ND
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	ND
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	ND
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	ND
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	ND
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	ND

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, May 31, 1991

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Routine Proceedings, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery and to the public galleries, where we have with us this morning Lieutenant-General Fred Sutherland, Commander of the Air Command; Colonel Skip Armstrong, Commander of CFB Westwin; Colonel Ray Henault, Commander, CFB Portage la Prairie; Colonel Doug Walton, Commander, CFB Shilo; and the Canadian Forces members from Manitoba who served in the Persian Gulf.

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here this morning.

* (1005)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement with copies for the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is being made, and I know that the Leaders of the opposition parties are very much looking forward to responding to the statement that I will be making in recognition of the presence here in the gallery of our Canadian Forces from Manitoba and their families, in what I would say is termed "Armed Forces Appreciation Day."

Canada has a proud history as a member of the United Nations. We have been active in many roles in the continual striving for world peace. Canada was instrumental in the formation of the U.N. peacekeeping force and has provided Armed Forces personnel under its auspices on many occasions.

As a strong supporter of United Nations initiatives, Canada responded swiftly when asked to contribute to the multinational coalition force that served in the Persian Gulf conflict. The overall operation added a new dimension to the function of the United Nations in its striving for peace and security in the world and specifically in the Persian Gulf region in

this instance. Canada's active participation gave us all cause for a renewed sense of pride and patriotism.

I am also pleased to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of some very special guests whom you have introduced to us, Mr. Speaker. As well, of course, we have the members of the personnel who served in the Persian Gulf together with their families and the senior officers of all of our bases and commands in Manitoba. On behalf of all Manitobans, I certainly want to welcome them here.

Members of our Armed Forces personnel left Canada beginning August 24. They left prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice if called upon to do so. Canadians participating in Operation Friction took on many vital roles, serving in a field hospital, aboard our supply and escort ships, at Canada Dry One and Two, the CF-18 bases, and in the Canadian headquarters at Bahrain. In addition, there were the personnel who flew within the theatre of operations in support of Operation Friction. During the conflict our service men and women were in our prayers. Mr. Speaker, our personnel served well in the Gulf and thankfully, they all came back.

It is my pleasure today to join with all Manitobans in welcoming all of our Canadian Forces personnel back to Canada, especially back to Manitoba. We are thankful that we have such dedicated and highly trained men and women prepared to serve their country in the Armed Forces.

If I may add, Mr. Speaker, on a more personal note, in acknowledging this celebration of Armed Forces Day in our Legislature, the presence in Manitoba of the Canadian Forces bases in Winnipeg, Shilo and Portage la Prairie represents a tremendous resource not only in economic terms but in human terms. It is not only the hundreds of millions of dollars that are contributed to our economy that is important in their presence, but it is the contribution that they all make as individual human beings to our community and our quality of life.

I know that as someone who has lived for a time in Brandon, at that time I was involved in a variety of activities and have enjoyed the hospitality of our

bases outside of Winnipeg. Having curled in bonspiels in Shilo and in Portage la Prairie in the past, living in south Winnipeg, my family and I have enjoyed the friendship of neighbours who are Armed Forces personnel over the years. Our children have gone to school together; they have played hockey, soccer and sports together. They have been very active and vital contributing members to our community. Many of them, I am proud to say, have come back to Manitoba, have chosen Manitoba as the place in which they have made their retirement homes and chosen to pursue careers here after their service in the Forces.

All of that, I think, is a tremendous addition to our province and long-term contribution that they have made. We have made many friends, because we have had the opportunity and the great good fortune of having Forces bases located in Manitoba. Over the years we exchange Christmas cards and friendly greetings with the people whom we have come to know over the many years. Janice and I very much value these relationships and friendships that have come as a result of the presence of the Forces base and particularly the personnel who serve here as part of their careers in the Armed Forces.

Today we have the opportunity to personally pass along our respects and our great good wishes to them for the contributions they make. I thought it was interesting as I looked across and the three Leaders are wearing blue, tan and green, and I thought we had not planned this, but we are making a statement of welcome to you by virtue of our clothing this morning.

Mr. Speaker, we have a reception in Room 200, which will be between 11 a.m. and noon, and although we are in session, I would hope that each member of the Legislature will have an opportunity to drop in and personally say hello and pass along their warmest regards to the personnel who have joined us.

Today I am especially proud, Mr. Speaker, to be a Manitoban, proud to be a Canadian and proud to say thank you to our Armed Forces personnel and their families seated in the gallery of the Legislature for all of the contributions they make to our country.

* (1010)

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I am pleased to rise with the Premier today on behalf of our New Democratic caucus and recognize the services rendered by the men and women of the

Canadian Forces base located in Manitoba, the bases in Winnipeg, Portage la Prairie, Shilo, who are seated in the gallery, and their families who are joining us in the Chamber here this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when first the United Nations made their announcements on the economic sanctions, and how we hoped and prayed that would result in a diplomatic resolution to the conflict that ultimately took place in the Middle East.

I also remember, and I think all members of this Chamber remember, the night when the war was announced, when the conflict indeed did start, and our tremendous feelings of grief and sorrow and disappointment that men's and women's lives would be put at risk all over the world and that diplomatic efforts and peace efforts had failed in terms of personkind in the world.

We recognize the strain and hardship that has been placed on the Armed Forces of Canada in the recent Gulf War and that has been put on you and your families throughout this war. I would just like to say that we are glad and happy to see that you have returned home safely here today.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about war and being proud of our own Armed Forces and our own services, we have to also remember the lessons of history, the lessons of history that will teach us to prevent wars in the future. I have a speech that was given by Sid Spivak, a former member of this Legislature, at the Rosh Pina Synagogue when he talked about the lessons we should learn when this conflict started.

He makes the point, I think, so eloquently in the middle of this conflict that no restraint was shown in selling arms and chemical warfare to the Arab states and to Iraq, no desire to control the absurd buildup of arms because the countries and companies did not want to reduce their own monstrous profits. The level of arms procurement was in excess of any legitimate defence requirements, but the appetites for money made western countries and the Soviet Union hungrier than ever. Now the world reaps the consequences, and the state of Israel, of course, is at risk.

Mr. Spivak goes further in his condemnation of the years that flowed before this war. The foolishness, the shortsightedness, the prejudice, the sheer ignorance of the leaders of the western world and the Soviet Union, combined with the ruthless autocratic and brutal administrations in the Middle East has brought us to this moment in history, and

we cannot and should not sit here tonight without feelings of outrage and anger for their failure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the troops today and their families that war has casualties, and there are casualties even today as we celebrate the return of our troops. There is predicted now 170,000 children in Iraq, by Harvard doctors, to die by the year end through malnutrition and other health realities. Innocent civilians always die in wars. Surely, at the end of a war or at the end of a conflict, we should take stock and learn from the mistakes that we have collectively made that led us to that war. Surely, the position of the Prime Minister to have a U.N. global summit to stop the arms buildup should be the priority of every member of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, we celebrate with the families the return of our Canadian Armed Forces to Canada. We are proud of the work that they have done over the years in the U.N. peacekeeping missions and the missions that they have been assigned by the Canadian governments of the day, but I would urge all members to work for a vision of peace and, surely, that we should work to prevent the terrible situation that developed in the last war so that we do not have a war five or six years from now with other Canadian troops and other Canadian families having their health, livelihood and peace at risk. Thank you very much.

* (1015)

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): I rise today on behalf of my party to welcome everybody home.

Mr. Speaker, as many of you know in this Assembly, I was born in Halifax. To be born in Halifax is to never be very far away from the military. As a child, if you drove in a family outing through HMCS dockyard and HMCS Stadacona, you quickly began to identify frigates, destroyers and minesweepers. It was very easy to identify the aircraft carrier. That is the one you probably learned when you were three or four because that was the one that was so different from all of the others.

It was much more than that, because the military, particularly the Navy, was such a presence in our lives there that we saw those in uniform no matter where we went, whether we were shopping or at a movie, or whether we were at university or at high school. The presence of those serving their country was very much with us. We learned at a very early age the deep respect for those who had taken that

particular oath of allegiance to their nation, to serve their nation in peacetime and in wartime. I think it is very clear that every single individual who takes that oath hopes in their heart of hearts that it will always be peace, but they accept with the full knowledge of, unfortunately, the human condition that they will also, in some instances, be subjected to war.

We have in our gallery today not only those who serve in uniform. We also have those who serve who are never in uniform, the spouses and the children, but they, too, make a sacrifice. They, too, are called upon to serve. They are called upon to serve in peacetime when their husbands or their wives are taken away from them for long stretches of time, and they find themselves the single support of their family unit. They are the ones who welcome back, but they, too, have had to bear a burden.

No one wants to go to war, particularly those most highly trained to go to war, because even more than any of us, they know the casualties of war. That has been their experience; that has been their training. So I welcome them home today because I think of every single Canadian's pride in their performance. I am deeply grateful that all of our forces returned without loss of life, but I would think that there has been some sense of a change in their lives which they will never forget because one cannot ever forget the experience that they have been through. I am humbled by their sense of dedication and their loyalty to their nation.

Thank you, every one of you for being who you are, and welcome home.

* (1020)

(O Canada was sung)

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics): Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement I would like to make.

Mr. Speaker, today, as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, I would like to inform the House that Statistics Canada will be conducting the 1991 Census of Population on Tuesday, June 4. Census questionnaires are being distributed by Statistics Canada to all Manitoba households between May 27 and June 1. The Census of Agriculture will also be conducted on June 4.

The Manitoba government relies on census data for many programs, including hospitals, schools,

day care, housing, highways, transportation and others. The information provided by the census will have an impact upon every Manitoban for some years to come.

Federal and provincial governments use the latest census figures as a basis for calculating the distribution of transfer payments to provincial and municipal governments. These funds are applied towards health care, education, social services and other provincial and municipal services. I would point out that each person missed is money lost. Each Manitoba resident not counted in the forthcoming census will cost the province approximately \$25,000 in lost federal government transfer payments over the next five years. If 10,000 persons are missed in the census, Manitoba stands to lose \$250 million over the next five years.

I would stress that all information obtained through the census is kept confidential under the terms of the federal statistics act and may be used only for the production of statistics. No individual information will be released. The upcoming census will be one of the most significant in the history of Manitoba and Canada since society is facing major and more dramatic changes than ever before.

Facts about our housing and farms, facts about the numbers, distribution activities and problems of our people, including women, seniors, youth, aboriginal persons, persons with disabilities and visible minorities will provide guidance over the next five to seven years to government, business, nonprofit organizations and individuals. The census will provide us with an inventory of ourselves in terms of population, economy and culture.

The Manitoba Bureau of Statistics has been co-ordinating the Manitoba government's support of Statistics Canada's efforts in the current census public awareness campaign through various activities, including the placing of posters in government and Crown corporation buildings, and the inclusion of "Count Yourself In" reminder notices in various government mailings to Manitobans.

On June 4, Manitobans can make an investment in the future. A few minutes of time is all that is required. Returns on this modest investment will be high, so I would urge you to please count yourself in.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable minister for the statement, and I certainly would agree that all Manitobans should co-operate with the Statistics Canada

organization in this very important 1991 Census of Population. I, too, would agree that many people perhaps do not appreciate the value of the statistics, and everyone has to co-operate in order to obtain valid data.

We do have estimates of statistics between censuses, of course, Mr. Speaker, and unfortunately, some of those estimates are rather bad news for Manitoba. We see rural population decline, in particular, which upsets us. In the last three years, there has been an absolute decline in the population of Manitoba, and I am afraid that is not satisfactory. That is not good enough. Not only that, but we have had insufficient total population growth, and I would take this opportunity to plead again with this government to get a plan of action to develop and encourage economic growth in this province.

We do not have any industrial development strategy that is effective. We see industries going to the United States, being shut down day in and day out. Unemployment at high levels, at all time drops in levels of employment in this province—just a horrendous situation. Indeed, we do not have an overall economic policy strategy to deal with the long-term economic development of this province.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that when this census is completed that the figures will reveal something rather encouraging in terms of population growth, but that remains to be seen. In the meantime, I would certainly agree we should encourage all Manitobans to co-operate in filling out their census forms and sending them in on June 4.

Thank you.

* (1025)

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): Monsieur le président, il me fait plaisir d'ajouter quelques mots à ce que le ministre de l'Industrie a dit.

L'importance, je crois, c'est de dire aux gens de remplir leur formule de recensement le 4 juin prochain. Justement cette semaine, j'ai assisté à une réunion, la réunion annuelle, de Pluri-Elles, un groupe de femmes à Saint-Boniface qui mentionnaient l'importance pour les Canadiens-Français du Canada et du Manitoba de remplir la formule en français puisque cela va désigner certainement les frontières où se situe la population francophone et l'importance de celle-ci.

L'autre chose qu'elles ont soulignée très clairement, ce sont les femmes au foyer qui ne

peuvent pas compter les heures qu'elles travaillent à la maison. Je pense que c'est important de souligner ce fait.

Lorsqu'on regarde les mères au foyer, elles ne travaillent pas seulement de 8 heures à 5 heures. Les heures que les mères au foyer passent à travailler étaient très soulignées car une mère ne travaille pas seulement de 8 heures à 5 heures, mais 18 heures par jour.

Alors pourquoi pas compter les heures que travaillent ces chères mamans—mêmes les papas maintenant qui restent à la maison et qui surveillent les enfants lorsque la mère travaille en dehors du foyer.

Mais l'importance, il ne faut pas oublier, et je m'adresse aux francophones du Manitoba, c'est de remplir la formule en français. Hier, justement, dans un foyer ils ont déjà les formules et l'on dit qu'il faut attendre le 4 juin pour les remplir. Puis là, une question leur a été posée: est-ce que vous avez répondu en français? Non, ils ont été chez nous puis ils nous l'ont fait remplir en anglais. Je crois que l'importance pour nos francophones encore, c'est de dire à ces gens dans nos foyers de les remplir en français.

En terminant, j'aimerais souligner l'importance aussi pour tout foyer qu'on indique la langue maternelle qu'on a commencée à parler à la maison, que ce soit le français, l'anglais, le cri, le saulteux, le polonais, l'ukrainien. C'est très important de reconnaître dans nos foyers de quel groupe ethnique on est issus, important pour le Canada et pour les Manitobains. J'aimerais féliciter le gouvernement du rapport ce matin. Merci.

(Translation)

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to add a few words to what the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism has said.

The important thing here, I think, is to ask people to fill out their census form on June 4. This week, in fact, I attended a meeting, the annual meeting, of Pluri-Elles, a group of St. Boniface women, where they mentioned how important it is for French-Canadians and Franco-Manitobans to fill out the French form since that will certainly designate the boundaries of the Francophone population and its size. Another thing that they clearly emphasized is the women at home who cannot count the number of hours that they work at home. I think it is important to emphasize that fact.

When we look at mothers who stay at home, they do not just work from 8 to 5. The time spent working by these mothers at home was heavily stressed because they do not just work from 8 to 5 but 18 hours a day. So why not count the hours that these dear mothers spend working—and even the fathers now who stay at home to take care of the children when the mother works outside the home.

The important thing that should not be forgotten, and here I am speaking to Franco-Manitobans, is to fill out the form in French. Yesterday, in fact, in one family they already have the form and it says to wait until June 4 to fill it out. The question was asked, did you answer in French? No, they came and had us fill it out in English. I think that the important thing for us as Francophones is to urge these families to fill their forms out in French.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize the importance for all families of indicating the language first learned at home, whether it be French, English, Cree, Saulteux, Polish or Ukrainian, it is very important for families to indicate the ethnic group from which they descended, important for Canada and Manitoba. I congratulate the Government for this morning's statement. Thank you.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

CFB Shilo

Closure—Government Strategy

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, almost four weeks ago, our member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) raised the issue of the closing of the base at Shilo. Subsequent to that, he has called on an all-party task force to work with all citizens of Manitoba to stand up for the economic reality and economic benefits of that base in western Manitoba. Yet, we have heard from the federal associate deputy minister that the criteria of the federal government will be local economic considerations. The last time we heard that, we saw bases close in P.E.I., in Portage la Prairie, and it had absolutely no socioeconomic relationship at all to the citizens of Canada.

My question therefore is to the Premier. He has been alerted to this issue almost four weeks. Has he raised this issue with the Prime Minister? Has he gotten a guarantee from the Prime Minister that Shilo is indeed not on the list of bases to be closed by the federal government?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that we take very seriously and we have grave concern for. As a result, our administration has been working on a variety of fronts. We have initiated contact not only with Manitoba members of the federal government caucus but the lead minister for Manitoba and a number of others, in the course of our inquiries and in the course of our urgings, that a decision not be made that would be to the detriment of Shilo and to the detriment of Manitoba.

We are taking it further, Mr. Speaker, and I know that the member for Brandon West, the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), along with the member for the Shilo area, the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gillieshammer), were out at a rally in Shilo yesterday. In addition to that, they have arranged for a meeting here in Winnipeg, I believe it is Monday, with the associate Deputy Minister of Defence, Mary Collins.

The Minister of Justice has attempted to have a meeting with Mr. Masse as well, but he is out of country and will be for some time. We do not believe the matter can be allowed to wait. As a consequence, that meeting has been set up. I believe that representatives of opposition parties have been included.

Yesterday, I had an extensive discussion with the Mayor of Brandon, Mr. Borotsik, with respect to strategy, tactics and further moves that will be made so that we do everything possible to put pressure on the federal government on the relevant ministries involved, to ensure that the decision that ultimately is made is not made in detriment to Shilo or Manitoba.

* (1030)

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, we are pleased that the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), who raised this in this House weeks ago, has been invited to that meeting.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier and I attended a meeting with the Leader of the Liberal Party, where Mary Collins was attending with the last base closures of this province. It was clear to any of us in that room who was making the decisions. It was the Prime Minister and upon the recommendations of the Minister of Defence.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, your own minister yesterday at the same "rally" stated very clearly that this will be a "political decision" which worries us, of course, because political decisions arising from

Marcel Masse have not normally been in the best interest of western Canada in our opinion. My question is therefore directed to the Premier.

I appreciate the meeting with the associate Minister of Defence, but has he contacted the Prime Minister? This issue was raised on May 6. It is surely important enough for the Premier to phone the Prime Minister. It is surely important enough to have the lead of our Manitoba government phone the head of the federal government. It is surely important enough for the head of state in Manitoba to phone the head of state in the country, because that is indeed who is going to make the decision, the Prime Minister ultimately.

That is why we would ask the Premier why he has not contacted the Prime Minister and when he will, so that we can prevent the closures rather than fight them after the fact?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, when this matter was first raised, I wrote directly to the Prime Minister. We are not awaiting a response. At this point, we are taking more direct action, and we are setting up meetings with the relevant ministry.

As the member knows full well, these matters originate within departments for ministries, and they have a life of their own, that by the time they come to the political level for a discussion and decision, there is a series of recommendations and evaluations that have already led to the position that is being taken. This kind of decision, surely, the member does not believe would originate out of the Prime Minister's office where he sits at his desk and he says, I think we ought to just close bases, and we are going to do this, this and this. That does not work like that whatsoever. You know, the member, charitably, has been in government, and he knows that these matters come through a whole series of steps and analyses for recommendation.

We are letting the Prime Minister know on the record, in writing, that we are concerned about the issue, that we believe that this matter is very, very important to Manitoba and to Shilo and the Brandon-Westman area and that we are going to put all pressure possible on to make sure that the decision made is not one that is detrimental and harmful to Shilo and Manitoba.

Mr. Doer: I am absolutely flabbergasted that the Premier of this province would tell people in Manitoba that we can trust the Prime Minister to get meritorious advice coming from the Defence ministry and that the Prime Minister, of course, will

never interfere and make a political decision on behalf of his priorities in this country.

Mr. Speaker, if the CF-18 issue is any indication to the people of this province, the Premier better use a different strategy. Now I know why we are getting shafted all the time by the Prime Minister.

I simply ask the Premier, this issue was raised by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) on May 6. Why has the Premier not phoned or contacted the Prime Minister directly—well, he rolls his eyes. The Premier knows that Manitoba was hit hardest of any other province in Canada in the last set of hits. Why can he not take the initiative to phone the Prime Minister and ask him to consider the absolute devastation of the proposals in the last set of military decisions and to absolutely rule out completely any further base closure proposals in Manitoba?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed difficult to respond to a question when the member on the other side deliberately misunderstands it or else misrepresents it. I have said that very shortly after the matter was raised I did contact the Prime Minister directly in writing to put our objections on the record—on the record officially.

I also said that the member knows full well that all of these matters come to the Prime Minister's desk with recommendations attached. We want to make sure that the recommendations attached, when they come to the Prime Minister's desk, are ones that are as positive as we can make them, so that we protect the interest of the people of Manitoba, of the Forces base at Shilo, of the whole Westman area.

We have to work at it in a whole host of fronts because this matter will not originate out of the Prime Minister's office; it will originate out of the department and through the system. Therefore, when it gets to the cabinet table for decision, we want the Prime Minister to be aware that we are absolutely committed to the preservation of that base here in Manitoba.

Free Trade Agreement Impact Manufacturing Industry

Mr. Jerry Storie (Filn Flon): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism.

A week ago we raised the issue of the Manitoba government purchasing furniture from manufacturers in the United States, and we indicated that it was going to create problems

inevitably for furniture manufacturers in the province of Manitoba. The government pooh-poohed the idea, said no, there was no substance to that sort of suggestion.

Today, we had the announcement that another 100 permanent jobs have been lost in the furniture manufacturing sector in the province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we have an acknowledgement from the industry that this is free trade related.

My question to the Industry, Trade and Tourism minister is: How many jobs in the manufacturing industry are going to be lost by 1993 when the final tariffs are removed from furniture coming into the province of Manitoba?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, first of all, once again, I have to call into question the honourable member's preamble. I do not know if it is intent to exaggerate for emphasis or what the reason is. Fournier Stands currently employs 50 people, just to at least get the numbers accurate that we are, in fact, talking about.

For the information for the honourable member, Fournier corporation, I think as he is aware, is headquartered in Minneapolis and does have facilities in Winnipeg, Minneapolis and Virginia. In terms of the contact we had with them today, Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons for the decision. Clearly free trade is one part of that, but there are several reasons that I would like the opportunity to elaborate for the honourable member's benefit so he gets a sense of just what is happening in our business community. I am sure with the next question I will get that opportunity.

Manufacturing Industry Government Initiatives

Mr. Jerry Storie (Filn Flon): Mr. Speaker, we are making progress. This is the first time publicly that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism has recognized that free trade is going to have an impact—not going to, it is having an impact and it is devastating.

Mr. Speaker, if we can just go the next step and get them to recognize that the 69,000 manufacturing jobs that used to be in the province are no longer here. We have lost 22 percent of those jobs already.

Perhaps we can get the minister to answer this question. Given that the Canadian Manufacturers'

Association themselves said that provincial governments, including the government of Manitoba, were going to have to provide incentives and support to the manufacturing sector to allow them to survive in Canada, can the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism tell us today what he is going to do to prevent the loss of the rest of the manufacturing jobs in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I think anybody who followed the free trade discussion, when it was before the public, recognized that the unfortunate part of the free trade arrangement would be that there would be some industry sectors that would be, in fact, winners and there would be some that might be negatively affected and adjustments would have to be made.

I do want to point out for the honourable member that I know he appreciates hearing good news, and Manitoba's manufacturing employment in April of 1991 was estimated at 56,000 persons, up 3,000 people from April of 1990. So, in fact, progress is being made, Mr. Speaker, in the manufacturing sector. I also want to point out, if the honourable member read the announcement in today's paper and the quote from one of the principals of the company, he talks about operations in West Virginia being cheaper and the first item he refers to is taxes.

The hypocrisy from across the way from a government that created the highest personal income taxes, the highest corporate income taxes, payroll taxes, capital taxes is absolutely unbelievable in terms of the economic climate in this province.

Mr. Storle: Even the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism knows that taxes are a very small input cost in proportion to the other costs. There is going to be no level playing field until all the jobs are in the United States.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Flin Flon, kindly put your question now, please.

* (1040)

Mr. Storle: Mr. Speaker, again to correct the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism, 100 jobs have been lost as a result of this closure. Just because it is—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a time for debate.

Labour Adjustment Strategy

Mr. Jerry Storle (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism is: Given that the Conservative government, including this government, mouths support for worker adjustment policy and additional training, can the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism tell this province how it can justify the lack of training opportunities, the cuts to our community colleges, the cuts to our universities, to the 100 families who are now out there scrambling to find a way to maintain their families?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, once again, I find the brief preamble that you allowed the honourable member unbelievable when he suggests that the taxes are a very small input cost to the cost of doing business in this province.

I had the good fortune to be out in a constituency last night, the constituency of Kildonan, and certainly when you go to the doors and talk to the people and you talk to the business people of this community, taxes are very much a concern in this province, are very much a concern of both the citizens and the people trying to do business in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Unquestionably, what is in the best interest of this province is in terms of creating a positive economic climate in terms of a positive taxation climate in terms of attracting businesses to our province and will create the long-term quality jobs that we so badly need. This government has the confidence in the people of Manitoba to compete anywhere in the world so long as we create the proper economic climate to give them the opportunity to do just that, and we will do that, Mr. Speaker.

Fournier Stands Manufacturing Government Discussions

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, once again we see the real impact of the Free Trade Agreement on the Manitoba economy. Fifty workers at Fournier Stands Manufacturing of Canada will be laid off on June 28. The company president cited the Free Trade Agreement as the reason for closing the Winnipeg plant. Wages, taxes, raw materials and utilities are cheaper in West Virginia.

My question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism is: What consultation has he had with the

company officials to persuade them to stay in the province?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, two points: I have had an opportunity through our department to obviously receive some briefing material this morning on Fournier. Our department is in contact with them and I, certainly on a personal basis, will be making contact with them, myself, later today.

In terms of the free trade issue, I think, in all fairness, one should look at the total picture when we discuss the free trade issue. I know the opposition party, in terms of quoting other statistics, have relied very heavily on the Canada West Foundation, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to quote from a recent report by the Canada West Foundation that indicates that Manitoba has had a great deal of success under free trade. The report notes that Manitoba has cut its trade deficit with the United States in half during the past five years from \$1.2 billion in 1986 to \$600 million in 1990.

Labour Adjustment Strategy

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, this government has failed to do anything for workers who are losing jobs due to the Free Trade Agreement. Fournier employs several handicapped workers who may have trouble finding employment.

Will this government now live up to its promise of providing labour adjustment and work with these employees to help them find jobs or retrain them, giving its uncompromising support for free trade?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, we certainly will be looking at every avenue available in terms of assisting the adjustment to the workers affected. Unquestionably, I do not want to discount that our government takes seriously anytime an unfortunate situation like this occurs, in terms of doing everything possible to deal with that adjustment. Certainly, in conjunction with our Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), we will be looking at that particular issue.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party is finally taking some interest in the economy of Manitoba. Going back to the communique prior to the opening of this House, which I have a copy of here today, there is not a single mention of the economy in the communique issued the day before.

So I am pleased to see that there is a recognition finally of the importance of the economy of Manitoba.

Mr. Gaudry: I think it is the government that does not recognize the economy of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government has been reluctant to put forward—and that is a Tory government—money for labour adjustment because they claim it is impossible to tell which jobs are lost because of the Free Trade Agreement.

Given that the president of Fournier has stated that the Free Trade Agreement is the reason for closing the Winnipeg plant, will the minister contact his federal counterpart and demand federal money to help the labour adjustment and the Fournier workers?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to a question from the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), I think there are several factors that led to this closing. Certainly, some of the information that I have received this morning indicates there is significantly more to it than just the Free Trade Agreement.

So we, first of all, Mr. Speaker, will be undertaking to do a thorough review of all of the factors that are leading to this closing. From that review, we will then proceed to the kinds of review and decision making that is required in terms of that final suggestion made by the honourable member for St. Boniface.

Rural Development Corporations Funding

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, last month I raised the issue of funding for rural development corporations. At the time, the Minister of Rural Development agreed that these organizations do provide meaningful programs to enhance the rural economy. He also said that through rural development bonds and other activities his government is working on, these groups would not have to worry about overcoming their funding difficulties.

I ask the minister: What are these other activities that he is talking about, because I have not heard of any of them and neither have the development corporations heard of them, other than offloading onto municipalities?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous

administration that encumbered the taxpayers of this province and rural communities with additional debt through the interest charges of some five hundreds of millions of dollars annually on the interest that we have to pay on the debt which was incurred by the previous administration, we are trying to create an environment which will encourage people to do business in rural and all parts of Manitoba as has been expressed by my colleague several times, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson). We are working on the rural bond development initiative. Hopefully, we can expect support from the members opposite when that positive initiative is, in fact, formally announced.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that many of the groups have contacted the minister and meetings have been scheduled to discuss this matter.

Can the minister give this House his assurance that he will reinstate funding not only for the development corporations, but for the association of rural development, particularly in the Parkland area where people in that part of the province are starting to work together to try to get economic development, but they need the help of the two economic officers if they are to succeed?

* (1050)

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated many times, the priorities of the government are to maintain the health care system throughout rural and urban Manitoba, to maintain the education system throughout our province and to maintain our family services component within the province. We have had to see through other departments, in fact, some reductions which will help to make sure those essential services are maintained. My deputy has been meeting and I have been meeting with rural development corporations, and we will continue to do so to hear their case as it relates to the funding.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is one other component. We have done the maintenance of these essential services with zero percent increase to the revenues of this province. So as we see improvements in this province, considerations will have to be given to programs that are of priority to rural Manitoba, and the RDCs will be one of those areas which will be considered.

4-H Clubs Programs Funding

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): We certainly have not seen any jobs which are also important to rural Manitoba. The other concern in rural Manitoba is the removal of the 4-H assistance.

I ask the Minister of Agriculture: In light of all the calls that he has received related to this matter, will he now recognize the importance of the 4-H assistance and consider reinstating the funding to those people as well to help rural Manitoba keep that 4-H movement going?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): As I said to the member when she asked that question a week or so ago, that the delivery of the 4-H program through the Department of Agriculture will remain as it has in the past with the home economists and the ag reps delivering the program along with some 2,000 voluntary leaders, which have always been the heart and soul of the 4-H program delivery. The use of the assistance is technically unaffordable at this time, but I want to remind the member that some other degree of bridging assistance will be given to the 4-H councils that allow them to make the decisions at the grassroots level in order to be able to continue the program with the continuous and strong support of the Department of Agriculture.

Environment Act Amendments

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Since the election, this government has been promising regulations to The Environment Act that will protect sensitive areas in this province from development and the ensuing pollution.

My question for the Minister of Environment is: When will the government stop delaying and introduce these new regulations?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the member is showing some ongoing interest in Shoal Lake, but I should remind her that, under The Environment Act which was started under the previous administration, I am required to consult on an ongoing basis in the development of regulations. We have had our regulations out twice on prior consultation. We will very shortly be taking them out in final consultation form, and she will have every opportunity to be involved in that.

Shoal Lake Environmental Protection

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): To the same minister.

Will the regulations include protection for Shoal Lake in a proactive manner, rather than in the inadequate, reactive approach by relying on environment impact assessments?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I assume the member saw the previous draft regulations that we took out for discussion, and what does she think we are doing? We are protecting the lake.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Speaker, this government cannot ask another jurisdiction to do what it will not.

My question to the minister is: Will he listen to the strong message from City Council, and will he move to ban all mining on Shoal Lake?

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the member's NDP colleagues in Ontario would have some interesting comments about me regulating Shoal Lake on the Ontario side of the border.

The key issue will be working closely and co-operatively with the government of Ontario. We have, in fact, moved forward rather aggressively in this area and have, to this point, received some very good response from the Province of Ontario, both under the previous administration and under this administration.

We are looking forward to having an opportunity for joint administration under a joint management plan that is far from being complete but is in the early stages of discussion, and if we have Ontario's co-operation on that, we can rest assured that drinking water for this city will be well protected.

Firearms Control Legislation Government Response

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I believe the vast majority of Canadians were deeply disappointed with the gun control legislation that was tabled in the House of Commons yesterday because it remains woefully inadequate. I would like to think the majority of us were sickened by the front page of the Sun today with a display of weapons in somebody's back yard, which brings very much to mind the fact that there are weapons out there that should not be in private hands.

Can the Minister of Justice tell the House today if he has reviewed the legislation, and will he be preparing a Manitoba response to the legislation?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Our review, Mr. Speaker, is not complete, but we will be preparing our comments for the federal minister on the legislation tabled.

Mrs. Carstairs: In those comments, will the government of the province of Manitoba be clearly indicating their disapproval of weapons which can be sold to 16- and 17-year-olds who are not of legal age?

Will the minister be telling the Government of Canada that we do not want 16- and 17-year-olds in the province of Manitoba to be able to own such weapons?

Mr. McCrae: We have made our positions and concerns about the availability of dangerous weapons in the hands of people in our country known in the past, and we will continue to be vigilant on that front, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the minister will not go on the record as being opposed to 16- and 17-year-olds having weapons in this country.

Will the minister tell us today if he will also express in the strongest possible terms the lack of clear guidelines in the legislation and the ability for 20 members of Parliament or 15 senators to indicate their objection to regulations which is the only way in which specific weapons will be banned in this nation?

Mr. McCrae: Sometimes the trouble with going on the record before your review is complete, it can get you into difficulty as the honourable Leader of the Liberal Party can attest. So I think care is always something that should be exercised, and the honourable Leader of the Liberal Party ought to know that by now.

I am not bound, Mr. Speaker, by the feelings of a handful of people here or a handful of people there. What I am bound by, as Minister of Justice for Manitoba, is what is right for the people of Manitoba, and some of the sentiments expressed by the honourable member are very appropriate sentiments and may very well form part of the Manitoba position on the bill.

Court Reporters Layoff Justification

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice and Attorney General.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, when the government said it was introducing a new court reporter system, the new system being put in place, government officials said that there were no plans to replace the court reporters. Now the minister says that the reason for the new system being put in place are the wage demands of the court reporters.

Can this minister indicate why he is jeopardizing not only the court system but the lives of families and the lives of individuals involved in the court system—families of court reporters—by his actions to replace the court reporters and put in this new system?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): We would certainly do nothing to jeopardize service to the public. The honourable member already knows that and should not make mischievous comments like the kinds he has just made.

He knows precisely that this government has picked up a mess left to it by the previous government, and he knows that well, and only since this honourable member came to this House have we had any questions from members of the New Democratic Party about the justice system, because they figured maybe enough time had elapsed and people would forget the disgraceful record of the New Democratic Party with regard to the justice system in this province.

I need only remind the honourable member that it was not this government that built all of the technology into the new court house over there across the street to accommodate the system of monitoring that this government is moving to. It was the previous government. It was Roland Penner. It was the Howard Pawley government of Manitoba that started that process.

This government, under this minister, did everything I could to slow down that process from the time that I became minister. Things became very difficult last October, as the honourable member knows, but the honourable member ought to get his history and his facts straight.

* (1100)

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, it was this minister's officials in October and this minister's officials in April of this year who gave no indication that court reporters would lose their jobs, and now the minister is saying that they are losing their jobs because of this new system.

Which is it? Why is this system being introduced, and was it because of wage demands or was it because of improved technology? What is the reason for it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. McCrae: I think maybe the honourable member—and I did actually raise my voice in my last answer to make sure the honourable member could hear, but I guess I will have to repeat the previous answer.

What happened is under the previous NDP administration, the court monitor system was on its way. I, operating as a court reporter previously, saw that was coming and it was a concern to me. As a newly appointed minister in May of 1988, I did what I could to make that program make sense. I tried not to see that program move so quickly that it would be disruptive to service to the public and more disruptive than necessary to the people working in the system.

October 5 came; a Memorandum of Understanding under which the court reporters had been operated was terminated. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that memorandum was terminated. The government was faced with some very difficult decisions to make at that time as to how we are supposed to properly deliver service to the public in the future. It does not do the honourable member much good to come along now, after the thing was set in place by the government that he supported, and complain to me about the situation we find ourselves in now.

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary. I have to repeat the question because the minister failed to answer.

Yesterday, he said the court reporters were being terminated because of wage demands. Is that the reason or is it the new system in place? Today, he is saying something else.

Mr. McCrae: I wonder if the honourable member understands that, unless you happen to be a court reporter who got a layoff notice yesterday, there is nobody in this province who feels worse about the decision that had to be made than this Minister of Justice.

The people we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, are my former colleagues, my former workmates. I say to the honourable member, he ought not to raise this matter in the way he usually does, in a crass political way. We are talking about people's lives here and their families, and if he thinks this decision was arrived at without a whole lot of difficulty, he is very, very wrong.

GRIP Program Statistics

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture's much-vaunted Gross Revenue Insurance Plan is off to a rocky start, hardly an overwhelming endorsement. Less than two-thirds of Manitoba farmers have signed up. That means that more than one-third of Manitoba farmers, thousands of farmers—and many more who signed up under protest—have disagreed with this minister's program. He says it was designed by farmers for farmers.

I want to ask the minister if he has available a comprehensive regional breakdown of the sign-up for GRIP across the province and an explanation for those figures?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, some approximately 13,000 farmers in Manitoba signed up for the revenue portion of GRIP. An additional 1,400 people signed up for crop insurance. It will bring the total number of clients in crop insurance up to around 14,000. There will be about 67 percent of farmers as a whole who signed up for GRIP, but when the acres are reported at the end of June, the full expectation is we will have 80 percent of the acres in Manitoba signed up for GRIP.

Consultations

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Well, the minister can put on a brave front, Mr. Speaker, but in view of what has to be a disappointing sign-up for this minister, will the minister now admit and accept the fact that the current program has serious inequities, region to region, farmer to farmer, in this province? Will he now agree to consult over the next number of months with farmers and make the changes that farmers are asking for?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there has been no more greater round of consultation than has gone on in the past year by this minister and this department in the development of this program.

The program was developed in response to farmers' needs, and it was developed by farmers for farmers. The consultation has gone on continuously on a week-by-week and month-by-month basis. We met with many delegations. We made many changes to the program in response to the farmers' needs, and we, as the Department of Agriculture in the Province of Manitoba, have demanded that there be a signatories committee so that changes can be put in place.

That was initiated by Manitoba. It is in place. It is ongoing and allows them a continuous input for changes they deem necessary to make the program respond to the situations in front of them in the years ahead.

Government Position

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Well, it is good to see the minister is responding, Mr. Speaker, and that there will be changes made, because there are thousands of farmers who have stood up bravely against this minister and against the governments who have said that all support will be lost to them if they did not sign up for GRIP.

I want to ask this minister today if he will publicly make his statement and his position clear that he will not leave these thousands of farmers who have not signed up for GRIP to fend for themselves in the face of future natural disasters?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, GRIP is an interim program to support prices for the grain sector, even though we have a trade war going on. The trade war is the problem, and GRIP is not the solution to the trade war.

We still have to continue to proceed aggressively as a province and a country to solve the major problem, and that is a trade war. That member fails to realize it, thinking somehow there is some magic that taxpayers' money can avoid the reality of a trade war. GRIP is designed to give farmers some support in the interim, while we continue to aggressively pursue, on an international basis, the resolution to the trade war, which unfortunately we are not seeing any sign of relaxation by the two major participants, Europe and the United States. The farmers recognize that. That is why they signed up for GRIP. That is why they are going to pursue the continuous efforts of this government and this country to resolve the trade war.

Gender Equity Curriculum Consultant Layoff Justification

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

In the Education Estimates it was learned that five curriculum consultants would be cut. One of those was the art consultant. Well, I have learned this week that the art consultant actually had a secondary function, 40 percent of her time was as the gender equity curriculum consultant. That has now been cut.

Can the Minister responsible for the Status of Women explain how there will be curriculum geared, as the Premier (Mr. Filmon), the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach) and she have said, to attracting more young women in programs like math and science when this curriculum consultant has been cut by this government?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister responsible for the Status of Women): Mr. Speaker, I cannot ascertain the content of the preamble to the question that was put to the House today. I will take the detail as notice and return to the House with a response.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister responsible for the Status of Women telling the House today that a gender equity curriculum consultant was slashed, cut from this provincial budget, and she had no knowledge of it?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept as fact the information that the Leader of the Second Opposition has put on the record. In fact, I indicated I would look at the question that she has put forward and come back to the House with an answer.

I do want to indicate that we as a government have made major accomplishments in the areas of government that do affect women.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Point of Order

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order involved around the debate of May 28, 1991. This debate ensued the unprecedented advancement of the closure motion by the New Democratic Party.

In the heat of debate, I have to confess and admit that I put what I thought was accurate information on the record. With further research, I find that indeed the closure motion had been placed in at

least one previous occasion on very short notice. I had expressed some dismay and shock at the bringing in of a closure motion by the New Democratic Party, and in the heat of debate, I did not have full and complete information.

I would like to indicate to the House that I would like the record to show I did not have right information when I indicated that the motion had never been presented before after a short 20-minute defence by the minister.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable minister did not have a point of order.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, to reconsider second readings, Bills 18, 46, 52 and then move to debate on second readings on Bills 38, 43, 44.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 18—The Municipal Amendment Act

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 18, The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

* (1110)

Point of Order

Mr. John Plohan (Dauphin): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) would table the document that shows the precedents for closure, as he called it, after short debate on the minister's salary.

I believe that the Minister of Health has acknowledged that he actually made the motion on previous occasions, cutting off debate. He might want to table it. It is customary, Mr. Speaker, to table those documents.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The time to have raised that would have been at the time the matter was raised.

* * *

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, Bill 18 proposes a number of amendments to The Municipal Act, some of which are of an updating or housekeeping nature

and others of which are being suggested at the request of elected and appointed municipal officials in the interests of clarifying responsibilities and improving administration of the services at the local government level.

For example, the bill contains amendments which clarify the date of commencement of the term of office of municipal councils to remove an inconsistency with the provisions of The City of Winnipeg Act. Similarly, there is an amendment to extend the time of filing nomination papers for perspective members of council because the existing provision in the act was considered to be too restrictive. Other amendments clarify the powers of municipal councils with respect to the payment of indemnities, the payment of grants and the investment of surplus funds.

There are two new provisions, in particular, which warrant special attention. One is to restrict the powers of outgoing councils between the date of a municipal election and the date of a new council taking office. This is consistent with legislation in place in the province of Ontario, and the responsible approach to local government taken by Manitoba municipal officials would certainly indicate that such restrictive legislation would be required only on rare occasions. It will not generally impede the operations of local government and will provide some security to incoming councils.

The second change which I would like to highlight and the most major amendment in the bill is the addition of legislation which replaces provisions for municipal assessment and taxation of equipment in sand and gravel pits and replaces that legislation with licensing powers. There has been growing concern among municipalities for at least the past 10 years regarding the level of property tax revenues received from sand and gravel operations. As a result, a committee of municipal industry and provincial representatives was formed to deal with the issue.

In summary, the committee recommended that the property tax applied to pit and quarry equipment be deleted and that in its place municipalities be empowered to license operators and levy a fee per tonne extracted, as well as a charge per mile travelled by haulers on municipal roads. I am pleased to have been able to respond to the concerns of municipal officials with the introduction of these amendments.

I wish to acknowledge the contribution of the members of the committee which proposed these changes be made. I welcome discussion on the bill and other amendments proposed in Bill 18. I would encourage speedy passage by members of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is—

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 46—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 46, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, a little over two years ago, this government unveiled the toughest antidrinking and driving legislation in Canada. That legislation was passed at the end of June 1989, and a bill making amendments was brought in when the House resumed sitting in September. The entire package was proclaimed on November 1, 1989.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

That legislation included an administrative licence revocation which was based on legislation developed primarily in the state of Minnesota, which had been recommended to all American states by both the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving and the Surgeon-General's Conference on Impaired Driving. More than half of the states in the United States now have an administrative licence revocation system.

The other part of the legislation was a unique program developed here in Manitoba to impound the car of persons who were driving while suspended. This kind of legislation was also recommended by the United States Surgeon-General's Conference, but Manitoba was

the first jurisdiction in North America and, we believe, in the world that developed the legislation. Both parts of the legislation now have been found constitutional by the courts of this province, and I am pleased to advise members of this House that the administrative licence revocation program is working very smoothly, so smoothly in fact that a full review of its operations by officials of the Department of Highways and Transportation did not lead to a single suggestion for amendment.

As for the seizure and impoundment of cars driven by suspended drivers, some problems with the legislation have been found. This was to be expected in such pioneering legislation, but the problems are minimal, and we believe that the administrative improvements in this bill combined with increasing the penalties for repeat offenders should iron out the bugs in the system.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe I can be forgiven before I discuss Bill 46, if I briefly mention to members of the House the very encouraging statistics we have on the first year of operation of the anti-impaired driving program.

In the year immediately preceding the implementation of Bill 3, police laid 5,328 charges related to drinking and driving. In the year subsequent to proclaiming Bill 3, the total number of charges laid was 4,659, a drop of 12.6 percent. More importantly, charges of impaired driving causing bodily harm and impaired driving causing death fell from 159 to 83, a drop of 47.8 percent. Summarily, charges of driving prohibited or driving while suspended fell from 2,852 to 2,457, a 13.8 percent drop.

The whole point of this tough legislation was to reduce the number of victims of drinking drivers. In that regard I am very pleased to inform the members of this House that the number of victims of alcohol related traffic accidents on Manitoba highways fell from 48 to 31, a decline of 35 percent.

Certainly we are encouraged by these results, but they give us no reason for complacency. We must continue to strengthen the legislation and find more effective ways of fighting drinking and driving. It is with that goal in mind that the government proposes Bill 46.

To the end of March there had been 439 hearings under the legislation resulting in 255 vehicles being released. This indicates to the government that the hearing process is working fairly with about one car

in 11 being released before the expiry of the 30 days.

It has however become clear that the silence in the existing legislation on the materials that should be considered by a magistrate to determine whether a car should be released leads to uncertainty and delays. For that reason Bill 46 specifies the reports and materials that a magistrate should be considering to determine the twin issues of whether the driver was in fact suspended and whether the registered owner knew or ought to have known of that suspension. The existing practice will not be appreciably changed, but we will be providing the statutory basis on which the magistrates will be entitled to rely.

* (1120)

Madam Deputy Speaker, when the legislation was drawn it was felt essential that the police not have the discretion to release a car. There are very good reasons for eliminating police discretion, since we do not want a situation in which the laws capriciously enforce or that the police have the possibility of doing a favour.

Unfortunately, this provision was drawn with inadequate consideration given to the problems of remote parts of the province. It is simply impossible to seize a car on a northern highway in the middle of the winter and leave the driver on the side of the road miles from home. Of course the police are not prepared to act in such an irresponsible manner, and so they have not followed the strict wording of the statute requiring a seizure in all cases.

The government agrees that the police face circumstances where they should not have to ignore the clear wording of the law. Accordingly, this bill will provide authority for the police not to seize the vehicle where safety would be jeopardized.

There are also circumstances where a quick release of the vehicle is desirable, particularly where evidence is discovered which convinces the police that the car has been stolen. Unnecessary inconvenience is caused to the innocent party by forcing him or her to go to a hearing. Again we do not believe police discretion in these matters should be totally unfettered. Consequently we are requiring that there be approval of a representative of impoundment control before the vehicle can be released from impoundment without a hearing.

One problem with the legislation that we did not anticipate when we wrote it is there are cars that

apparently are not worth the time and expense involved in auctioning them under The Garage Keepers Act. This is particularly serious outside of Winnipeg where the cost of towing a car to the auction may be prohibitive. These cars, Madam Deputy Speaker, are beaters, and their value is less than the lien or they would have been claimed by their owners. A streamlined process allowing the garage keeper to get title to the vehicle is therefore introduced by this bill.

Madam Deputy Speaker, until now the discussion of the contents of this bill has dealt with the attempts to make the administration cleaner. While these are important, members of the House will perhaps be most interested in the government's determination to increase the penalties on those who flout the law. This bill introduces a 60-day impoundment where the same registered owner has had two or more cars seized within two years. This will double the cost and double the inconvenience to that owner and, we trust, will discourage repeat offenders.

This is perhaps an indication of just how ingrained the determination is to drive that we have experienced a surprising number of persons who do not appear to be deterred by the 30-day impoundment and the \$250 cost. In fact, of the 2,748 vehicles seized between November 1, 1989, and March 31, 1991, 603 were being driven by a person who had already been apprehended. There were 224 offenders who were caught twice; 36 were caught three times; nine were caught four times; one was caught five times; and one was caught six times. There were 202 registered owners involved in providing the cars for these offenders. We believe that doubling the penalties for registered owners whose vehicles are used a second or subsequent time will dry up the pool of cars available for use by suspended drivers.

Madam Deputy Speaker, a clause-by-clause explanation of the provisions of the bill will be provided to the opposition critics for their consideration of Bill 46 in committee. I will try and make it available soon as well.

It is with pleasure that I recommend Bill 46 to the House.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), that debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 52—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 52, The Family Maintenance Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire), be now read a second time and referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. McCrae: Madam Deputy Speaker, Bill 52 is a very brief act which will introduce a more just procedure for dealing with persons who have failed to appear at a hearing or have made default in their payments. The current legislation is extremely inflexible. It authorizes a warrant to be issued for such persons, which is quite appropriate, but it makes no provision for allowing these people interim release until the hearing can be held. Accordingly, we have no choice but to hold these people in prison. They are being treated more harshly than persons accused of criminal offences.

I am advised that the present provisions do not normally cause grave difficulty because most apprehensions under warrants are made during the week, and there is prompt access to a master who can make the decision.

Nevertheless, there are some instances of a person being apprehended on the weekend and that person faces the possibility of being held in jail for two nights before a hearing can be held. We believe this is inappropriate and accordingly this legislation will provide for a system similar to that under the Criminal Code. It will require that a person apprehended under a warrant be brought before a justice within 24 hours and that the person be released unless the Crown can establish that there are good reasons for keeping the person detained. It will also provide for an appeal of that decision to the Court of Queen's Bench.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I commend Bill 52 to the members of this House.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 38—The Wildlife Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), second reading of Bill 38, (The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune), standing in the name of the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): Madam Deputy Speaker, it gives me pleasure to speak to this bill, The Wildlife Amendment Act. There are pros and cons to the whole bill. I have some concerns related to this bill that I would like to address shortly.

The Wildlife Act will encompass all of Manitoba and will especially take effect in northern Manitoba. One of the areas that I personally and our party have concern about is the powers of the minister where at the whim of the minister, the minister can almost virtually do and approve whatever he or she wants. It is not a reflection on the minister of today, but is a caution for the future. We do not know who will be the next Minister of Natural Resources and what type of individual will take up that responsibility.

At the whim of the minister—I will give you, Madam Deputy Speaker, an example up near Churchill, Manitoba. I am very familiar with that area. What you have is two areas that are very important for habitat purposes. One is around the Cape Churchill area which is the area for polar bears to have their young cubs. They have their dens and everything in that area. The other area when you move a little further east is an area called La Pérouse Bay.

La Pérouse Bay is a few miles from the community of Churchill. What happens at La Pérouse Bay is you have a migration of snow geese that come and nest there every year. The habits of geese that I am familiar with is that they have a migratory route that is built into their system by Mother Nature. What happens is when a goose is born in a certain area, that is where that goose when they are mature and come back to have their own family, they always come back to where they were born.

So the reason I mention that is La Pérouse Bay has thousands and thousands of nesting snow geese. It has been one of the areas that scientists and conservation people have gone to and have used that breeding area for tagging purposes.

* (1130)

Madam Deputy Speaker, what they do is they string out a long net and they shoot it out over top of the flocks of geese. Then they go in and brand the geese and that way they are able to track the geese wherever they go. A lot of them end up in Mexico, and some are shot along the way. It is very important to preserve those sorts of habitats where it will guarantee, generations to come, adequate snow geese and other species of birds for our children and our grandchildren in the future.

What I am concerned about—and I mentioned earlier, it is not a direct reflection to this minister, it is a reflection to the future. What could happen, say in the future, if someone had a great brainwave to build a research station in La Pérouse Bay, for per se, to do a study of snow geese. We know—at least I know, coming from that area—that we do not have the power source and stuff like that to operate a scientific research station. What would happen, Madam Deputy Speaker, if per se they went to a nuclear plant to form the electrical powers and stuff to run that research station? That would be very, very scary. I think something of that nature, or whatever nature that could affect habitat for our birds or animals should have the full participation of all Manitobans and go to public hearings. That is the concern I have, those processes that are in place might not be carried out.

I use that example of a nuclear power plant because we have seen examples. What happened in Chernobyl? It is a very, very scary thought. Also with the area I just mentioned of La Pérouse Bay, I know personally a lot of people from the community of Churchill. They use that area for recreation purposes. A lot of people go out there to take pictures of small—I guess they are goslings you would call them—baby geese and the mothers and their nesting areas. There are many people who I know and even professionals who go up there to take photos of the geese to market them and also for tourists who come up there. A lot of tourists go out into that area because like I said there are thousands and thousands of geese that nest in that area and feed from those marshes at La Pérouse Bay.

Also at the whim of a minister—I have to make it very clear that I am not addressing the minister of today—but it could happen any day. What would happen, Madam Deputy Speaker, if, per se, someone got permission to open a hunting lodge right in La Pérouse Bay. I think that would be very scary, because when you have a hunting season starting in northern Manitoba of—it starts September 1 in northern Manitoba, and there are a lot of immature geese that breed in that area and fly back and forth. A lot of the hunters that come in are first-time hunters. They do not have the experience to pick out certain geese from flocks that fly overhead. What they do is they just flock shoot.

A lot of times what happens is a lot of those young immature geese are shot and you try even to pluck one of those, you cannot, because their skin is so tender, all you do is really peel them. That is what we call pot geese, because the only thing they are good for is boiling. You cannot roast them because they do not have the fat and stuff like that. We have used those for making stews and stuff like that.

The whole, I guess, freedom of whoever is the minister at any given time could encourage a hunting lodge or a research station to be placed in feeding areas or habitats of these wild birds. Also, a lot of that marsh area that I am speaking to, there are also a lot of other species of birds that migrate and gather in that area.

I do not know, Madam Deputy Speaker, if you are familiar with that area, but it is one of the greatest bird watching areas in all of North America. It is world known, the whole Churchill area for bird watchers to come from all parts of North America, all parts of the world. In fact, even a couple of years ago—it would be about 10 years ago now—we had the first sighting of a Ross gull. Now that Ross gull goes back to Churchill yearly and lays their nest and has young ones.

That kind of power, if not used properly, could be detrimental to communities along the bay line and especially the community of Churchill, because Churchill is one of the great tourist attractions in Manitoba, and a lot of the people in that community exist on tourist dollars alone, like your businesses in that community. Your tour operators and even local people will get employment opportunities as guides and various employment opportunities that tourism brings to a community like Churchill.

I would be cautious in recommending this bill without added amendments or when it goes into

committee stage, where the public has a chance to have their say and input. I know that the public of Manitoba will have some serious concerns about this.

Hopefully, we will have the opportunity to make amendments to this bill when it moves into committee for the betterment of all Manitobans and of all tourist people who go up to Churchill for recreation and also for professional reasons. You have professional photographers who go up there, with our wildlife that is available there. You even have movie companies that go up to Churchill to do some filming.

It is those buildings in wildlife habitats that are kind of a scary thought to me, because I have hunted extensively and I have made many trips out into Cape Churchill, La Pérouse Bay up to York Factory, and I know that the community of Churchill there is a migration of caribou through that area. In the winter months, we go out there and do our hunting of caribou.

It is very important for the aboriginal people in the community of Churchill, because my own experience alone, when I was a child and growing up, it was a rare, rare occasion for our family to have store-bought meat. It was very rare, because one thing we could not afford it, and we depended on hunting and fishing of that area.

Many, many times, we used to have to go out to Cape Churchill out to around La Pérouse Bay and a lot of times north to Seal River and that area to hunt caribou. Almost every meal we had when I was a young child, almost every meal we had in the winter months was caribou meat. The only thing I could not tell you was how it was going to be cooked that day, but I could tell you what I was going to have for supper and what I was going to eat. It was going to be caribou.

We used to go out—my family were Inuit family, and we had our own village in Churchill. It was called the flats. If you go there today or if you had been there in the past, you would know that it is mostly aboriginal people that live in that area. We had our own little section off, and we had our own community, because we were the only Inuit family who was living in Churchill at that time.

* (1140)

Madam Deputy Speaker, it is a unique experience, because we lived with my uncles, my aunts, and we had a family together. Every one of

the family members had a responsibility that they had to fulfill in order for our extended family, like for our village, to survive. My uncle, William Kidlapik, God bless his soul, who is now deceased, I used to spend a lot of time with him and he used to spend a lot of time with me, because we had 12 members of our family and my parents did not have time for all of us.

So my uncle, who was a single man at that time, sort of took me under his wing. He was the one who was responsible for looking after the dogs. We had six, seven of our own families living together, and we used to have about 40-some dogs, so he had a big responsibility. I was fortunate enough—

An Honourable Member: How did you feed all of those dogs?

Mr. Hickes: Well, we fed them with caribou meat and wild meat, and in the summertime we would feed them with seals and whale meat. So it was a full-time job just to feed, like the Minister of Highways says, the dogs and our family. So that is why I know that hunting is not to that extent today. I know that, because a lot of people who had depended on it now use other agencies or services or employment opportunities. A lot of them do not go hunting and fishing. The ones that do, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have to ensure that the opportunities are there for the individuals who want and need to hunt to maintain their families and also to have proper food for their families, especially the old people. Like my mother today, if you put down a piece of bought prime-cut T-bone steak on a plate and if you put a caribou steak, I could tell you which one she would choose without second thought, because she is used to that kind of food.

That is why, Madam Deputy Speaker, a lot of people who come to the hospitals and centres in southern Manitoba—for instance, at 5 East Gate is an Inuit centre right now. They bring in Inuit food from up North, because that is what the people are used to and that is what they want. So we have to make sure that those animals and game birds and the resources for aboriginal people are maintained.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

It is nice to say that we will not do anything to jeopardize the caribou herds, the geese's nesting place, but how do we ensure that that happens? If you give power to one individual—we have seen examples in other parts of the world where, when one individual holds that much power, anything could happen. That is the whole danger of it. The

people who elected us, whom we are responsible to, have to have their opportunity and their say in rules and regulations or laws that we pass.

When we move this into committee stage, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we will have some interest groups come out. I hope that one of the groups that come out will be the Manitoba Trappers Association. The trappers and hunters of Manitoba and especially of northern Manitoba depend so much on our wildlife that we have available to us, not only for their own food substance, but also for their income to supplement the high prices that we have to pay in stores in northern Manitoba.

It does not matter what it is, you could take one item from any store in southern Manitoba, where we here pass laws and regulations—but many of us in this Chamber have not lived and experienced the difficulties it is living in northern Manitoba with the high cost. Everybody says it is because of freight. That could be true. Also, when you take one item from southern Manitoba and compare it to whatever that item is in northern Manitoba, you will see where the price is drastically increased.

When you are working at a lot of the jobs—you, know, a lot of the employment opportunities are \$6, \$7, \$8 an hour—you cannot depend on running to the store to buy your steaks, roasts and pork chops, because you just do not have that kind of income to feed your family properly. So you have to ensure that you have access to the moose, the caribou, the snow geese, the Canada geese. That way your family has a chance for at least meat in their diet.

If you go to any community in northern Manitoba, any remote community, you will see, Mr. Speaker, where the majority of the individuals in that community, if they invite you for a meal, almost guaranteed you will have either fish or moose meat.

How do we ensure that those communities are able to get moose regularly or caribou regularly or snow geese? The only way we can do it is to try and leave things the way they are. That way the animals can exist in their natural habitats, and that way the people in those communities will have the benefit of those animals.

If we start building whatever the buildings are or whatever the projects are, you will scare away the birds, the animals, and they will move elsewhere, or what happens is an accident occurs and many of them will be killed off, and then the people will suffer, Mr. Speaker.

On the other side of that is—I have very, very mixed feelings about this part of the bill, where protection of the polar bears as a protected species in Manitoba, he says polar bears will have additional protection to ensure they will not be hunted or trapped. Well, Mr. Speaker, that part of the bill I have mixed reactions to, because I see, I guess, the need for it today, maybe the need for it tomorrow, but also I see the need for our trappers and hunters of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I have to go back to my childhood again. When I was growing up we used to hunt polar bears for their fur and for their meat. I do not know if anyone else in this Chamber has eaten polar bear meat, but it is an excellent meat source. When you eat it and you taste it, it is sort of sweet in nature. When I describe that to my friends when we are comparing notes, they say, well, maybe it is like a black bear. Well, I could not tell you that, because I have never eaten a black bear, but I have eaten polar bears.

Many people in northern Manitoba, well, I would not say northern Manitoba, but the Northwest Territories—also, there are a few Inuit families that still reside in Churchill, but not as many as there used to, because they have moved their territorial headquarters from Churchill to Rankin Inlet a few years back.

Mr. Speaker, when you have the protection of polar bears, the reason I can see for that is that Churchill is what they call the polar bear capital of the world. The polar bears, you want them there for the tourists who come up to take pictures of the bears, put into promotional packages and market elsewhere. Also, if you just look at the Cape Churchill, it is the denning ground for polar bears. That is where the polar bears come and have their young cubs. I hope the minister is very careful in enforcing this and has some long-range plans, because when you increase the population of any animal, what you have is competition for food sources. I have never heard, until recently, of any polar bears that were spotted as far south as Norway House and Gillam, and I have heard that in the last few years that they have spotted or

killed or seen polar bears in Norway House and in Gillam.

* (1150)

An Honourable Member: All the way to Gillam?

Mr. Hickes: Yes, and that is totally unheard of in the past. So what could be happening, Mr. Speaker, is the polar bears or any animals that get overpopulated, they will have to spread out for their food source. That is what I am afraid that could happen to the polar bears—

An Honourable Member: Or that global warming is a myth and we are entering the next Ice Age.

Mr. Hickes: That could be, but I know speaking to some of my family members and Inuit people from Northwest Territories, when I was sharing this story with them, they said, that far. That is what I am saying today—that far. Why? Maybe it is global warming, I do not know, but I know and I understand and I would recommend to individuals of the House that is probably due to overpopulation, because when you lose your food source you have to go elsewhere or expand out—

An Honourable Member: Do you want us to shoot some polar bears?

Mr. Hickes: Well, the minister says, do you want us to shoot some bears. I say to the minister, have some control measures in place in case of overpopulation. I lived in Churchill and I know what happens in Churchill when the bears migrate from their dens and they have their cubs and they wander into the communities. I know. I have had friends who were attacked by these polar bears. I have a friend right now who is living in Thompson, Manitoba, who is walking around with one arm.

What happens is the polar bear, under normal circumstances, is not a dangerous animal. So what happens is any person or any animal, when they are surprised, that is when your first reaction is to defend yourself. My friend who lost an arm was out goose hunting and was walking around this island and never even noticed—normally when you walk you either make noise or you whistle. That is probably why I talk to myself to this day, maybe, but you try to make enough noise so that if there is a bear laying in the willows or somewhere near, they will hear you. The normal reaction is, they will get up and look and you will spot them and you go your own separate ways. But if they are surprised, they will attack you.

When I started school, I lived down in the flats. That was approximately a mile to go to school. We used to have to walk in the morning and walk at noon hour and then walk again after school. Many, many times I spotted polar bears that were walking out in the open. We were just young kids, six, seven years

old, and if that is not a scary thought—it is. It is very scary, but we were always told to keep an eye and keep on walking. I have walked many times where the polar bears walk over there, and I am walking this way, and we have always been told, do not run and do not do anything to excite, and just walk, and I have done that.

Also, when we had to walk along the tracks, thank God, there were railroad tracks there, because we kept to where the gravel was and there were willows on the side. We would always whistle or make noise, or whatever. We were told to do that by our parents. You could hear, and I have seen where we were walking and a bear was laying in the willows having a sleep. By us making noise, then that bear woke up and sort of watched as we went along. This is in Churchill. So that is why I say, be very careful. Make sure that there are measures in place to make sure that the polar bears do not overpopulate. You see, the bears, when they come out of their dens, gather around in the community of Churchill because there is a garbage dump there. A lot of them as young cubs are used to going into the community to go to the garbage dump. I have been to that garbage dump, and I have counted over 20 bears, over 20 bears. It was like looking at a great big football team. They all had these big numbers on their backsides because every time they are caught, they are numbered so that they can keep track of them.

Why they are gathering there is they are waiting for the ice to form so that they can go out into the Hudson Bay to seal hunt. All I am saying—I am raising caution here because I do not want to see any people or anybody and especially children of that community killed or hurt by polar bears because they have to wait for the ice to form and in the meanwhile they have to eat. Now they bury the garbage and they burn it so that there is very little food source, so a lot of them will walk you right into the community.

When I was a kid, there were not as many bears that walked right into the community of Churchill, as there are today. They are losing the fear. Polar bears are losing their fear of people because we have all the tourists who are going out in the dune buggies and everything and are taking pictures of the bears. They are very close to people, and they are getting used to them. So, if we let the bears overpopulate, it will be a danger.

Also, with the trappers in a community like Churchill, I think they should—this is my own personal feeling—have an opportunity to hunt and trap a quota number of bears. Those same bears, when they leave Churchill and go out into the bay and go into Northwest Territories, the Eskimo Point, the Rankin Inlet and various communities along the bay to do their hunting and the feeding of seals, they will be shot in those communities because those communities have quotas.

A pelt for a polar bear fetches anywhere—you can go anywhere from \$1,200 to \$3,000, which, for a trapper, is quite a bit of money. If we had a quota, even if it is three or four, that way we would be able to keep the population down and also increase the activity for the trappers who now have no market for their foxes and their beavers.

I will not go on. I would like to have the opportunity to go on, but I cannot because we have other speakers and we would like to move this on into committee later. So I thank you for your time.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlsson): Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to join the debate on this bill. It is one of the first issues, or it is related to one of the first issues, that I have spent some time in dealing with since being elected, and the more I look at legislation included in this bill that deals with wildlife management areas, the more I am convinced that we do have a long way to go in this whole area.

This bill represents some very crass politics. I think it also represents some misuse of power in terms of the environment. It represents the kind of political games that have gone on with respect to the environment. I want to talk about the motivation for this bill, and I want to talk about how it is going in the exact opposite direction in terms of dealing with environment and sensitive natural habitat. I also want to talk specifically about Oak Hammock Marsh.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a time when there is more attention being paid to environment issues. The idea that this kind of a bill which is going to give a minister the ability to okay development in a wildlife management area, which is intended to protect natural habitat, is ludicrous. It is going exactly in the opposite direction from what we should be going.

The idea that wildlife management areas—as I read the government's pamphlet which includes a map of all the wildlife management areas in Manitoba, as I read it and I see that these areas are opened for agriculture, forestry, recreation, gravel extraction, and other resource uses currently, I

question the need for what the minister is proposing in this bill. What it points to is something I find quite appalling, which is that this bill is motivated by the development of one project in a specific wildlife management area. As legislators, if we are going to be developing legislation that is going to cover the province on the basis of trying to force through the development of one specific project, I really would say that is highly questionable, and I would even say unethical.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what is motivating this bill, and it becomes more and more clear as we have gone along. I have spent quite a bit of time consulting with groups who are going to be opposed to this bill, as they were opposed to a number of the other projects that come in wildlife management areas.

* (1200)

The other thing that is questionable and reprehensible about this bill is that it is not democratic. As I said, to give a minister the kind of authority to okay development in a wildlife management area that this bill does, it feeds into the notion that politics is moving in the opposite direction in terms of the environment than we should be. We want to move legislation that is going to give the public more say, the public more empowerment to have some say in what happens with respect to the environment. This is going in the opposite direction. No wonder people are cynical when we can have politicians pass legislation that is going to allow them to push through their pet projects, and to protect the developer who has been given public funds to develop in specifically wildlife management areas.

I think this bill, as it ties into the development at Oak Hammock Marsh Wildlife Management Area, is becoming a symbol for this government's true approach to environment and natural resources related issues. They are trying to put in some wording that is going to protect some species—polar bears and some toads, I understand from reading the bill—but we know that the real intent of this bill is to make it easier for the development of Oak Hammock Marsh to go ahead and to protect Ducks Unlimited and to give the minister the authority to do that.

It brings into question the whole notion of wildlife management areas and again, when I look at the pamphlet describing where they are and what wildlife management areas are there for, I question

wildlife management areas for whom? We are seeing that it is not for protection of wildlife in and of itself, it is management for the needs of people, often, as we are seeing in this case as it relates to Oak Hammock Marsh, for hunters.

I find that appalling, and when you look at the history of wildlife management areas, I would say that we should be looking at legislation that is going to dramatically change our approach to wildlife management areas.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other things that is a problem with this bill is that with this bill the government is sending a very contradictory message to the public. On the one hand, during the campaign they were talking about bringing in legislation and programs for endangered spaces in Manitoba. They talked about wanting to do more research to protect endangered species as well. Then, on the other hand, they are sending this very contradictory message, which is going to give the minister and politicians the ability to have any kind of development they see fit to go ahead in a wildlife management area.

I would say that is a very contradictory and confusing message to be giving to the public. People are wanting more protection from business or government development in areas that are designated as sensitive or designated as environmentally selective or of importance to maintain in their natural state.

I would suggest that, if we continue on in the trend that this government is taking with respect to Oak Hammock Marsh, which is not only developing legislation like this, which gives the minister the ability to okay development, but also turns over the management of wildlife management areas to a corporation, again we are moving in the wrong direction, and there will be no point in having wildlife management areas designated as to be protected by the Crown or by the government.

We can look at this government's treatment of Oak Hammock Marsh in the sense that what is happening is environmentally special areas are being seen as another business opportunity. This is the point I was trying to make the other day in Question Period, where we are not seeing a true interest in ecology education or environmental education or developing natural interpretive centres. If people really wanted to experience nature, they would just go out and experience nature. They do not need a building and an interpretive centre and

slide shows and alligator ponds. I do not know when alligator ponds were natural to Manitoba, but that is what is in the Oak Hammock Marsh proposal.

I would suggest that this government is more interested, be it with polar bears or with wetland areas, of capitalizing on natural environments so that they can create another tourist industry which is going to be more in the line of a museum or Disneyland, rather than getting people out into nature so that they can experience and start to truly appreciate the environment and learn about ecology and ecosystems as they naturally cycle and naturally contribute to the life of the planet.

As we are going to see with Oak Hammock Marsh, as we look at the plan that Ducks Unlimited and the Minister of Natural Resources has authorized, which is going to create not a natural experience for people but, I would say, a very unnatural one. It points to the whole approach that this government is taking to sustainable development. Again, one of the points that I was trying to make the other day with respect to Oak Hammock Marsh is, this area is not going to be able to sustain the kind of tourism that this Minister sees for the area.

One of the points in the plan for Oak Hammock Marsh Wildlife Management Area is that there will be over 200,000 visitors by the third year of operation. It is interesting when you compare that with the pamphlet on Oak Hammock Marsh that this government issued before the environmental assessment was completed, I might add. They had a pamphlet out that was talking about how wonderful Oak Hammock Marsh is going to be after Ducks Unlimited got to it with its new building.

When you look at the picture in that pamphlet, you will see three children walking through the marsh with an armload of bulrushes. I would say that you combine that picture with 200,000 visitors to the marsh and we are not going to have a marshland. That is the point I am trying to make with respect to sustainable development, the kind of tourism that this Minister sees for Oak Hammock Marsh.

* (1210)

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): The next pamphlets . . . of the bulrushes: No more bulrushes will be picked in my marsh.

Ms. Cerilli: The minister says, his marsh. I would think it is the marsh that belongs to the people of

Manitoba. I would say, though, that is a very strong message in terms of the kind of vision that this government has for sustainable development and the kind of vision that this government has for the environment, where the environment is nothing more than another thing that business can use to develop, and not that that is inherently something that is a problem, but it is when you go for the big glitzy commercial kind of development that this government and Ducks Unlimited are proposing for Oak Hammock Marsh. That is one of the things that we are objecting to.

People all over this province go to wildlife management areas to have a natural wilderness experience. I, throughout my lifetime, have been an avid canoeist and an avid camper, and I have used the parks and wildlife management areas and natural environment in this province a tremendous amount, and I am always amazed at the number of different kinds of ecosystems and natural environments we have in this province. What we want to do to educate people is to bring them out into the wilderness, and that is one of the things that is a selling point of the proposed development of the wildlife management area in Oak Hammock Marsh. People are saying, we want to bring people to the marsh. We want them to see the birds and to see the natural wetland environment, and that is wonderful, but let us do that with the natural environment intact, let us do that and give them a truly natural experience. We do not need to have this museum of an interpretative centre.

You can see, Mr. Speaker, that it is not just anymore the office complex that people are objecting to in terms of Oak Hammock Marsh, it is also the nature of the Ducks Unlimited complex.

One of the other things that has been used to sell the project at Oak Hammock Marsh by Ducks Unlimited is the notion that Ducks Unlimited is a conservation organization. -(interjection)- Pardon? Well, I have some -(interjection)-

Listen to the point I am going to make. They are interested not in a holistic way with preserving wetlands. They have a very specific interest in ducks, told to us by their name. One of the problems that a lot of the opponents to this project have, especially if they gain management of the entire wildlife management area, is that their concern will be exclusively or limited to ducks and other waterfowl. That is not in keeping with what environmentalists and ecologists know about how

ecology works. You have to have management and interest in the entire wetland, in the entire marsh, into all the species that are involved in this habitat. You cannot focus on one specific species.

The other thing that is related to this is the nature of Ducks Unlimited. We know, and the public is becoming more and more aware of where Ducks Unlimited gets its money from, of who are the backers of Ducks Unlimited, that it is directly tied to waterfowl and duck hunting. The fact that that is becoming more public, I would say, is what is generating the opposition to this project. It is generating—we saw yesterday that I had a petition, which did not as I said have 300 names on it, it had 800 names on it. That petition was developed by two high school students.

I would say that this government is making a very big mistake in going through with this development, because the public is seeing through the project and is very much opposed. It is going to be a report card for this government's record on the environment.

Mr. Speaker, we are anxious for this bill to go to committee. There are a number of groups out there who have an interest in wildlife management areas and also have an interest in, specifically, Oak Hammock Marsh Wildlife Management Area, which, I have said, is the motivation for this bill. We will be proposing amendments to this bill. I would hope that the government and the Minister for Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) will reconsider this bill and reconsider the developments at Oak Hammock Marsh, which is motivating this bill. Thank you very much.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), that debate of this bill be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe this matter is already standing in the name of the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk). I believe the House has granted leave for this matter to remain standing. Leave? Yes, that has been agreed already upon.

Bill 43—The Workers Compensation Amendment Act (2)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), Bill 43, The Workers Compensation Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail, standing in the name of the honourable member for

Wellington (Ms. Barrett). Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: Leave is denied.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise to speak today on Bill 43. Bill 43 is somewhat of a routine bill. Not having spent many years in this House, I am not personally aware of that routine, having researched the issue, I see that stemming from many, many years it has been necessary to bring back the payment schedule under The Workers Compensation Act to update it, to keep abreast of the real cost of living and the real amount of payments that are owed injured workers. The bill would increase the payments to surviving dependents of workers killed before 1974, as well as increase the minimum and maximum payments under Section 28 of the act.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly unfortunate, and I am sure the minister will agree, that we have to do this every once in a while. It is somewhat unfortunate that at the time—and perhaps people could not foresee the ravages of inflation over decades and decades—they put in set figures. Any time you put in set amounts of money, it is generally a mistake, because as time goes on you are inevitably forced to change those figures. Therefore, we look forward to the promised legislation from the minister, which will put in a more regularized formula for updating this. We do not have to come back to the House and ask members to go through the legislative process to pass new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is eager, as I believe all parties are in this House, to see this bill go forward to committee and be put into law. It is a bill which we hope will result in immediate benefits to those who deserve the higher amounts of money.

* (1220)

Again, it is the hope of the Liberal Party, with respect to all kinds of issues on Workers Compensation, that we can develop and create a more user-friendly system, a system that better achieves the goals of the Workers Compensation scheme, which is an ancient scheme of sorts. It has been around for many, many decades. It was an agreement. It was a bargain between the workers of this province and between business, and each gave something up in order to get something in return. Workers are supposed to have gotten fair

compensation when they were injured at work in return for their giving up their right to sue their employer, which was a significant concession at the time. It is incumbent upon all to respect that bargain that was made and to ensure that the real amounts paid reflect what is truly owed those who are receiving dependants, or those who are injured.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that in keeping with the modern practice we can put into place a system, a regime, whereby these amounts are regularly increased to reflect the cost-of-living increases and changes in the financial situation of those who are receiving benefits.

We are eager, as I have said—I believe all parties are—to see this legislation passed, these increases allowed to go through. I am led to believe that as soon as this passes, we can put those increases into place. So we greatly look forward to that and look forward to seeing this passed speedily onto the committee stage.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 43, The Workers Compensation Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du

travail. Is it the privilege of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 44—The Public Utilities Board Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), Bill 44, The Public Utilities Board Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Régie des services publics, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). Stand.

Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave? Agreed. Is it the will of the House to call it 12:30?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed. The hour being 12:30 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday.

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Friday, May 31, 1991

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Ministerial Statements

Canadian Armed Forces Appreciation Day Filmon	2747
Doer	2748
Carstairs	2749
Census Day Stefanson	2749
L. Evans	2750
Gaudry	2750

Oral Questions

CFB Shilo Doer; Filmon	2751
Free Trade Agreement Storie; Stefanson	2753
Manufacturing Industry Storie; Stefanson	2753
Fournier Stands Manufacturing Gaudry; Stefanson	2754
Rural Development Corporations Wowchuk; Downey	2755
4-H Clubs Wowchuk; Findlay	2756
Environment Act Cerilli; Cummings	2756

Shoal Lake Cerilli; Cummings	2757
Firearms Control Legislation Carstairs; McCrae	2757
Court Reporters Chomiak; McCrae	2758
GRIP Program Plohman; Findlay	2759
Gender Equity Curriculum Consultant Carstairs; Mitchelson	2760

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Second Readings

Bill 18, Municipal Amendment Act Downey	2760
Bill 46, Highway Traffic Amendment Act Driedger	2761
Bill 52, Family Maintenance Amendment Act McCrae	2763
Bill 38, Wildlife Amendment Act Hickes Cerilli	2764 2768
Bill 43, Workers Compensation Amendment Act (2) Edwards	2771