

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 8 July, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your Committee met on Thursday, May 21; Thursday, May 28; Thursday, June 4; Thursday, June 18; and Tuesday, July 7, 1987 in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1986. At the meeting on Tuesday, July 7, 1987, your Committee elected Mr. C. Santos as Chairperson.

Messrs. C.E. Curtis, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Manitoba Telephone System; E.J. Robertson, Acting President, Manitoba Telephone System; G. McKenzie, Managing Partner, The Coopers and Lybrand Consulting Group; and other staff members of the Manitoba Telephone System provided such information as was requested by members of the Committee with respect to the Annual Report and business of the Manitoba Telephone System.

Your Committee examined the Annual Report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1986, of the Manitoba Telephone System, and adopted the same as presented.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, your Standing Committee on Agriculture presents their First Annual Report.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Tuesday, July 7, 1987, in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider Bills referred.

Your Committee heard representations on Bill No. 14 - An Act to amend The Milk Prices Review Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le contrôle du prix du lait, as follows:

Mr. Archie Bruce - Manco Dairies
Mr. Mike Gadora - People's Cooperative Ltd.
Mr. Craig Finnie - The Manitoba Milk Producers' Marketing Board

Your Committee has considered:

Bill No. 15 - The Crop Insurance Act; Loi sur l'assurance récolte, and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered:

Bill No. 14 - An Act to amend The Milk Prices Review Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le contrôle du prix du lait;

Bill No. 41 - An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élevage,

and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: I move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. C. BAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Agriculture.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, please clarify. Is that the same committee report the Honourable Member for Kildonan just presented? Is it a different one?

MR. C. BAKER: Madam Speaker, I understand it's already been done. I apologize.

MADAM SPEAKER: Right. Thank you.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

I would like to table for information of members the Annual Report of the Manitoba Properties Inc. for the fiscal year ended January 31, 1987 . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: . . . and also the Supplementary Estimates Information of the 1987-88 Departmental Revenue Estimates, Department of Finance.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. J. McCRAE introduced, by leave, Bill No. 73, An Act to Continue Brandon University Foundation.

ORAL QUESTIONS

St. Boniface Hospital - closure of eye unit

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Acting Minister of Health.

Madam Speaker, can the Minister inform the House where the over 300 patients who are on the waiting list at St. Boniface Hospital for eye surgery will go once the eye unit at St. Boniface Hospital is closed?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

St. Boniface Hospital - rerouting of patients

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister.

Did the Minister give approval to hospitals to reroute patients to other facilities that are already working at full capacity in order to cut their deficits?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, again in the absence of the Minister, I'll take that question as notice.

Eye surgery - assessment of needs and services in the province

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

Has the Minister assessed the needs and services for eye surgery in the province, given that the Health Sciences Centre has just reduced eye beds, Misericordia's eye ward is working to full capacity, and Seven Oaks Hospital has been asked to cut back the number of cataract surgeries from around 1,300 to around 1,150?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Again, Madam Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and get the information back to the member.

Free-standing facility for eye patients - planning and cost of

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: While the Minister is taking that question as notice, maybe he could find out also whether the Minister of Health is planning to open a free-standing facility to accommodate these patients and at what cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Again, Madam Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

St. Boniface Hospital - closing of Ward 4B

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a further question for the Acting Minister of Health.

In conjunction with a proposal to trim \$2.5 million from its annual budget, it's my understanding that the St. Boniface Hospital has proposed certain bed closures.

I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether or not the entire 4B Ward is proposed to be closed. That includes not only 11 ophthalmology beds that have been referred to by my colleague for River East, but 12 or 13 ear, nose and throat beds and additional orthopedic beds.

Is that part of the proposal that has been put forward for closure in order to trim that \$2.5 million from the St. Boniface Hospital budget?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I will certainly take that question as notice. I'm not sure whether, in fact, those questions weren't asked last week, but I'll take it as notice.

I would indicate to the members opposite that the Health budget has increased by more than \$118 million over the last year, which is much more, on a per capita basis, than is taking place in Conservative provinces. So I wonder what solution Conservatives would have to this situation.

St. Boniface Hospital - alternate facilities for surgery

MR. G. FILMON: I can assure the Minister that these are new proposals for bed closures and cutbacks in addition to the ones that . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: . . . had been asked about in other hospitals in the past week or two.

Madam Speaker, now that all of these emergency surgery beds are proposed to be cut or closed at St. Boniface Hospital, where will the doctors be able to go to admit patients for this type of specialty surgery?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

St. Boniface Hospital - waiting lists as a result of bed closures

MR. G. FILMON: I wonder if the Minister could indicate what effect this will have on waiting lists for surgery in these specialty areas, the closure of all of these beds that is being proposed, as I understand it, at St. Boniface Hospital.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I will certainly take that question as notice, but I should indicate that these decisions are made by independent boards that are established and have operated in this way for probably the last 20 or 30 years, and they are the ones that make decisions as to what budgets they can live within. I know they've been getting increases that are substantially greater than the cost-of-living increases, Madam Speaker, so it's a matter of them establishing their priorities. But certainly, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, I'll take his question as notice and try and bring him back the information.

St. Boniface Hospital - closure to control deficit

MR. G. FILMON: In taking that as notice, would the Minister indicate whether or not these closures, this proposal, is in order to meet the requirements given to them by the Health Services Commission to cut \$2.5 million from their budget; that, in fact, the closure decisions and the study flows directly from that mandate by the Health Services Commission to cut \$2.5 million?

HON. W. PARASIUK: We, in fact, have provided a very significant increase to all hospitals, including St. Boniface Hospital. It would appear that St. Boniface Hospital, with its operations, has put itself into a deficit position.

I'm surprised that the Leader of the Opposition would come along saying that somehow the government is the one that has put St. Boniface into a deficit position. I think it was yesterday that they were arguing that we should not have deficits and that no one should have deficits and today, Madam Speaker, they are saying that we should increase the deficit.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, we're talking about priorities. This is the same member . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Yes. This is the same member who caused a big fuss . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: . . . because people were being given two strips of bacon rather than three.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Now we're talking about the closures of entire wards.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Question period is not a time for debate. The honourable member with a question.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Madam Speaker.

I'm sorry, I got carried away. I thank you for your admonition.

Workers Compensation Board - Wiebe Report - investigation re allegations

MR. G. FILMON: My question is for the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board.

Within the past two or three weeks, I have asked him, on numerous occasions, questions about the Wiebe Report, the report of the former director of Finance on the Workers Compensation Board, in which he said, among other things, that the board routinely was making overpayments and then had taken a decision to make no effort to collect on overpayments.

I wonder if he has had an opportunity to investigate that allegation and if he can report back to us on that?

HON. W. PARASIUK: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition got up and made a speech about health and then has asked a question to the member responsible for the Workers Compensation.

I would like to know whether, in fact, I can respond to the inaccuracies put on the record by the Leader of the Opposition when he was out of order?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member does not have a point of order. I admonished the honourable leader for his speech, and he asked a question.

The Honourable Minister responsible for Workers Compensation to answer the question.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, the Wiebe Report - Wiebe, who was the director of finance, made the report to the chief executive officer. The chief executive officer has dealt with the report and he has disputed most of the allegations made in that report.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, is the Minister responsible saying that overpayments are not being made at the Workers Compensation Board, that's been investigated and he's satisfied that the allegation is untrue?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I have asked for a report on that, Madam Speaker. I have not received the report back at this time. When I do get the report back, I'll share that information with the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I've asked questions for almost a month now on that particular item.

In accordance with his investigation, I'd like to give the Minister a cheque for \$500, which appears to have been a duplicate cheque that's been given to me by a claimant at Workers Compensation, and a file of information concerning his problems. But, among them, he has asked me to present the Minister with this cheque, which is a duplicate cheque of \$500 on the same item that he has been paid for.

Will he accept the cheque from a claimant who doesn't want it?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: I would suggest that the member table it and I'll deal with it.

Natural gas industry - regulation of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Madam Speaker, I would like to give the Minister an opportunity to clarify comments attributable to him, as a result of statements made by the Federal Minister in the last 24 hours, having to do with the Manitoba-Alberta natural gas situation.

My specific question to the Minister is: Is the Minister of Energy and Mines welcoming back some form of regulation with respect to the industry?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, what I said - and I think that the Member for Lakeside is referring to a headline in the Winnipeg Free Press, which again doesn't necessarily follow the story, but headline writers for the Free Press tend to do that.

What I did say is I said yesterday that, if the Federal Government does get involved in acting between provinces with respect to matters of gas pricing and accessibility of gas, there would be a type of reregulation back on the natural gas industry.

The Federal Minister of Energy and Mines has indeed indicated that publicly, and to me privately, that if they did get involved, this could lead to reregulation. My comeback to him, when he made that point, was that right now we don't have a deregulated system anyway, and that what we have is a regulated-deregulated system which is a contradiction in terms, and that is why it's not working.

Natural gas industry - continuity of supply

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister.

In that same response reported by whomever, the Minister seemed to indicate that one of the advantages of some form of regulation would be continuity of long-term supply.

My very specific question to the Minister is: Does that apply to us, that the current arrangements that he has made and announced in the House do not have a long-term supply feature about them, do not have continuity of supply in those arrangements that are currently being negotiated?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I welcome the question so that I can clarify my statements for the Member for Lakeside.

Under a regulated system, which we had up until a year-and-a-half ago, we had at least a 15-year surplus requirement that producers had to prove was available to meet Canadian suppliers for the future before gas could be exported to United States.

In some instances, that was a 25-year supply of natural gas had to be proven to be in existence to safeguard all Canadian consumers' long-term energy requirements with respect to natural gas.

With deregulation, that has all been waived so that we do not have security of supply as we had before deregulation for Canadian consumers. We, of course, were worried about that both then and now.

Also, in a regulated system, we had price security. We had a range of prices so we had a floor in terms of how low prices could go according to administration and regulations, but also a ceiling as to how high prices could be shocked upwards, in large part, because of actions taken by people outside Canada, mainly OPEC.

We, in fact, in Canada, experienced price shocks with respect to petroleum and natural gas through the Seventies - '73, '75, '78 and '79 - and those were very major price increases, but we were protected by what was called the "Made in Canada" oil and natural gas policy.

With deregulation, all those protections have indeed been removed, Madam Speaker, so that consumers find themselves vulnerable to future price shocks, and that is one of the reasons why this government is acting to try to protect consumers against future price shocks with respect to natural gas price increases.

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, I appreciate that history lesson, but the Minister fails to answer the very specific question.

That question is: The announcement that he and his First Minister made with respect to natural gas and the initiatives being considered by this administration, do those arrangements that he has entered into with other than our past suppliers, are they long-term arrangements?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Madam Speaker, I've indicated in the House before that there is a package of gas contracts that indeed go to a length of 15 years, which is a long-term arrangement meeting all concerns of Alberta and other people that we, in fact, have long-term contracts.

We do have a package of long-term contracts going up to 15 years. Some of them are of shorter-term duration to allow for a phasing-in of gas reserves that we are intending to purchase directly, which we can acquire at a very good saving today, and we would phase those in at the future, but our gas contracts do extend for a period of up to 15 years.

Manitoba Developmental Centre - fire safety system at Northgrove

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

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

Madam Speaker, on April 28, 1977, under an NDP government, eight residents of the Manitoba Developmental Centre perished in a fire, six years after they had been warned by the Provincial Fire Commissioner to install a fire alarm system and sprinkler system. When that government was overturned, the Member for Lakeside, then the Minister, put hundreds of thousands of dollars into that facility to upgrade the fire system.

Can the Minister of Community Services tell us why they had a fire alarm system for Northgrove that had

been purchased by that Sterling Lyon Government but hadn't been installed, why they left it to rust and rot while the residents of Northgrove were at risk for five years?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, this is a question that has been asked nine or ten times before. The answer remains the same.

The elements of a fire safety system, including piping and some of the sprinkler materials, had been purchased before the decision was made to phase out the Northgrove building. What had not been budgeted for was the 20-times-more amount of funding required to reconstruct the doorways and, in fact, make the fire and safety system effective.

The decision of the government to phase out the Northgrove building was taken in consultation with the Fire Commissioner, and the Fire Commissioner agreed, along with the temporary extra provisions that were put in for fire safety in the interim, to go along with the plan we had because of our clear intent to vacate the building and demolish it.

Manitoba Developmental Centre - government plans to improve buildings at MDC

MR. E. CONNERY: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

Last Friday she had said that she wasn't aware of any major development program that the Sterling Lyon Government had done, and I want to make sure that she knew that our party had done a lot.

Madam Speaker, is it the policy of the government to fix up garages at the Manitoba Developmental Centre and to put elevators into administration buildings while the residents and the workers are working and living in very poor conditions, very poor environmental conditions, which the Ombudsman said? Has she now got plans that she can tell us about to improve the buildings at the MDC?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the notion of program, when we were talking about the Developmental Centre, refers to a medical or developmental program that directly benefits the residents, and that was the sense in which I was using the word "program." I do agree that, after that disastrous fire, there was a gradual program or plan for upgrading the fire and safety provisions.

With regard to current improvements, there was a flurry about a week ago about a garage having received some repairs. Madam Speaker, there was a total of \$500 spent because there was a lean-to attached to a garage that's on-site, used by the doctor that's on 24-hour call. This lean-to was in damaged condition. Local children were playing on it and it was determined necessary to remove that lean-to to prevent any injury. In so doing, the roof of the garage received some damage and a total of \$500 was spent in giving a repair to that roof and some painting to the garage. So, again, it was a safety measure.

With regard to the elevator that has been in the tentative plan for this year's upgrading to MDC, it's been included because there is a provision by Government Services to make buildings accessible to the handicapped when there are major repairs. However, in reviewing the priorities for upgrading, my department currently is querying the priority given to an elevator over against other needed repairs and we hope shortly to be able to announce a revised set of repair priorities.

Manitoba Developmental Centre - safe dispensing of medication

MR. E. CONNERY: My final question to the same Minister.

After the scathing report of the Ombudsman on the poor way that this government has looked after the mentally handicapped at Portage, she said that she would be calling on the College of Physicians and Surgeons to do an investigation into the drugging or overdrugging at the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

Has this report been given to her and, if it has, will she table it in this House?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the Ombudsman's report was reporting on the state of historical inattention paid to the development of programs in that institution for the handicapped, a lack of attention that went through all governments, not only this government. In fact, since this government has been in power, there has been not only a gradual downsizing of the institution, but an improvement of the space and the programming available to the residents.

With regard to the question about the College of Physicians and Surgeons that were reviewing the use of drugs, I have not, as yet, received their report.

Manitoba Investment Savings Certificates - amount of sales reached

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Finance.

Last Saturday, I understand, was the last closing day for the purchase of Manitoba Investment Savings Certificates. The Minister originally predicted \$20 million in sales.

I'm wondering if he reached that figure.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

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

In response to the question, I can confirm that indeed the sales of the Manitoba Investment Savings Certificates have closed and that we have raised, by way of that issue, more money than we had expected. A total of some \$32 million has been raised from Manitobans with respect to the borrowing requirements of the province.

The member will recall that this is the first issue since 1979, since it was discontinued by the previous

Conservative Government. So we're certainly pleased that Manitobans have responded to the Manitoba Investment Savings Certificates that were issued this year.

Manitoba Investment Savings Certificates - demographic statistics

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, a supplementary. This was intended for Manitoba residents and small investors rather than large investors.

I'm wondering if the Minister has received any demographics on who actually purchased these and whether or not the program was successful in reaching the small Manitoba investor.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, all of the statistics have not been drawn together as a result of the completion of the sale last Saturday. Indeed, the figures that I quoted previously may rise slightly as we receive some late returns from remote areas of the province by way of mail or other services.

But I can inform the member that the vast majority of the certificates were sold to individual Manitobans rather than corporations or other institutions. So we're certainly pleased that it has been used as a vehicle for savings and investment by ordinary Manitobans.

Manitoba Investment Savings Certificates - future sale of

MR. M. DOLIN: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary. It seemed to be a rather short period that people could purchase them, only about two weeks and, you know, I myself wanted to get some and didn't get the opportunity.

I'm wondering, will the Minister be having this program again. Will this become an annual program where Manitobans can invest in their own province?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Madam Speaker, I sincerely regret that the member did not have the opportunity to . . .

MR. M. DOLIN: Give me another chance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I would hope that his situation, as a member of the Legislative Assembly, is an isolated one. It was the shortest period of sale of any issue that's been done by the province in the history of the province in doing these types of issues; it was the shortest period of sales. Regrettably, that occurred because of the time of year when we were able to launch the series.

As you recall, it was first announced in the Budget as a means to ensure that we attempt to get more of our capital needs supplied in the Province of Manitoba, in the country and, because of the time needed to get it in place, it could only be put in place in the latter part of June. It's our intention to continue it and, hopefully, have it earlier in the year next year, and for a longer period of time, and even more successful next year.

Stonewall quarry operators - restricted hours and charges laid

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

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

On June 15 of this year, the Clean Environment Commission ordered quarry operators in the Stonewall area to restrict their hours of operation from 6:00 a.m. in the morning to 8:00 p.m., and to not operate on Sundays or holidays.

On July 1, Canada Day, one of the quarry operators was charged - charges which were later dropped because Carl Orcutt, the director of Environmental Control, stated the Minister of Environment had stayed the order.

Did the Minister stay this order?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Madam Speaker, the answer to that is no, I did not stay the order; and, secondly, Madam Speaker, no charges were laid in this particular case.

The operator in this case, Madam Speaker - there are more than one - the one that was operating more than one shift was operating under an order of the Clean Environment Commission. But because of continuing complaints from residents, local residents, the Clean Environment Commission was asked by myself to hold new hearings and issue a new order, which they did, Madam Speaker, upon which the operator immediately appealed and requested that I stay the order. Until he got a reply from me, there was perhaps room for some misunderstanding in terms of whether, on the part of the operator, the new order was in force or whether the existing, the old order, was in force.

That, Madam Speaker, has definitely been cleared up by the very fact that last Friday a letter was delivered to the operator and his lawyer, stating that there was no stay of order.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Can the Minister confirm then that charges will now be laid against any quarry operators who are, in fact, operating outside of this order?

HON. G. LECUYER: Madam Speaker, the letter states, in effect, that the request for a stay of order, pending my dealing with the appeal, is denied. Therefore, should they not obey the order, they will be prosecuted.

Having said that, Madam Speaker, there is a meeting scheduled with the operator and the citizens who appeared in front of the Clean Environment Commission on this issue. I'm not sure for what date they're slated, but there are meetings slated so that I can hear the appeal.

Falcon Lake - Dust Abatement Program, spreading of oil

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

Madam Speaker, we're at the peak of the holiday and vacation season at the present time, especially in our provincial parks.

Can the Minister indicate why, at this time, his staff would allow to have oil spread in a place like Falcon Lake, to the annoyance and the inconvenience of many, many people?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

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

I'm glad that the Opposition critic recognizes the popularity of our Manitoba parks and the fact that they are being utilized to a great extent.

One of the concerns that has been brought to our attention, particularly in Falcon Lake, and it had been mentioned last year, was the problem with dust in the area. We utilized a product which was very successful, and we were complimented by the people in the area for our Dust Abatement Program. That program, I am aware, was to be implemented again this year. I'm not aware of the particulars as to the timing of the application, Madam Speaker, but I will inquire and report back.

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

The people are coming in spite of the efforts, seemingly, of this Minister and his department of keeping the people away from the parks.

Provincial Parks - charge for firewood

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

The Minister implemented firewood charges this spring in provincial parks for people who are out there camping. Could the Minister indicate what has happened since that time? It is my understanding that people are stripping branches and trees and trying to get away from the charges that are being laid.

I would ask the Minister whether he would consider a change in the policy and remove the charges for firewood in the provincial parks.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, this is an experimental program which we indicated would be in operation in the southeast portion of the province for this year.

It's interesting to hear from some of the members opposite criticizing the program where, in fact, some of the interest came from the operators of concessionaires who said that they were prepared to work with the Parks Branch in providing the fuel wood, and that would relieve some of the pressure on our staff and make that staff time available to other activities. It should be noted, Madam Speaker, that the camping charge in those parks, the fee for the use of the facility, is reduced in those areas where fuel wood is sold.

We will be reviewing the experiment at the end of this summer to see what the response of our campers was, and we will make a decision at that time as to

whether we should be continuing with that. But indications are, from most reports at this stage, that campers are not unhappy.

We did experience - I'm sure the member will know - some problems of providing fuel wood earlier where there was some indiscriminate use of the fuel wood. Now, if there are problems in terms of campers utilizing standing trees, clearly there is provision for those to be dealt with at this time.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, a final supplementary - a different question really, a comment I'd just like to make.

I hope there are still trees and branches left by the time this Minister has reviewed that program.

Provincial Parks - qualify for school tax rebate re charges in lieu of taxes

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, this Minister also implemented a program of charging \$500 for residents who are permanently in provincial parks and this is supposed to be in lieu of taxes.

My question to the Minister is: Can the Minister indicate whether these people will qualify for the school tax rebate as all other Manitobans do?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, before answering the question on the permanent residents in the parks, I just want to express my disappointment that the Member for Emerson would characterize campers as people who would go around breaking the branches off trees. Clearly, that is not our view.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

May I remind the Honourable Minister that answers should not provoke debate?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: On the matter of permanent residents in the parks . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources has the floor.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, we have, over a period of some 20 years, been dealing with the problem of those who have permits for seasonal use of the parks choosing to occupy these sites on a year-round basis. That has caused a problem for campers and neighbouring municipalities as well.

At this time, we are trying to work that problem through. We have a proposal before the public in Manitoba for this debate. We have had meetings in Flin Flon and The Pas. We are having meetings in the Whiteshell area as well.

One of the proposals is that there would be a \$500 charge to those who would be given permission to occupy this on a year-round basis, and it is our intention that those who would be given that permission would, as well, be eligible for the property tax credit.

Alcoholism Foundation - cut in support to

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I have a question of the First Minister.

Madam Speaker, Manitobans are continually becoming alarmed about the cutbacks in health care in this province and hospital bed closures. Madam Speaker, the Alcoholics Anonymous program in this province has done a tremendous amount of good work.

My question to the First Minister: Why would his government cut back on support to the Alcoholism Foundation of this province by reducing the staff persons out of Brandon by two, the administrator and the assistant? Why would the First Minister cut back on support to the Alcoholics Anonymous in the Westman region?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I believe that the decision has been taken by the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba which administers the alcohol treatment programs for all of Manitoba. They have made that in their best judgment in terms of operating in a way that best meets the needs of all Manitobans. It has been done with the view of providing the best possible service to all of Manitoba and, as a result, there may have to be some prioritization somewhere.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, this is to the First Minister.

How can the First Minister and his government say that the support to the Alcoholics Anonymous in the Westman region will be better served out of Winnipeg when he removes two staff officers out of Brandon who traditionally looked after that area? How can they be better served out of the central office in Winnipeg, Madam Speaker?

Will he screw up his courage and stand up for the people and reverse that decision?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I believe the Honourable Minister indicated that that matter is not within the jurisdiction of the government.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, to the First Minister.

In view of the fact that the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, the AFM, gets their support from the province, Madam Speaker; and in view of the fact that the board is appointed by the Government of Manitoba, of which 16 members are appointed - 5 from rural Manitoba, the balance from the City of Winnipeg - my question to the First Minister is: Will he stand up and support the Alcoholism Foundation of this province and the alcoholic movement in this province and replace those staff officers in Brandon?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, let the record show that these people laugh at hospital cutbacks.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: They laugh at cutbacks to support Alcoholics Anonymous.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I'd be happy to answer that question as Acting Minister of Health.

I might indicate to the Member for Arthur that members on both sides of the Legislature were not laughing at the matter of alcoholism. They were laughing at the way in which the Member for Arthur presented the question; wherein he asked on the one hand about reductions, possibly, of an administrative nature made by the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, and then he got up and asked whether in fact we would back the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba with respect to its actions.

If he, in fact, is asking us to support the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba with respect to his judgment as to how, from an administrative perspective, it can provide services best to Manitobans without political interference of that nature from the Member for Arthur with respect to a purely administrative manner, then certainly we will provide support to the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, which is what the Member for Arthur has just asked us to do.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, a question to the First Minister.

Has the First Minister responded to the letter asking him to do just that, which he received on June 29 from the Parkland Region, Madam Speaker? Has he responded to the letter in which they point out their concerns, the No. 1 concern being the rural people of Manitoba are tired of perimeter mentality under this administration? Has he answered that letter yet?

Ask your Minister if you haven't got the guts to stand up for yourself.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, it's not a humorous situation in this House, but rather it is a tragic situation.

The inconsistencies and the contradictions that we observe from day to day without exception - demands so far in this Session totalling between \$400 million and \$500 million; demands that we intervene insofar as the priorities being established within agencies that are funded by government, and rationalizing administrative services; demands daily, Madam Speaker - you can't have it both ways.

Whether it is the Alcoholic Foundation of Manitoba, whether it's any other area, you can't be reducing your deficit, reducing taxes and at the same time demanding, as the honourable members across the way have, an increase in expenditure of \$400 million to \$500 million, Madam Speaker, during the course of this Legislative Session.

SuperValu demonstration - why is Mr. Conklin seized with these matters

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Attorney-General.

Two weeks ago at a violent labour demonstration attended by the Honourable Member for Kildonan and

three other NDP MLA's, there were 14 people arrested at that time. I understand, Madam Speaker, that prosecution decisions haven't been made yet - this is two weeks later - and won't be made until at least the end of July when Mr. Murray Conklin, the Crown Attorney involved with the case, will return from his vacation. Well, I know Mr. Conklin well enough to know that he's a very competent Crown Attorney.

Is there any reason why Mr. Conklin is seized with those matters?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I'll take that as notice.

I'm not so sure that in fact is the case. In any event, I'll have the Director of Prosecutions review the issue.

Prosecution decisions - length of time to settle

MR. J. McCRAE: Madam Speaker, the Free Press is wrong again when it quotes an official in the Department of Attorney-General as saying the whole thing is in abeyance until Mr. Conklin returns. The Free Press, once again, is the villain in this piece, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. J. McCRAE: Is it the policy of the government, in view of the Minister's comments yesterday, that labour dispute infractions of the law are not treated separately or differently from any other infringement, or alleged infringement, of the law? Is it the policy of the government that all prosecution decisions in this province can take up to five weeks to be made?

HON. R. PENNER: That, of course, depends on the complexity of the given case. We've got some prosecutorial decisions that may take in excess of two years before charges are laid. Those, of course, are exceptional and are in cases of a very complex nature. Cases of the kind which I assume to be involved in the affair during the picketing at the SuperValu store would not, of course, take that long.

I said I would take the matter as notice. With respect to the Member for Brandon West's allusion to the Free Press, I simply said I'm not so sure that that is the case. I made no inference with respect to the Free Press, but it would be responsible, on my part, to check out exactly what the facts are as to who is seized of the case and why. If, in fact, it is Murray Conklin, there may be particular reasons and I would want to know what they are. I simply assured the member, as I assured the House, that I'll find out.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: May I direct the attention of honourable members to the Gallery where we have 52 students from all parts of Canada participating in the

Shad Valley Manitoba Program, studying technology at St. John's College at the University of Manitoba.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this afternoon. May I add that the students are under the direction of Mr. Al Lansdown. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to revert back to statements due to my absence at the beginning of . . .

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I wish to inform members that we received a very thorough briefing on the current status of the Canada-U.S. negotiations from the Prime Minister and from Canada's chief negotiator last evening.

During the meeting, which extended over seven hours, we were taken through an outline of the possible shape of the agreement from the Canadian perspective. We also had an opportunity to discuss the timetable presently proposed by the Government of Canada for concluding this important trade initiative.

I can report that the Canadian and the U.S. negotiators have made some progress on several important issues.

The thoroughness of the presentation on the current state of negotiations was appreciated. I am pleased to be able to report that this gave me and other Premiers an opportunity to raise a number of concerns and to seek further clarification on a number of critical issues of importance to our provinces, and indeed to all Canadians.

I reiterated our major reservations about investment being put on the table, about agriculture, about regional development programming, and about the need to ensure there is a meaningful mechanism for resolving trade disputes.

I also must report, however, that it was very evident that there are still many areas of critical importance to Manitobans, to Canadians, that remain to be clarified. There are significant uncertainties about the content of major components in the proposed agreement. Many questions remain to be answered regarding the differences between the Canadian proposals and the American position on many of these issues.

Until these uncertainties are clarified, until more precise wording is available for analysis, it is simply not possible to assess the potential impact or the implications of a Canada-U.S. trade agreement for a province such as Manitoba.

As a Provincial Government, we in Manitoba are not prepared to provide approval in principle for an agreement of this magnitude and potential significance until we have had adequate opportunity to evaluate its impact and its implications. We are not prepared to write a blank cheque, either to the U.S. Government or to the Government of Canada for Canada-U.S. free

trade as an abstract principle. We must see the final bottom line, read the fine print on all major components of this deal.

Nevertheless, it is very evident that time is becoming increasingly short. We are disappointed, Madam Speaker, that progress in the negotiations to date did not allow us to review a draft agreement at this meeting. This poses a potentially serious problem, in our view.

Members will be aware that in a statement to this House last week, I called for national public hearings on this important policy matter. The Leader of the Opposition supported that call, I am pleased to note. This is a point of principle that I raised during our meeting in Ottawa.

While we intend to pursue this matter further with the Federal Government and other provinces, I regret to say that we did not receive a clear endorsement of the principle and the assurances we would like in this regard.

With no draft of the agreement available at this time, and with a major U.S. deadline for the negotiations only 90 days away, we were not assured that there will be an opportunity for adequate public analysis of and meaningful public input into this agreement.

Let me conclude, Madam Speaker, with a comment I have made several times since we adjourned at 12:30 a.m. this morning.

It is my firm view that this is not a time for sentiments of either overoptimism or overpessimism on this issue.

We should be neither promoting a deal before we finish negotiating it, nor dismissing it out of hand as a failure.

This is a time for realism, for a thorough analysis, for pragmatism.

This is the course we are pursuing and will continue to pursue on this issue of such potential importance to the economic and social future of our province and of our nation.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

I thank the Premier for his progress report on the talks with respect to a freer trade agreement and negotiations that have been carried on by the Government of Canada with the Government of the United States.

It would appear that the agenda that is being followed is the one that this Premier supported and endorsed to begin with. It is going through the process of sorting out the differences and negotiating on a tough basis all the difficult questions that must be resolved between the two countries. Only after that process has reached its full conclusion can a deal be put forward before the provinces, before the people of this country.

Certainly I look forward to the continuing efforts on behalf of both countries, on behalf of Canada, and certainly our interests being represented through those negotiations to ensure that they arrive at a satisfactory conclusion and a positive one, on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

But I must quote a couple of lines from the Premier's statement, one being, and I quote: "We should be

neither promoting a deal before we finish negotiating it, nor dismissing it out of hand as a failure." I wonder how that applies to the ICG agreement that is currently being negotiated and promoted at the same time by this provincial administration under this Premier. He is indeed, and his Minister of Energy is indeed promoting that deal to the people of Manitoba. He says that they know what the bottom line is, but the Minister has not been able to tell us the answers to any questions that have been asked for more than two weeks now.

He says that he is committed to a full public hearing and scrutiny of the arrangements, and yet he won't provide that kind of full and open and complete public scrutiny of the ICG deal before it is entered into. We see nothing of that being offered here.

So I say to the Premier that he ought to be consistent and that, if he believes that negotiation must be done before a package can be put forward, he ought to let that negotiation take place in order that we can get satisfactory results.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, I have some committee changes.

Under Private Bills: Kovnats for Ernst.

Under Municipal Affairs: Findlay for Downey.

Under Privileges and Elections: Connery for Brown.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, before proceeding into Orders of the Day, I'd like to announce that there will be meetings of the Standing Committee on Private Bills tomorrow, July 9, at 10:00 a.m.; and, at the same time, there will be meetings of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections tomorrow, July 9, at 10:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. and Friday, 2:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m., if required. That is to deal specifically with Bill 47. The Standing Committee on Private Bills will deal with those bills that have been referred to it. And there will be a meeting of the Standing Committee of Municipal Affairs tomorrow evening at 8:00 p.m., July 9, to continue consideration of the matters which are currently referred to it and any other matters that may be referred to it in the interim.

Would you call debate on Bill 47, standing in the name of the Member for Charleswood, please?

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 47 - THE HUMAN RIGHTS CODE

MADAM SPEAKER: On the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General,

Bill No. 47, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is my privilege this afternoon to rise and put on the record my position, my few words with respect to Bill 47, so that the constituents of Charleswood know where I stand on this issue and so that the people of Manitoba know how wrong I think the government is in bringing forward not human rights legislation, Madam Speaker, for I support that and I think all members on this side support the basic legislation. But the one dealing with sexual orientation I think, Madam Speaker, has clouded the whole issue of human rights legislation that has been brought forward in this bill. It has in fact detracted substantially I think from the bill in itself that's been brought forward, a bill I think that should be applauded in general terms.

Madam Speaker, I have to wonder at the sincerity of the Attorney-General, the insincerity of this government in bringing forward a bill such as this, loudly proclaiming that they are the supporters of human rights across Manitoba, loudly proclaiming that they are the defenders of those who will be disadvantaged in society by human rights violations, when they themselves practise it on a daily basis.

Madam Speaker, this is an application form from the Province of Manitoba for the requirement of a licence. Madam Speaker, this application form is put forward within the last two weeks by this government containing at least two violations of any potential human rights, of existing human rights legislation. Now how can one accept the sincerity of a government such as this, loudly proclaiming their position, their bringing forward such great legislation, Madam Speaker, when they are in fact violating that legislation, violating the existing legislation on a daily basis. Madam Speaker, they are not major violations in my view, but violations nonetheless.

I'll give you an example, Madam Speaker. In this application, on question 5, it requires that the sex of the applicant be disclosed. For the last 10 years or more, that has been illegal in the Province of Manitoba. It has been illegal to ask the question what sex a person is, but that application came forward just two weeks ago. Madam Speaker, at the same time, it requires you to state your date of birth. Madam Speaker, that is also illegal. You can ask someone if they are over the age of majority or under, but Madam Speaker, it matters not I think in the application for a licence whether or not your specific birth date is known.

Madam Speaker, those are violations. Another violation under the same question is marital status. That, for 10 years in this province, has been illegal to ask. You cannot ask what the marital status of an applicant is, yet this government is doing it at the same time they're proclaiming a bill protecting human rights.

But, Madam Speaker, those were the small violations in my view because the major violation occurs in question seven. The basic principles of law in Manitoba have been compromised with this application. Let me read the question: "Have you ever been charged, indicted or convicted under the law of any province, state or country?" Madam Speaker, the basic principles of law say that until you are proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, you are presumed to be innocent.

Why then does this application require someone to disclose whether someone has been charged, whether someone has been indicted but not convicted, Madam Speaker? I don't understand how a government who proclaims to be the protectors of human rights now produce and require an applicant to answer those kinds of questions. And, Madam Speaker, I will table this application for the benefit of all members of the House and, in particular, for the Attorney-General.

Madam Speaker, that application form is for a licence as an authorized official or a mortgage salesman under The Manitoba Consumer and Corporate Affairs Act. That application came to my office two weeks ago. Madam Speaker, to top it all off, the question of, "Have you ever been charged, indicted or convicted under any law of any province, state or country?" The answer is yes, or no. So if I received a traffic ticket, if I received a speeding ticket and was convicted under that speeding ticket, I would have to answer this question, yes, as if in fact I was a common criminal, as opposed to having a minor highway traffic act violation because in fact, Madam Speaker, I was charged with a speeding ticket and ultimately was convicted with that speeding ticket.

Madam Speaker, I don't think on the public record of this province I would want to see my name associated with having been charged or convicted under any law because the inference, apart from the human rights aspect, the inference alone is that the applicant has done something major in terms of criminal activity, and I think that is wrong as well.

So I will table this application, Madam Speaker, for members of the House and for the Attorney-General so they can review this because I feel, and I have a legal opinion from my own solicitor who has indicated that, even though I have to file one of these applications, I need not answer those questions because they are in fact violations of The Human Rights Act.

Now, Madam Speaker, we deal with the question of The Human Rights Act. I have, as I indicated earlier, grave concerns over the question of sexual orientation being included in that act.

I've had great concern expressed to me, Madam Speaker, from my constituents about including sexual orientation in that act, and I know that those people are not bigots, they are not gay-bashers, they are not out to persecute anyone, but they feel it is morally wrong that sexual orientation ought to be included. I've had any number of letters and telephone calls, Madam Speaker, from those constituents of mine who are very concerned that this government is bringing forward a bill which they feel is morally wrong and an affront to their religious beliefs.

Madam Speaker, I conducted a survey, as did many of my colleagues last spring, with respect to any number of questions. I believe there were 12 or 14 questions on the questionnaire submitted to my constituents.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 1,196 people responded from the questionnaire sent to my constituency. That, Madam Speaker, I think, is a significant poll. Governments make major decisions, corporations make major decisions, based on polls of 1,000 people across a whole province. But here are 1,200 people from the small constituency

of Charleswood who have made, took the time, and spent the 30-odd cents required to mail that response back to me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 88 percent of the respondents of those 1,196 respondents, were opposed to having any additional or special legislation for protection of homosexuals. That's 88 percent, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There can be no question that the people of Charleswood, by virtue of that poll, are opposed to having sexual orientation included in this bill.

In general, minority groups have been classified, based on religion, based on colour, based on race, based on gender. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for some time they've had the protection of basic human rights legislation, notwithstanding the fact that the government ignores its own legislation from time to time, as in the case of the application form submitted.

And it's been accepted, that basic human rights legislation, over those years. It's been accepted by the majority of the people of this province. They have, not because it was legislated I don't think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but because they wanted to accept it. I think people, basically, in this province are good. People basically in this province want to get along, to ensure that everyone has an equal opportunity. They're not out there, by and large, to persecute anyone.

I think many of the old hang-ups of the past have gone with respect to discrimination or to bigotry or those kinds of things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because people have become more tolerant. People have become more understanding. People have come to know other people from other backgrounds, and there is a better mix in society today than perhaps there was 50 or 100 years ago. They've accepted, I think, those principles of human rights, Mr. Deputy Speaker, without really the need for legislation, although the legislation exists in order to protect those it was intended to protect.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, homosexuals and lesbians have the same protection as every other group in society, every other person in society at the present time under that existing legislation and, under the basic principles of the new legislation, they have that same protection.

They have the protection against discrimination on the basis of race or creed or colour or gender. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they hold those same equal rights under the laws, not only of the Province of Manitoba or the country of Canada, they hold those rights under the laws of God, Mr. Deputy Speaker, God, however you define it, whether it's a Christian God or a Muslim God or a Buddhist God or a Jewish God, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or any other kind of God, the Supreme Being. Those laws, I think, throughout those religions, throughout the world are similar in nature, and preach similar tolerances for their fellow man.

In my own case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a Catholic and as a Christian, those same beliefs, those same rights under God, I think, apply for me as well. But what is wrong, what is against God's law is not so much the fact that someone is a homosexual, it's the fact they practice homosexuality. To regularize the question of homosexual practice, to say to people in a statute that such practice is recognized by the Government of Manitoba as being something that ought to be protected against, something that ought to be preserved by statute, something that ought to say to the people of

Manitoba, you cannot say that is wrong because in fact the statute says it is okay, that goes against the grain of the people of Charleswood. It goes against the grain certainly of myself and I think of many of my colleagues who have spoken here today. I'm certain it goes against the grain of members opposite in a number of cases as well but, unfortunately, they have not the opportunity to express their own views. They have to express the views of the party line in this case.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my Bishop, Adam Exner, has said it is wrong, and he does not want to see homosexual orientation or sexual orientation included in The Human Rights Act. My friend, the Bishop for the Member for The Pas, Peter Sutton, said the same thing. The Bishop for the Member for Radisson, the Bishop for the Member for Concordia, the Archbishop of St. Boniface also said the same thing. Pope John II has said the same thing.

What they have said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the fact that one ought not to persecute homosexuals. One ought to have compassion for the problem that they find themselves in, for the illness they find themselves with, but one ought not to persecute them. I suggest that is a reasonable position for any human being to take but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what they are not saying is that we should condone, we should regularize, we should legislate some kind of acceptance of that kind of lifestyle. That's what they are saying. They are saying that is wrong and that is, in fact, what will happen - what is happening - with the implementation of this bill and of this amendment to that bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it disturbs me greatly that by the passage of this amendment and this bill, it will say to the people of Manitoba that the practice of homosexuality is in fact acceptable, acceptable certainly to the government, and should be acceptable then to all of the people of Manitoba, and that is not the case. Certainly in the constituency of Charleswood, it is not the case; 88 percent of those people who responded to my questionnaire said no. They said that they do not want to see additional legislation and many of them wrote in, Mr. Deputy Speaker, over top of the questionnaire that was provided for them to answer "yes" or "no." Many of them wrote in and said basic human rights legislation applies to all Manitobans. It does not apply specifically to any one group or other, any one lifestyle or other; it applies to all Manitobans. And those people said that basic human rights legislation applies to all people in Manitoba and they need not have additional protection. They need not have this amendment contained in this bill, because they are protected by that legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the family unit - and other members have talked of this question - but the family unit is the basis of civilization as we know it. That family unit, apart from the most modern lifestyle, the most modern city, the most modern of civilization, right back to the Third World jungle, the basis of every society and every place on this planet is based on a heterosexual family tradition, man and woman, coming together, procreating and bringing forth children to further the human race.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, homosexuals cannot procreate. So they must do something else. They must recruit, and that is a great danger. I think that is one of the major concerns that the people of Charleswood

certainly, and the people of Manitoba have in their minds when this kind of amendment comes forward.

They must recruit support for their lifestyle. They must convert those people who may presently have a heterosexual lifestyle or who may have no sexual lifestyle because they are just coming to the age of puberty. (Interjection)- My colleague, the Member for Brandon West, indicates that the family unit today is under enough pressure as it is, and Lord knows that's correct. You know that and I know that, and every member in this House knows that.

Divorce rates are high. Pressures of work, of business, of finances, of family breakdown, all of those things coming together need not be nudged or, in fact, pushed over the edge by this kind of an amendment and this kind of legislation coming forward saying that lifestyle, the homosexual lifestyle, is in fact equivalent or equal or acceptable in the eyes of Manitobans to a heterosexual one. That's not, in my view, the kind of thing that we need to have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, others have tried to destroy that family unit. We've had communist regimes, we've had dictators, we've had any number of other kinds of governments of, say, dictators or others, trying to destroy the family unit, and they have not yet succeeded. Yet we should not aid and abet the kind of destruction that is coming forward and the pressures that apply to that family unit because that will see a total breakdown in our society.

The basic human bond and the laws of God and nature, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have provided, and have prevailed well for society as we know it. For 1,000 years and more, we have lived, we have advanced, we have learned new technology and we have still held together as a reasonably cohesive race.

But with the advent of homosexuality - the promotion, if you will, of homosexuality, virtually, in this case - it then causes, I think, a further pressure and a further breakdown in our society and, should that become the prevalent lifestyle, we will be no more.

Homosexuality, in my belief, is not something that you are born with. It is something that is cultivated, something that is learned, something that is taken by preference and is in fact a lifestyle as opposed to something that one is born with. One is born with a yellow or black skin. One is born of Ukrainian descent or Filipino descent or Jewish descent or Mennonite descent or both, but it is a preference.

In the case of homosexuality, it is not a minority in the sense of ethnic groups. It's not a gender, it's not a language-based minority or any other minority as we normally associate in our society. It is something that is cultivated, it is learned, it is taken by preference. It has become in fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a lifestyle.

But if less than 50 percent of the people now smoke, for instance, do they have the right to be treated as a minority? The Member for Brandon West indicated in his address yesterday and asked the same question that, if less than 50 percent of the people in this province smoke, they are now a minority. But it is a minority based on something that is cultivated, something that is learned, something that is taken by preference, and is in fact, in loose terms at least, a lifestyle, a behaviour pattern.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, both fit the criteria. The homosexual lifestyle and that of a smoker fit that same

criteria. Then are they to be protected? Or in fact now are smokers protected, Mr. Deputy Speaker? They're not. They are in fact persecuted by governments in this country. They put up signs that say you can't smoke here, you can't smoke there. You have to have "No Smoking" areas in restaurants. They are in fact persecuted by Ministers of Finance across the whole country. They are taxed to death on that product, that same thing that they learned, they cultivated and they take by preference - smoking. So are they going to now get the same protection as homosexuals under this particular situation because they are discriminated against? Airlines have now said you can't smoke at all on our airplanes. So when someone travels by air, Air Canada for instance, a government airline supported by the taxpayers of this country, are they then to not cry out that they are being discriminated against? Are they not entitled to some protection?

By passing this portion of the legislation regarding sexual orientation, we are holding out to the people of Manitoba the acceptability of a lifestyle that, in my view and certainly the view of my constituents, is not acceptable. I suspect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's the view of the majority of your constituents that it's not acceptable and I suspect that, in the view of the Attorney-General and his constituents, it's not acceptable. But notwithstanding that, they seem to be blindly going ahead because of some fixation, some promise, some lobby group that has in fact convinced them that they need this protection, that they need some way to legitimize their lifestyle.

Perhaps it is as Mr. Vogel has indicated, that he wished to have his male spouse now eligible for government benefits, for pension plans, for health care, dental care and all of those things that apply. Perhaps that's the driving force behind it. I don't know, but certainly there is a problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The young people of this province are very impressionable, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and look forward to role models of various kinds. They read the papers, they watch television, they see the news and they see that the majority government of this province has said that they are passing laws in favour of homosexual lifestyles. Now that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, says to those young people that this is acceptable. Those impressionable young people are going to take that in and they are going to weigh that amongst the other educational intakes that they have from school, from their parents, from other portions of their environment to determine whether something is acceptable, something is available to them, something that they perhaps should investigate - an alternative, a legitimate alternative, as my colleague from Brandon West has said.

We have seen churches come forward in opposition to this, and we are going to see many more, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when this bill presents itself at the standing committee starting tomorrow. We're going to see a number of people, I think, coming forward and condemning the government for this kind of action. There will be a strong lobby in favour of the bill. I'm certain that there will have been sufficient forces mobilized in order to come forward and give some legitimacy to this kind of amendment to that bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but you're going to see many people also opposed on the basis of morality, opposed on the basis of religious beliefs.

We also saw, Mr. Deputy Speaker, or heard yesterday, a comment about AIDS, the spread of a disease that is the No. 1 or will soon be the No. 1 killer in the world today, a disease that is spread 99 percent by homosexual activity. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, scares me greatly.

We legislate and discriminate against people in this province and take away their rights, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by saying, because of the health care costs, motorcyclists will now wear helmets, automobile drivers and passengers will now wear seat belts and, with those two items, we will save ourselves millions of dollars in health care costs. That was the rationale for those items being brought forward, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We have the No 1 killer, AIDS, and in fact we're going out to protect the lifestyle of the people who are the major transmitters of that disease, the No. 1 killer in North America and in fact probably the world, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we're out protecting that lifestyle and saying to others you have to wear a seat belt. Now does that make sense? That, Mr. Deputy Speaker, does not make sense in my view.

The whole matter then boils down, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the beliefs of an individual, beliefs of what is right and wrong, beliefs of what is acceptable or not acceptable, beliefs of what is necessary or unnecessary in our lifestyle. My own, as a Christian, say it is wrong, notwithstanding my colleagues, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who are carrying on a debate of their own. But, in fact, in my view, mine as a Christian, I think that it is wrong that sexual orientation be included in this bill for the reasons as I've stated.

Homosexuality is wrong. However, it is a choice made by individuals, a choice that stems from I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an illness, one that needs to have as much treatment brought forward for it as can humanly be found. But I'm tolerant enough to say that, notwithstanding that, I am tolerant enough to accept that lifestyle will occur. I'm tolerant enough to say let it occur, but let it occur not in public. Let it occur behind closed bedroom doors where government need never intrude, Mr. Deputy Speaker. And don't try to equate the homosexual with a heterosexual lifestyle, one that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the majority of the citizens of this province enjoy and wish to preserve.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. J. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to rise at this time to make a few comments on the bill and to speak generally in favour of the principles involved, but to mention some of the new facets that have been added to the human rights bill which in itself goes back for quite some time, I believe.

I've given a lot of thought to this matter and some study to the bill, and I've discussed it at some length with people whose opinion I appreciate, and I believe now it's become a little clearer to me part of what is involved in this case.

The Attorney-General, when introducing the bill, spoke of wrongful discrimination, and he mentioned that several times. When we look through the bill, we find on innumerable clauses there that there is a

prohibition of discrimination followed by the words, "except where it is reasonable or there is a bona fide reason," or words to that effect. That occurs very generally through the bill, and what is reasonable to the Attorney-General might not be reasonable to me, and what is bona fide to some other member is certainly to vary.

We find that we have a bill that no longer tells us exactly what is prohibited and what must not be done and what the penalty is, but there is there that someone must decide what is reasonable and whether there is a bona fide reason for doing that particular thing.

I recall back in history of several centuries that the head of state had, at that time, a great deal of freedom of action and could imprison people, banish them, exile them, and do any sort of thing at his sole discretion, and do that differently to different citizens of the state. The time that followed that, up to the present, has been a time of making laws applicable to everyone and doing that equally. That is a principle that remains today and the attempt is always made, legal terminology notwithstanding, to let people know exactly what is prohibited and what they cannot do.

I'm a little concerned that we have a bill such as this which says that you must not do this; however, you may do if there is a bona fide reason, or if it is reasonable to do so.-(Interjection)- I guess my cheering section, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

You should, perhaps point out at this time that the word "discrimination" has come to have a sort of meaning that it is somehow oppressive to a minority. Discrimination doesn't mean that at all. Discrimination means to know the difference or to be able to judge the difference between two or more things - that's all it means - just as some people can differentiate between a Ford and a Chevy or between chicken pox and the measles or between a rabbit and a hare, for example.

It doesn't mean they take any action in favour of or against one of them, just so that the difference is seen and noted. However, the language has become so changed, I suppose, that the word has come to have a different meaning, so we should perhaps not try to change it back to its original meaning. I will accept what it has come to mean.

As far as rights themselves are concerned, people should not make the mistake of thinking that this particular bill gives rights to people. The government doesn't have any rights. Only people have rights and, if there is to be any legislation, the government can only take away people's rights. It might mean, in taking away those rights, that it confers benefits on other people, just as if you take away the right to own slaves, then you prefer a benefit on those ex-slaves, and so many things like that. If you read the bill through, what it does is to give certain benefits to some people by taking away the rights of other people to discriminate, as the case may be.

The suggestion has been made in this House several times that somehow members on this side have been ordered to vote in a certain way or to support a certain thing and the members should all be aware - (Interjection)- I think that the Member for Brandon West has had his opportunity to speak to this. I would hope that he would give me the same courtesy of allowing me to -(Interjection)- The Member for Brandon West has been told on a number of occasions, both by the

Attorney-General himself in bringing this matter in, and secondly by the Minister of Health who made the point very forcefully and very clearly that a constituency elects its member to come to this place and to give his best views and his best thought and the opinion that he thinks is best under the circumstances.

I'm sure that I cannot put it as well as the Minister of Health did, but he made the point very clearly that nobody tells an MLA how to vote or what opinion to have on a particular matter.

A MEMBER: Is that so? How long you been around here, Jim?

A MEMBER: A lot longer than you have.

MR. J. WALDING: The member across the way wants to know how long I've been around here. Perhaps too long, but certainly longer than that member.

There is one particular clause in this bill which has to do with paramountcy. It tells everyone that the human rights bill comes before any other act of the province and that it has paramountcy over it and, where they are in conflict, that Bill 47 in fact applies. We must hope then that, since Bill 47 contains much of what was in the previous Human Rights Act, it will be in fact respected and followed by the government itself.

To just give a few examples where it hasn't been accorded the proper respect and followed in the way that it should have, just about a year ago, there was a memo sent around to all members on this side from the Premier's Office seeking nominations for various boards and commissions, stating that there should be members of a particular ethnic group or members of the female gender, someone who could, in fact, speak French apparently.

Another example, a Minister in this House stood up a couple of months ago and said that he had fired four members from a government board, not because they were incompetent, not because they couldn't do the job or because there had been any conflict of interest, but because they were men. That's the only reason. I listened in vain for anyone to stand up and say that's sexist; you can't do that. It's against the rules, it's against the act - not a word, not a word. Had those four people been women, you can be sure that there would have been screams from here until Christmas that this was some sort of blatant sexism put in place by this government and how terrible it was. When it's men, not a word, not a word.

I don't have the date of this particular ad and I assume that it was in early May or the end of April, but it was in the Free Press, I think, one Saturday and I tore it out. It's an advertisement for a community college and they were advertising for a community social development worker instructor, whatever that is. Having given that indication of what is required there, the final paragraph or the final sentence in fact, in that application says: "Preference will be given to candidates with Native ancestry," and just underneath that of course it says, "An Equal Opportunity Employer." George Orwell would have loved that.

There is also a program which has been in effect for a couple of years called the 55-Plus Program, which says who is eligible: "You may be eligible for the 55-

Plus if you are 55 years or older." Now this particular bill is quite clear in saying that you cannot discriminate on the grounds of age, and in fact the previous or the existing Human Rights Act says exactly the same thing. So what is it that would make a person needful for some extra income just because they reach the age of 55. If they're 54, they don't get it. There may be other programs which the 55-and-over group are entitled to but not this particular one. It is quite clear that age is the first criterion which is given.

Rather than being needy, it frequently happens that people in their mid-50's are better off than they have been before. Their mortgage might well be paid, children have left home or are married, and they find themselves probably earning more and having progressed in their career to a higher position than they have ever done so before. Affirmative action or whatever it's called really does not apply there. Age is the criterion and that is what is given.

Those are four particular instances wherein breach of Bill 47 have been allowed to occur, and I can only hope that the government will in fact abide by the spirit and the principle of this act, as well as what is written there.- (Interjection)- I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who has spoken on this bill, and I don't think he really wants to speak for a second time. But if he does, he will get his opportunity at committee or at Third Reading, whenever that happens.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

A couple of new items in the bill that were put in this time as an enlargement of what the bill used to be. One of them has to do with harassment and that has to do with, of course, "vexatious or unwelcome conduct or comment undertaken or made on the basis of any characteristic referred to in subsection 9(2)." It goes on to mention in two other parts of that same clause that it refers in those two parts to sexual harassment. I'm wondering quite what is meant there, or whether the government is really prepared to see the paramountcy involved in this particular case involved in other areas where harassment can in fact occur.

And it occurs to me that there might be a strike at a supermarket, for example, where the union is on strike outside and is setting up a picket line. They would be providing, or it could be argued that they are providing some harassment to the customers of the store or to the management of the store, and the management could equally claim, I suppose, that it was getting some harassment from the picket line as far as that store was concerned. Now, does it in fact apply? It says that it applies to all of those characteristics in 9(2) and, when you look at 9(2), it includes something to do with "political belief, political association or political activity."

There might well be those who would argue that picketing outside a store on a strike action is not political activity, but I'm sure that the members of that particular union are conducting that particular action because of their political beliefs. It could well have some involvement and interference with The Labour Relations Act. I'm not sure whether or not that has been, in fact, considered. There may well be other acts too where this harassment could have an effect that has not yet occurred to me.

One of the new sections in the act has to do with pregnancy or sex including pregnancy, the possibility of pregnancy or the circumstances related to pregnancy. I looked in vain for the reasons why this was in there and the reasons why it should be included, and presumably there had been some reason why it was not in the past.

However, when it comes to a landlord or an employer or a manager taking some particular action with regard to a pregnant woman, that brings in a third factor into the equation which does not appear in any of these others, and that has of course to do with the unborn baby and whatever dangers might be caused by that particular person being required to do that particular thing. So there are not two things. The employer has to take into account or the landlord, whatever it might be, that whatever course of action is required from that employee will affect or could affect another human being.

I was reading just the other day about thalidomide and the problems that has caused. It occurred to me then that thalidomide was one of the best tranquilizers which has ever been made. It had absolutely no side effects and, as far as most people were concerned, it did what it was suppose to do and nothing else with one exception, and that it is that it had a terrible effect on those unborn babies where their mother had taken thalidomide. It would seem a reasonable and probably a bona fide reason, were thalidomide available now, to prevent its use to pregnant women but to give it quite freely to men or to non-pregnant women.

Perhaps it would be a reasonable course of action to put something in the bill that had to do with the well-being of the unborn, in such cases where there could well be conditions that were dangerous to health that were required to be done by an employee that an employer could well order any employee to do but, when it came to a pregnant woman, would naturally think twice, and might well not wish that particular thing done because of the possible danger.

The matter of the sexual orientation has been referred to on numerous occasions, many times by members putting forward a particular religious basis to it or giving as the reasons for that particular position the fact that their own particular church was against it, or that they knew of a church that was opposed to it. Those members, I suppose, are fortunate in that they can rely on their own church to give them their moral viewpoint on this. Not expressing any particular allegiance to a church, I can't rely on that, and I have to think the thing through to try to come up to the opinion that is, in my opinion, the moral thing to do.

There have been a number of members who have said that this is not a moral issue at all, that it's a human rights issue. They are not quite right in that. What we have here is a human rights and a moral issue. It is both. I haven't heard sufficient distinction on the part of members that homosexuals as individuals are a different thing from homosexuality as a practice. It's been touched on, on a couple of occasions.

The fact that the human rights refers to homosexuals, I will support that prohibition in that particular case of any discrimination against them as individuals. So as far as them as individuals are concerned, it is a human rights case. Separate and distinct from that is homosexuality as an activity, and that is a moral issue.

But what we are being asked to do in this particular case is, in order to support the human rights aspect for individuals, we are being asked to support a section which is called, "sexual orientation," that equates heterosexual with homosexual activities. It doesn't have to. The two things are separate.

Before anyone else gets up to criticize me, I'd better be quite clear that, as far as individuals are concerned, I support the human rights aspect of homosexuals.

Other members have said that they are that way because of choice or because of training or recruitment, but it is a learned experience. From what I've read on the matter, experts have said, no, that's not really the case. Others have said, well, it's something that one is born with. It's hereditary. There you have these two opinions from different experts, and it depends on which particular book or report that you read as to whether you believe it is the one thing or the other.

I'm not sure which is which, I really don't know. I can't see it entirely as a learned experience but, on the other hand, by definition, homosexuals don't produce offspring and so they don't pass on those particular genes or chromosomes or whatever it might be, so that it is passed down from one generation to another. So I really don't know. But whatever is the cause of homosexuality, I do not see it as the normal, natural state of human endeavour, and I prefer to see it as a deviation from the norms of society. Homosexuality is repugnant to me. I find the very thought of it to be offensive.

It would, I'm sure, be possible to put into the act that there was some protection on a human rights basis for homosexuals as individuals, but it is not. It is blurred and the human rights aspect of people is blurred with the moral aspect of homosexuality.-(Interjection)- Okay. In case I don't make that quite clear, look under section 1 of the definition section, where it says, "'sexual orientation' means heterosexual, homosexual." Not that one is good and one is bad and not that one is permissible and one is frowned on, but they are given equality in that particular instance.

It is done because of the use of the phrase, "sexual orientation." If it just said, "homosexuals as people," then that could be dealt with. If it said "homosexuality," that could be a separate thing. But by using the words, "sexual orientation," it lumps the two things in together. What the Attorney-General is asking members to do is, if they are in favour of that removal of discrimination on a human rights basis, they accept that homosexual activity is equivalent to heterosexual activity.

I find in there that it says, "'sexual orientation' means heterosexual." It occurs to me that human beings have been committing heterosexual acts for the last million years and that is the reason why we are here today. If that wasn't happening, we wouldn't be here today. It seems a supreme arrogance that the government should say, well, we will sanction heterosexual activity. You can do these things. It's okay now.-(Interjection)- Whether they said so or not, I assure him that it would continue, and it will continue for a long time to come, but it suggests in there that homosexual activity is just as permissible. I can't go along with that at all. I find that, to me, homosexuality is a perversion and I don't like it and I don't want to see it even peripherally given any sort of sanction in a bill.

There are a number of other perversions, probably an innumerable number of them, for example,

kleptomania, drug addiction, child molesting. Even smoking, I suppose, can be considered by some people to be a perversion. None of those are mentioned in the act, and that could well be considered in itself a discrimination to put only one particular perversion in there.

They should look at the list of applicable characteristics. It mentions ancestry and nationality, ethnic background, religion, age, sex, family status, etc. All those sorts of things are the generally accepted norms in our society. There are many religions; they're all accepted. There are a number of people of different ancestry; they're all accepted. Those are all the norms. Homosexuality is a perversion and, in my opinion, should not be in this particular place.

I also notice, for those people who might be at all interested, that section 11 has to do with affirmative action, and it says that there may be reasonable accommodation to adopt or implement an affirmative action program that has, as its object, the amelioration of conditions of disadvantaged individuals or groups, including those who are disadvantaged because of any characteristic included in section 9(2), which tells you, I believe, that it may well be the next step for people who are within that particular group to come back and say, "Well, the bill says that we are disadvantaged and we can show by these particular facts that we are disadvantaged," and so they should be given some affirmative action program. What form that will take, I leave to the imagination of the people opposite.

Madam Speaker, this particular matter is a matter of morality as far as I am concerned. I would have much preferred to see the matter of sexual orientation, as it's concerned, not be in this particular bill and then I could have supported it most easily. But I cannot, in good conscience, support a measure that would legitimize a practice that I consider to be a perversion. And I cannot, in good conscience, support a clause that would equate homosexuality and heterosexuality as alternate and acceptable lifestyles.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Oh, excuse me.

Before I recognize the honourable member, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 150 exchange students from the Province of Quebec, who are here at the University of Manitoba under the direction of Mr. Matt Certosimo.

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

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Madame le Présidente, avant commencer j'aimerais . . . à bienvenue a tout le collège de la province de Quebec. J'espère que la revient bien ca va aussi.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

May I inform the honourable member that one of the conditions that the students have is that they are not to speak or hear more than three words of French together in their stay in Manitoba.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: I just want to point out that, because an NDP Government exists in Manitoba, people can use French in the Legislature. Not like in Conservative . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

May we please get back to serious business? Order please.

The honourable member does not have a point of order.

BILL NO. 47 - THE HUMAN RIGHTS CODE

MADAM SPEAKER: I recognize the Honourable Member for Springfield on Bill No. 47.

MR. G. ROCH: Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on Bill 47.- (Interjection)- Despite the negative comments of the Member for St. James, it doesn't surprise me a person like him supporting this bill.

Twenty years ago, maybe even before or even less than that, it would have been unthinkable, Madam Speaker, that such a bill would even be before us. It makes you wonder what next? This is the first step towards what? Certainly not the road to the new Jerusalem, Madam Speaker. This is one of the most regressive pieces of legislation ever introduced in any Legislature anywhere.

Introduced by whom? What was his political affiliation? It was a Liberal, a Liberal Government. Just like the Liberal Party in Manitoba supporting it, so then did Liberal Governments elsewhere introduce it.

Madam Speaker, like I said, the very fact that this is being introduced is an abomination. Governments have no business legislating morals, it has been said. Well, I would say, it has no business legislating immorality either, forcing upon people what society does not want, only a small vocal minority, sexual deviants, Madam Speaker, trying to legitimize them as a bona fide minority. I think it is insulting to every ethnic, racial, religious and minority group in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, the legitimate minorities, as has been pointed out by my various colleagues, have got traits, beliefs, they have *raison d'être*. Homosexuality revolves around one act. That is not sufficient grounds. That is not grounds at all to give a group like that special status.

Some of my colleagues have quoted from the Bible, even members across who don't believe in the Bible. I'm not going to stand here and pretend to be superreligious. Maybe I'm not religious enough, many of us are not religious enough. But whether we are or we aren't, whether we believe or we don't, it doesn't matter. The fact is there is a supreme being, and there are limits to what that being will accept.

There is historical evidence of that, Madam Speaker. One does not need to read the Bible. History books show that there were people more powerful than us, and we're mortals, and that there were in fact two cities destroyed because previous governments in history tried to legitimize this type of activity.

A MEMBER: Fargo and Moorhead.

MR. M. DOLIN: Moorhead.

MR. G. ROCH: The Member for Elmwood and the Member for Kildonan make light of this. They say it's Fargo and Moorehead.

A MEMBER: That's where he comes from.

MR. G. ROCH: This is hardly a bill to make light of. They know very well the cities I referred to are Sodom and Gomorrah, and why one of those acts is referred to as sodomy.

Madam Speaker, it is kind of disheartening when churches, whose teachings are supposed to be based on scripture, come out and condone this type of activity. It is heartening to see that most of them, well over 90 percent them, are opposed to this type of bill. I have spoken to people within the Evangelical Free Church, the Catholic Church, the Mennonite Church, various churches, but I have also spoken to people who do not belong to any churches and they are just as offended.

This bill, this type of activity, is something which supersedes, which crosses all religious barriers. It crosses those barriers of another religion - it goes right down to human decency. To what limits will society accept such an act? Those people are offended.

The Member for St. Boniface is trying to find some way to dance around it, to justify his voting for it unlike the Member for St. Vital who, I must admit, stayed true to his word after making a lengthy speech pointing out the errors of this bill, and announced that he would not support it. I would have expected that from the Member for St. Boniface, the Member for Radisson, the Member for The Pas, the Member for Swan River, the Member for Lac du Bonnet. All are fine and decent people, all members here are indeed honourable members.

But maybe, when the vote is taken on Bill 47, it will draw the line between those members who are honourable and those who are not perhaps. I am not making any accusations or any other allegations. The time will come.

The Member for St. Boniface said it was a sickness and he is right - he's absolutely right - but there are many sicknesses in this world today. This is a sickness of a mental kind. How many more bills, how many more laws are we going to pass to legitimize sickness? Kleptomania is a sickness. Some say people are born with it, just like they say people are born with homosexuality. Are we going to pass a law saying, well this person was born with a compulsive urge to steal, therefore they shall have their rights? That would be ridiculous. Ten or 20 years ago it would have been thought unthinkable that this type of a sickness would have been the status of a minority group, but here we are today.

Maybe the Member for Waterhen (sic) can refresh our memory, but I believe the Attorney-General is a Rhodes Scholar?

A MEMBER: No, he didn't make it.

MR. G. ROCH: He didn't make it. He's a scholar of some type. It just goes to show that having a lot of

education does not necessarily make people wise. To think that such a piece of legislation would be introduced and supported by elected members of our society. Polls have been quoted, but there comes a time when you mustn't listen to polls. Polls are okay to determine where you put a certain road possibly, what you do with certain things, it's good to know but, in the end, you must vote for or against what is right and what is wrong.

Madam Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface said there weren't enough devils in hell or angels in heaven to force him to vote against his conscience, but obviously there were enough devils within the NDP to make him vote against his conscience, and I find that reprehensible. The editorial writers, the lib-left editorial writers, which are supporting this bill, I can't understand it. Madam Speaker, I cannot understand it.

At least some of the rural newspapers have not lost touch with what is right, what is wrong, what is decent, what is moral. The Carillon, which is situated in the constituency of my colleague for La Verendrye, which circulates in all of Southeastern Manitoba, was not afraid to take a courageous stand on it, rather than go with the lib-left trend that other newspapers have taken. Some people think it's trendy, fashionable, to support these various - some would call disgusting - trends going on in society today.

And irony of ironies, Madam Speaker, some people accuse the Progressive Conservative Party of not being forward thinking because they do not support such a bill. As I pointed out earlier, this is a very regressive bill. It has taken us back to times when homosexuality had become very commonplace, until the wrath of a supreme being came upon the world. Then it seems to have slowed down for awhile.

As the Member for St. Vital and the Member for Charleswood said, these people cannot reproduce, heterosexuals can reproduce. They can only recruit. That is the purpose of this bill. It's to encourage this type of recruitment. We all know the preference of these types of people. In more cases than not, they do prefer young males, in some cases, young females too, depending on the gender of that person. This will make that lifestyle, that type of activity more acceptable in some quarters, those quarters where it is not accepted, to encourage those people not to criticize, not to say anything - will take the attitude of we better not say anything. Some members think this is not so. The facts are, every time laws are passed that make situations more acceptable, more tolerable, it comes to being.

Maybe there is no doubt - I'm not firmly convinced - but sometimes some people are resigned to the fact that possibly this is a losing battle. Possibly so, but it will be to our everlasting shame and will come back to haunt us. When I say "we," I talk about the Legislature as a whole if we pass such a bill, Madam Speaker.

The New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan did not cave in to the gay and lesbian lobby. The New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan did not allow the gay and lesbian lobby to infiltrate its ranks. The New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan refused to pass such a bill. It took Liberal governments, Madam Speaker, to pass it, liberal governments who are sometimes left, sometimes right, usually on the fence trying to gauge what is trendy, what is popular, and the Liberal Party of Manitoba is on record as supporting this bill.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. ROCH: I hear, "Hear, hear," from members opposite. It's nothing to cheer about.

Madam Speaker, as well we've heard from other organizations such as Big Brothers, which have said they have concerns about this bill. As it has been pointed out, section 11 where it refers to affirmative action, who is to say that some day some sharp lawyer will not go to pick up the case of someone in court and they'll say, you must hire someone from the homosexual community, you must have one on your board, you must have one on your committee, you must have one in your organization? Therein lies the danger.

I have referred to in the past, so has the Member for St. Vital just recently, about other types of sexual orientation. Some members opposite have said this will not happen. It is not true at all, Madam Speaker. Although it states sexual orientation to mean heterosexual, homosexual and bisexuality, the fact is that this bill is enshrining sexual orientation. Those definitions may be changed later on or they may be challenged in court and people who have other sexual orientations, I believe, given this bill, could win their case. I'll leave that up to people's imaginations as to how far this could go, but don't say this could never happen because, 20 or 30 years from now, there could be a bill before us trying to legitimize all the other sexual perversions which exist on the face of this earth.

Madam Speaker, this bill is another step in the breakdown of society as we know it. Already there are too many laws and regulations which permit the family unit to fall apart, indeed which encourages it, far too many laws, Madam Speaker, which have turned our society into a very permissive one. I would like to think that this is the straw that breaks the camel's back, but I'm afraid there may be more, many more.

What makes it worse, when I look further in the act, there are penalties for those people who do not believe in this, what is liberally referred to as - and no pun intended there but which is referred to as - an ultimate lifestyle. Madam Speaker, I cannot just quite find the section right now, but it says for fines up to \$2,000, if I recall correctly. Don't believe those who would say that the act says that, if there are bona fide reasons, you will not have to. I think Mr. Vogel, an employee of this government - I don't know how much time he spends on Civil Service business and how much he spends on a promotion of his beliefs - but he has already said what his goals are. The Gays for Equality lobby send out letters saying what they want eventually, even though your organization, your group, your school, does not want a homosexual teaching.

Once the act is passed, once it's been in the law books for a few years, they will get the lawyers, they will probably get grants from this government to pursue those goals. There is a precedent when the International Gay and Lesbian Film Festival receives \$2,000 from this government and an additional \$1,100 from a body funded by this government. Had it been a heterosexual film festival, it would have been labelled pornographic. No doubt the Member for St. Johns would have said it was exploitation of women but, because it was homosexual, it was regarded as an art and received

grants. So don't say, Madam Speaker, don't anyone say that they shall never get grants to pursue legal battles in court to promote their particular type of perversion, whether it be homosexuality or another kind.

Madam Speaker, in that letter from the Gays for Equality lobby, they refer to a few of our members on this side who spoke in the press and Estimates in reference to them. Madam Speaker, they have lobbied, asking us not to generate too much debate on this issue, to oppose it if we so desire, but to do away with minimal discussion. Basically what they were saying, without saying it is, well, make a few comments, oppose it and let it go through. Madam Speaker, I will not be taken in by that lobby, as many members have, not at all. I shall speak my mind.

We on this side have agreed to a free vote, and a free vote means free and open debate, and we have all participated so far. It may come to a vote today, we're not sure. We have a free vote on this side.

Madam Speaker, I now have before me the area on prosecution, section 51(1)(e) and (f), fines of up to \$10,000, Madam Speaker, up to \$10,000 because you refuse to accept what is unacceptable, immoral, indecent, disgusting behavior. For that, society, individuals, organizations shall be penalized. It is the type of legislation, it is just like deliberate deficit financing is doing its best to undermine our economy, to put us into debt. This is doing the same thing on the moral, on the family side. It is to break down society, to break down the family.

Madam Speaker, this bill would have been bad at the best of times. This bill should be opposed. It should not even be introduced at the best of times but, given the scourge of AIDS which is presently upon this continent, indeed upon the world, this is the worst time to introduce such a bill. If there had been organizations to support rights of leprosy victims back then, we may not have been here today to debate this bill. If they had done the same with diphtheria and scarlet fever as they are doing to AIDS victims today, none of us might be here today. Why the concern, Madam Speaker, about the victims of AIDS? Why? Because as was pointed out by one of my colleagues, over 90 percent of them are homosexual. It goes right back to this Bill 47, this caving in of society, this caving in of governments that we have to certain groups in our society.

Madam Speaker, by encouraging - and that's what this bill will do - by encouraging this type of a lifestyle, you are indeed encouraging that disease to spread. It has become an epidemic, Madam Speaker, and instead of seeking ways of stopping it, we are promoting ways of spreading it. We are encouraging the very type of lifestyle, the very type of activity which has been the main cause of this epidemic. - (Interjection) - The Member for Kildonan, who is about as bright as a shut-out lightbulb is making irrelevant comments from his seat, it's better that he should keep quiet and go back to the type of people he seems to like so much when he speaks in favour of such a bill.

Madam Speaker, the main reason for this bill, as I have said previously, is to legitimize homosexual and other irregular sexual activities - sexual perversions, that's what they are. Everything else in the bill is simply a window dressing, a window dressing to try and make it acceptable to society. All kinds of definitions, all kinds of reasons - this, this, this and that - but the main

reason jumps out at anyone who really reads the bill. It is sexual orientation and let's make no mistake about that.

Madam Speaker, I never thought in my lifetime that I would be participating in a debate on a bill such as this. I never thought society would become so sick that its governments would introduce such a bill. Madam Speaker, I will do everything that I can to try and prevent this bill from passing - everything.

I would encourage all members, including the Member for River Heights and especially the government members, to take another look at this bill and defeat it before it comes to Third Reading or even before Second Reading.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I've watched this debate with great interest over the last several weeks, and I think we've seen both some encouraging and some very discouraging aspects through this debate. I think we've seen some very good debates by members on all sides of this House, for example, but I think we've also seen some of the most negative, mean-spirited debates on any issue that I've seen. We've seen hyperbole, we've seen fear, Madam Speaker. We've seen the Legislature at its worst.

But there is one thing, Madam Speaker, that does give me encouragement, and that is that mean spirit, that fear, has been expressed mostly by members opposite in this Chamber and, in my discussions with people in this province, I found that this issue has brought out the best in people. I found out, Madam Speaker, that despite the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, when this issue was first raised, when it was placed for First Reading, this particular code, said this would be the biggest issue of the Session. In fact, it is not the biggest issue of the Session.

Do you know why, Madam Speaker? Because a vast majority of the people of this province have approached this issue out of a sense of fairness and equality. It's not that they condone any lifestyle or any particular political view for that matter, or any particular religious belief. In fact, I've talked to many people who say, I don't agree at all with certain political views or certain types of sexual orientation. I've talked to many, but they've said the bottom line is I don't think that we discriminate against people for those reasons. Live and let live. Surely, Madam Speaker, is that not the most fundamental principle of human rights legislation?

I was reminded of a quote - I'm sure members of this House have heard it at some time - which I think addresses one particular aspect of human rights. It's a quote that was attributed to Voltaire who stated, Madam Speaker, and I quote, "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." That is the principle, Madam Speaker, that is in this bill in regard to political views and religious beliefs.

But I would also suggest to you that the reaction of many people in this province is that they also defend the rights of people in this province to live their life as they choose. They may even condemn the way those

individuals live that life, Madam Speaker, but they will defend to the death their right to live it. I've heard that from many people, Madam Speaker, in my own area who said, it's not that I support or condone a lifestyle any more than I support or condone a political belief. It's just that I think that people have certain basic rights and, amongst those basic rights, is the right to a job, the right to service and the right to accommodation without discrimination, period.

Madam Speaker, I think if one approaches this particular code with that particular view clearly in mind, I think one will recognize this is the best human rights legislation in Canada. I'm proud of that, Madam Speaker. I'm proud that this legislation clearly states that in this province we're against discrimination, period. And I'm proud, Madam Speaker, because support for human rights is probably one of the most fundamental principles of the New Democratic Party and, before it, the CCF.

I remember as I joined the NDP at the age of 17, a number of years ago, reading, Madam Speaker, with particular pride about the fact that it was the CCF that defended the rights of the Japanese in the 1940's when it was not particularly popular to do so; that it was the CCF in Saskatchewan that introduced the first Bill of Rights in Canada, in any province; that it was the CCF that opposed the persecution of Jehovah's Witnesses in Quebec in the 1950's; that it was the NDP, Madam Speaker, that supported those in Quebec who said that the imposition of the War Measures Act in 1970 was a total infringement on the civil liberties of many people in that province.

Yes, Manitoba also has a proud record in that regard, Madam Speaker, because it was the NDP that brought in the forerunners of this Human Rights Code in the 1970's. I'm proud of that, Madam Speaker, because it says quite clearly that this party is willing to stand up for the rights of all.

I'm also proud of this caucus because we're a caucus of many diverse views on issues, like any other caucus, I suppose, but I've seen this debate bring out the best in people once again, Madam Speaker. I've talked to many members of this caucus who perhaps might have had different views a few years ago but have said that they stand for the fundamental principle of opposing discrimination in this province.

Let's deal with that issue, Madam Speaker. Let's deal with the fact of discrimination. Yes, Madam Speaker, it exists. Talk to anyone about the situation in this province and, yes, it most certainly exists in terms of visible minorities. You can talk to people who, day in and day out, face that discrimination, and I really believe that this new code will help them, Madam Speaker, in fighting against that discrimination. You can talk to many people who've gone through that situation. You can talk to women in this province.

I remember an experience I had when I was first elected as an MLA. One of the first cases I dealt with was with a woman, Madam Speaker, who had gone to a trucking firm to apply for work as a trucker - she had worked as a trucker in an area where women have not traditionally worked - and she was told that there were no jobs. Do you know what she did, Madam Speaker? She had one of her male friends go down, with the same experience, apply to that same company about two hours after that, and he got a job. So let

no one tell her there isn't discrimination against women in this society and let no one tell any member of this Legislature.

Let's deal with other aspects of discrimination. You know, I recently had a young man come into my office, 19 years old, just out of high school. He's an epileptic, Madam Speaker. He has been trying, since he graduated from high school, to obtain employment, and he's been told flat to his face that he cannot be employed because he's an epileptic. Well, I happen to know that his condition is controllable. I happen to know, Madam Speaker, that other employers in this province have made provisions for epileptics. I have to think it is grossly unfair for him at the age of 19, when he sees all his fellow graduates working and not facing that kind of discrimination, to be told that, because of a condition that he inherited, he cannot obtain employment. That is what discrimination is all about and that is addressed in this act.

Yes, Madam Speaker, I want to address the question of sexual orientation, as to whether there is discrimination. Some members have suggested that somehow there is not discrimination in that regard. Well, Madam Speaker, to this point, there has never been any protection against discrimination under The Human Rights Act. So I don't think it would be that surprising that The Human Rights Act would not have any great record of problems in this regard.

The one jurisdiction where there is a history of cases is Quebec in this regard and, since sexual orientation was added to their code in 1977, there have been a total of 131 complaints filed under that particular provision, Madam Speaker. That's about 2.5 percent of the overall caseload. But it surely shows that there was some significant problems in terms of discrimination.

I think if anyone checks with anyone who has any knowledge of the type of situation facing people today, I think one will find that is very clearly the case. I know, in talking to some of the representatives of the coalitions supporting this bill, as other members have done, they've documented to me many cases of people who have been denied accommodation, denied service and, yes, Madam Speaker, fired because of their sexual orientation.

So let's deal with the very obvious fact that discrimination exists. And for the Leader of the Opposition who says that he's not against discrimination, Madam Speaker, and that many people are protected under this code, that people are protected in regard to sexual orientation under the present code, let him talk to people who today have been discriminated against and have no recourse because it is not in that act.

So discrimination is a fact. Well, how do we approach it, Madam Speaker? I think we're seeing different views on how we approach it. There's the selective view - and we have certainly seen many selective views in this House in this debate - the sort of view that says, well, I'm against discrimination on these grounds, but on these other grounds, well, perhaps we'll have to allow that to go ahead.

We even saw, Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition try to develop an argument which has no basis in fact in the code by suggesting that the provision on sexual orientation goes against the tradition of

human rights legislation in Canada. Well, it does not, Madam Speaker. He suggested that we have protected visible minorities, which we have, and that we have protected political and religious belief, which we have.

But if the Leader of the Opposition cares to read the section regarding the applicable characteristics, he will find that a number of items are also included which do not relate to any of those particular categories, and not just sexual orientation but marital or family status and source of income. He will find that there are a total of 12 provisions in here, 12 comprehensive provisions that don't establish special rights for someone with a particular ancestry or colour or perceived race, or nationality or national origin, or ethnic background or origin, or religion or creed or religious belief, religious association or religious activity, or age or sex or pregnancy. Madam Speaker, I could continue to read the entire list, and I think it would demonstrate clearly that no one is being given special rights. All that is being done with this particular code is that we are saying in this province that we are against discrimination. That is the fundamental principle of this legislation, Madam Speaker, and let there be no mistake about it.

Let's address some of the more ridiculous assertions, most notably from the Member for Springfield, who I thought gave one of the most regrettable speeches I've ever heard in this Legislature in suggesting that somehow the rest of the act doesn't matter, that there's only one clause that matters in this act. Well if he bothered to read this act, if he bothered to follow this issue since the Human Rights Commission originally recommended a substantial number of changes several years ago, he would have found that this act has a lot more involved than one particular section.

He would have found that religion will now be defined to include creed and religious belief, association or activity. He will find that sex will now specifically include circumstances related to pregnancy. He will find the political belief will be expanded to include political association or activity. He will find that specific provisions have been put in this legislation to protect against harassment, including sexual harassment. As anyone knows from watching court decisions in recent years, it's been stated quite clearly by the courts that one has to specifically state a provision in the act for it to have any force.

If the member bothered to read this act, he would find that there are provisions for contract compliance, Madam Speaker, an item that I think may prove to be the most significant facet of this particular bill. I believe strongly that we need a workable affirmative action program in this province. I believe that we have to rework our own provincial affirmative action program. I think it has to be stronger, it has to be tougher. I believe it has to be applied to our Crown corporations, and I also believe that it is reasonable, Madam Speaker, for us to include affirmative action as a contract compliance with those who we do business with. All we're saying, Madam Speaker, is that they have to do what we're doing ourselves, that we're ensuring that there isn't systematic discrimination. That's what we're asking with an affirmative action policy, and I think it's fair to ask for that by contract compliance.

If the member also had bothered to read further in the act he would have seen that there are advisory

opinions included, that steps had been made to ensure that reasonable accommodation will be made for the needs of disadvantaged Manitobans.

In fact, Madam Speaker, that member and any other member who cared to read this act would have found quite clearly why I described it, at the beginning of my speech, as probably the best human rights legislation in Canada.

Well, I've dealt with what the act is; let's focus in on what it isn't. I've already mentioned one that it clearly is not. It is not an act that provides special rights for anyone.

I recently became aware of a quote, I think, which summed it up quite well, and it's someone who the honourable members opposite may put some faith in, may listen to, the Honourable John Crosbie, who on April 15, 1986, wrote that the government - this being the Federal Government - has made an important commitment to equality and social justice and to the principle that all Canadians have an equal opportunity to participate as fully as they can in our society.

It goes on to state: "In particular, persons should not be excluded from employment opportunities for reasons that are irrelevant to their capacity and ability to do the job. The government does not intend to extend special privileges to this minority - that is, homosexuals or any other - but is committed to ensure that all Canadians are protected equally against arbitrary discrimination, as indeed is required by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms." I think that statement by John Crosbie sums it up. No special rights are created in this legislation - far from it, Madam Speaker.

I want to deal also with another issue that has been raised throughout this debate, and that is the moral issue. You know, I've heard members get up and talk about their own moral and religious views, and I respect that. I do believe that we, as Members of the Legislature, have a responsibility to consult our own consciences and our own moral and religious views, but also to respect those of others, particularly those in our constituency. I also believe quite sincerely that we do not have the right to impose our own individual religious or moral beliefs on others. I actually was quite offended, not by those who sincerely expressed their religious beliefs, but those who I thought did injustice to the very beliefs that they were attempting to profess in this Chamber.

I know, for example, the Member for Brandon West, who quoted quite extensively and selectively from the Bible - his quote from Leviticus 20, verse 13: "If a man also lie with mankind, as he lies with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death . . ." "Is he suggesting, Madam Speaker, that is how we should deal with homosexuality in society?"

Well, surely, he is not. But he quoted from it. - (Interjection)- I'm glad the Member for Sturgeon Creek is mentioning quoting from the Bible because I, having grown up, gone through Sunday School, having quite some familiarity with the Bible from that, I was reminded of a quote from the Bible, a particular passage that I think is something that those members opposite who have talked in very glowing terms in terms of morality, should do well to read.

It states, and this is from Romans, chapter 2: "THEREFORE thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever

thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself."

Madam Speaker, we're not talking in this Legislature about condoning. I would hope that others who have different views about homosexuality or any other item will not condemn by using the instrument of the law. Let them condemn in their own private lives, but let them not turn the law into condemning any particular individual in this society of ours to discrimination.

In bringing my contributions to this debate to a close, I want to reflect on a couple of things: first, Madam Speaker, what people will look back on this particular debate and see. You know what I think they will see in six months or a year or two years or five years? I think they will ask themselves a question. They will say: What was all the fuss about? Because once this legislation is passed, there will be no changes in society, Madam Speaker, other than the fact that certain people will have protection against discrimination. They will be able to walk in that extra human dignity that not having to face that discrimination will give them. Will that cause a huge change or collapse in society? I think not, Madam Speaker. In fact, Madam Speaker, I think it will strengthen our society.

I look at this perhaps from a different perspective from some perhaps, using some of the words the Member for Springfield used. He said, he couldn't have seen this coming in 10 or 20 years ago. I wish he would look at what is happening in society. I would suggest to him that one of the reasons we're seeing it today is that attitudes have changed.

I know my own generation, Madam Speaker - and I speak as the youngest member of the Legislature - but I know my own generation views some of the issues that have been raised in quite a substantial way. But I've also noticed all generations who have changed their views, Madam Speaker, who have said quite clearly, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, that it's not a question of whether we promote or condone or approve of any particular political view or lifestyle, but whether we're against discrimination or not. They said very clearly, Madam Speaker, they're against discrimination.

I want to sum up by addressing my comments specifically to the Member for Sturgeon Creek. Madam Speaker, yesterday the Member for Sturgeon Creek asked members of this House what they would say to their wives and children about this particular legislation.

I want to say to the Member for Sturgeon Creek and all members of this House that I do have discussions with my children. Alexander is two years old. Of course, we're just beginning to be able to communicate back and forth. But my daughter, Niki, is four. You know, she has an incredible mind; she asks many questions. She asked me today what I was doing, what meeting I was at, because that's obviously one question that gets asked a lot in our household. You know what I said to her, and I said it to her with some pride. I said we're discussing a bill that's going to prevent discrimination; it's against discrimination. Then when I explained discrimination, she understood it. She's four years old, Madam Speaker. She believes at four years old that it's wrong to discriminate. I think most people are in the same situation, Madam Speaker.

I can say to the Member for Sturgeon Creek that, when I stand up on this bill on Second Reading and

Third Reading, I'm going to do so with considerable pride. I will tell my daughter today, and I will tell her in five or ten years and when I'm out of politics altogether, Madam Speaker, and I look back on my period in the Legislature, that one of the things I was most proud of was being able to support this particular code.

I will say to the Member for Sturgeon Creek that what I hope for my daughter and my son is that they will grow up in a society that is tolerant, Madam Speaker, a society that is far more tolerant than today. I hope they will grow up in a society, Madam Speaker, that does not believe in discrimination of any kind, that accepts people for what they are. That's what I want for my daughter and my son. That is what this legislation is part of.

It will not accomplish all of that, Madam Speaker. Only changes in attitudes over time will, but I see those changes of attitude coming. I see them coming for members of my generation and members of other generations, Madam Speaker. I have hope for the future of this province. I am proud for my children and for other children in this province to be working for a better society. I am definitely, Madam Speaker, by voting for this particular legislation, working for a fairer, more tolerant society, free of discrimination of any kind.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the honourable member permit a question? He has time remaining.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I was wondering if the honourable member would tell me if he will explain to his wife and family that he believes a homosexual relationship between two men is the same as the relationship between he and his wife?

MR. S. ASHTON: Madam Speaker, that sort of question is typical of the misunderstanding that member has of this particular legislation. It has nothing to do with that. It has nothing to do with whether one says that a particular relationship is different or better than another.

And I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that I believe strongly in the family. I believe strongly in my family, but I have a little more faith than do members opposite. I do not fear, Madam Speaker, others in society. I believe quite strongly that the family unit, the basic family unit, my own family, Madam Speaker, will not be affected or will not have to be afraid of the way others lead their life. I'm more concerned about the way we lead our life as a family, that we be tolerant and that we not discriminate, Madam Speaker. So I totally reject the premise of the member opposite, and I wish he would try to understand again that this is not about promoting or condoning or suggesting that something is better or not. This, Madam Speaker, legislation is about being against discrimination, period.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

If honourable members want to have private conversations, they can do so elsewhere.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has the floor.

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

I must admit that, when I rise to speak to this bill, it's after having given it long and serious consideration. I rather resent the remarks of some of the members on the other side when they say that there's a lack of understanding and caring and compassion on this side because of the position that many members have taken. We have taken a position on this side not as a group, as is implied from the government benches, but from a position of conscience and a position of personal feelings and personal regard for the act that we see before us. When we talk about being caring and compassionate, I don't think that there's any lack of compassion on this side. Certainly, I don't feel any lack of caring and compassion because of the position that I intend to take on this particular piece of legislation.

The legislation where we are trying to set up a law within our society where it is illegal to discriminate against people because of their colour, because of their creed, because of their religious beliefs, because of their political beliefs, I don't think that there's anyone in this House and I think there are very few people in this society who object or who do not support that type of a statement on behalf of those people in society who, for whatever reason that is beyond their control, may find themselves being discriminated against or may find themselves not receiving services.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is, as I said, not without a great deal of care and consideration that I establish my position regarding this bill. I support the great majority of the clauses that are in this bill. I would not nor would I expect anybody in society to be allowed to discriminate against people because of their race or their nationality or their ethnic background or their religion or their creed. We don't have to agree with them, but we don't have to and we should not, we must not, practise discrimination against those groups.

The clause that says we would not and should not and must not practise discrimination on the grounds of sex, including pregnancy and the possibility of pregnancy or circumstances related to that is progressive legislation, and I can support that.

Marital and family status, source of income, political activity, or earning disabilities that people have, these are all sound reasons and sound clauses to have in this bill. But I will not support any kind of active discrimination or physical abuse against anyone in our society, but neither will I support the placing of a homosexual clause in this bill that places homosexual activity in the minds of many people in the public, and certainly in the eyes of this law, an equivalent with the heterosexual lifestyle that is the cornerstone of our society.

To say that, because some of us in this Chamber want to stand up and speak loud and clear on the basis of our own moral beliefs and our own strongly-held

convictions about our society and about our families, to say that for some reason because we do this is out of a lack of compassion, is simply not true.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that all people in our society have equal rights before the law. I think that it is equally difficult and I think that I have to tell you and tell this House, that I became much stringent, much more strident in my approach to this bill when I listened to Mr. Vogel tell the media that this now was the opportunity that he had been waiting for and been working for, so that now it will legitimize his marriage with his male spouse, would legitimize his feelings that they were now eligible for pension benefits, spousal benefits and plans and dental plans such as any heterosexual relationship would be.

And I tell you that, after I considered that, I considered that the most active promoter of gay rights in this province felt that somehow this bill opened the door for him to those types of situations, I started to realize that there was a lot more to this bill that I had previously seen on the surface.

We on this side are constantly accused of seeing shadows behind every rock. I think that's the case with every Opposition to every government in a democracy. It is the Opposition's job to question what will happen when these bills become law. In my short time as an elected representative in this Chamber, I have seen too often the results of legislation where we saw not the problems that could go with it when regulations were attached and we saw not the problems that could be created down the road. I think that we have to view this law, this bill, in the same way.

But there is more to it when we talk about sexual orientation, frankly. What example are we setting to the young people of our society? And I must tell you that, as a trustee for several years in our local school division, this is not a problem that I have not had to deal with previously, where those who are the leaders in our society are the setters of example for our community, have to answer for more than just their pay cheque.

If you were to hire a teacher or hire any other professional, if you asked them what their lifestyle was, you would be out of place. What if a prospective employee came - and I will use an imaginary school division - if a prospective employee came forward and showed their qualifications, and said, and I'm promiscuous. Would that school division probably hire that person? I wonder. If they came forward and said, I have a wife, but I have several, would they hire that person? But at the same time, after this bill was enacted, after having presented his credentials, if that person said, oh, and by the way I'm a practising homosexual, all of a sudden, if he did not get the job, he might very well have legitimized a case to claim that he was being unfairly discriminated against.

I think that those are the types of problems that those who wrote this bill have very likely overlooked. We cannot ask those types of questions when we hire an employee but, when we look at a situation where the employee chooses to flaunt his lifestyle, we may very well have put the employer in a very untenable position.

I can tell you, as other members before me have stated, that religious upbringing and family background have some bearing on my feelings towards this bill. I

have to tell you that it is not particularly easy to look at a bill that you have to speak out in terms of whether or not there are people within the community that you cannot accept their lifestyle, when you have to go to the same church that now speaks out and says that they support this type of legislation, and debate with the ministers there in a very difficult way as to whether or not my beliefs and my upbringing and my history in the church is more important to me than theirs.

Quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's a position that I find myself in. As a lifetime member of the United Church, having been a Sunday School teacher there for quite a few years, I find it difficult to speak against this bill, but I will because I am offended by this lifestyle. I'm offended by those who believe that we should equate this to a family lifestyle, and I'm frankly offended by those who say that this can be equated with other types of discrimination in our society.

I think I can, without any embarrassment, say that I have never in my life discriminated against a person because of his race or his creed or his colour but, unfortunately, this bill puts us in a position of saying that there are some practices in our society that some of us are unprepared to accept as an example to our families, as an example to our children.

I look at section 9(3) where we talk about systemic discrimination. What is systemic discrimination? Well, under the act, apparently that is where there is any accidental discrimination where, without meaning to, the person has discriminated under one of the clauses that are mentioned above or one of the subsections that are mentioned above. I find it difficult, I find it very difficult to include in this act the sections on homosexuality and hold them up as equal to marital or family status, hold them up as equal to pregnancy or the possibility of pregnancy. Unfortunately the media and many of us have, through our debate, identified the one clause in this bill - and Bill 47 is by and large seen as the bill that has the one clause that everybody knows about - and that is sexual orientation.

But there are so many other types of discrimination, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have to deal with that I think we have missed the mark badly. And I think, if this government was wise, they would withdraw this section and not risk the lack of support that the rest of the bill should be able to claim. It has its blemishes - the Member for St. Vital pointed out many of them, my leader has pointed out some of them - but what we have done is very possibly put the government in the bedrooms of this country.

I, frankly, don't give a damn what somebody does in their bedroom, and I hope they don't care what I do in mine. And I think that, by putting a lifestyle delineation in this act, we have crossed over the line between lifestyle, religion, and good government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have numerous other notes that I would like to delve into but there are other members on this side who, I'm sure, want to put their words on the record as well. Quite simply, I do not support the sexual orientation section of this act. The rest of the act, I will strongly support.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I will try to keep my remarks to this bill relatively brief, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and in doing so I guess I'll first pick up on a couple of issues that have been raised, one in particular by the Opposition House Leader, on something that goes back to, I guess, a practice that I learned of and saw the successful working of in my tour a few years ago of both the countries of Finland and Sweden, and that is in the appointment of boards and commissions.

I guess over the last six years that I've been a member of this House, sometimes I've been fervently partisan. I think with time, and I would hope with time, that some of the members opposite, the newer members in particular, will become a little less partisan in their presentations because I think, the longer you are here, the less you see things in black and white, the more things are grey and varying shades of grey.

And I can quite strongly accept the notion of the Opposition House Leader in suggesting that a commission, especially a commission such as the Human Rights Commission, should not be merely the appointment of people who may or may not be partisan but, because of the appointment of peoples by a particular government of a stripe, they are more likely to be seen as being partisan in the public. And in a commission as important as the Human Rights Commission, I believe it to be beneficial to have the members of that commission be seen in the public eye as not having their partisanship the primary focus of the composition of that commission.

Now, in that, I also accept what one may say as well, the Member for St. Norbert is staying with the partisan board, in that the recognized parties of the Legislature shall have a designated number of appointments to the board. I think his suggestion was eight and five, eight appointed by government, five by the Opposition.

You would still have a nature of partisanship in the appointment but, in the conduct and the exercise of the rulings and the work of the commission, I believe you would have the people losing some degree of their partisanship. I think it would be important and indicative of the people making the recommendations for the representatives on that commission, their sincerity towards the working and the sound working of the commission by the people who they appoint. So it's a great deal of responsibility on the political parties represented or the official political parties represented in the Legislature as to who and how they appoint to a commission.

From what I could see in my all too short visits in those Scandinavian countries, virtually all their boards and commissions are appointed in that fashion. What it's tended to do from what people who are on the commissions who I had a chance to speak with, it tended to depoliticize to some extent the working of the commissions, and to educate people from all political stripes as to their role and responsibilities they have in governance of that area or making rulings in that particular area.

So I think it's certainly something that is worth consideration, and I don't know whether the Attorney-General has given a great deal of thought to that. I know the Minister of Health in his comments had given some credence to the acceptance of that proposal as well, or some version of that proposal, and I would hope that not only the Attorney-General but also

members in general of the committee who this bill referred to will take into consideration the advisability of using a more broadly-based board to make up the Human Rights Commission.

Perhaps this could be a pilot or the initial one for this sort of appointment to be made and, further down the road, we could move away from the relatively - and I'm not speaking just of this administration by any stretch of the imagination. It's been historic of the basis for appointment to our boards and commissions.

I note to some striking examples where it has not been the case, and I refer in particular to the appointment of Mr. Pollock, who is an active Conservative to chair the Lotteries Foundation when it was newly enacted and powers it through, I think, some very fundamental changes in the way lotteries are administered in the Province of Manitoba. Through that, the whole conduct of that operation, by having a board that was not made up simply of people, one political stripe, I think that it probably enabled that board to both make recommendations and also, in the public eye, have greater credibility in carrying those recommendations through.

So it's not that was an example of what the Leader of the Opposition has suggested. I don't know whether they, if they would have had the power at the time, would have suggested that particular individual for the appointment. I'm pleased that the individual did accept the appointment at the time, and I think that in future we would have a sounder basis in our boards and commissions if that were to be followed through.

Referring to other sections of the bill, other principles that were brought out in the bill, I'd just like to be able, when we get into committee, to have some further explanation on a couple of items. One in particular is the issue around harassment. Just how broad is that? If it's sexual harassment, I fully endorse. The ruling that was made a couple of years ago on the basis of sexual harassment not being sexual discrimination, I think at the time some people thought it was a narrow decision. I don't share that opinion. I don't think the legislation was broad enough to be able to encompass that.

In legislation, we should not leave up to judges to tell us what our legislation says and means. We should make it very clear, and this legislation makes that point very clear, that sexual harassment is a grounds to be covered under The Human Rights Act.

The rest of it, just how broad it can come, I'm really not sure myself. Is harassment, as the Member for St. Vital this afternoon mentioned harassment being a possible grounds around pickets, an activity of pickets on a legal picket line, are the picketers harassing people who pass through the line or people who approach the line, or are people going through the line harassing the rights of association that the picketers have that is defined and presented in other parts of the act?

There are many other examples I'm sure people will be able to come up with. I guess I have some difficulty with passing legislation which doesn't, to my mind, sufficiently define the characteristics of how the commission shall adjudicate in matters dealing with a particular form of discrimination and, in this case, harassment.

I'd like I guess to pass something onto a commission, a quasi-judicial body with further definition in it, so there are less grounds for interpretation on their behalf,

so that they're not making rulings that are not intended by legislation. It goes beyond the intent of the legislation's provisions.

One other section that I would just like additional definition when we get through the committee, or perhaps the Attorney-General in summation can refer to this as well, is on the basis of creed included and added along with religion on prohibited basis of discrimination. Does creed include cults? Does creed include things such as a profession of faith as some legal dictionaries? In looking up in Black's Law Dictionary, creed is defined as something having a confession or articles of faith or, another explanation, a form of declaration of a religious belief. Chambers Dictionary defines it as an accepted or a professed system of religious belief, and yet in a book on synonyms, it also includes such things as cults.

I don't want to take this too far, but would things where you have professions towards an organization like a masonic order, of a certain profession of a faith when one joins an order of that nature similar to much less prestigious organizations such as motorcycle gangs, have a similar sort of initiation process that people go through?

I would not want to see any body, be it the commission or a judicial body somewhere down the road, accept the inclusion in the Charter of things such motorcycle gangs or religious cults, cults that - you know, we spend a tremendous amount of time and energy trying to get people away from certain cults who have, in a sense, kidnapped people's, both their mental capability to be able to think on their own.

We've heard many instances of people who have ended up living as virtual slaves within certain cults. I would hope that the inclusion of the word creed, would not allow such things as cults. Another example that I've read in other jurisdictions in this country - I believe it was in Ontario - where people who, and I'm not speaking as a strongly religious person here, but wanting to have the inclusion of devil worshippers and whatnot in the legislation as well, at least within the definition of their Human Rights Code. I have not heard any representations of that here, but I would like to have it clarified to make sure, or at least for the public's mind, as well as our own mind in this Legislature, that things like that are not necessarily included.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to move on to the other area that, I guess, has caught most of the attention, unfortunately so, because in bulk I think this is a fine piece of legislation. It's unfortunate in a way but predictable, I guess, that the inclusion of something such as sexual orientation, would serve to focus as much to debate on this one particular aspect of the bill.

I, as many people in this House know, am not overly excited about the inclusion of sexual orientation into The Human Rights Act in the Province of Manitoba. It's something that I must confess, a couple of years ago, I would have been far more willing to accept. I can't fully explain why I have slipped away, I guess, in support of that notion to be included in the House. But I don't know what factors have affected me over the last few years to lessen my - not that I had any great enthusiasm for it - but less and less support for that proposal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I guess my question on this, and I don't want to in any way be linked with some of

the less sensitive, I suppose, and downright insensitive, not only insensitive but almost condemnatory statements that several members of the Opposition have used. Inflammatory is another word that can certainly be used to indicate some of the comments of members opposite, not all of the members opposite but some of the members opposite. Some of the members opposite, as myself and the Member for St. Vital this afternoon, certainly have expressed serious concerns as to the propriety and properness of us including sexual orientation in The Human Rights Act.

I have, myself, not been a strongly religious person. I have some objection to the comments that were made by the Leader of the Opposition and several other members opposite of picking out particular members on this side of the House that, because they may profess to one particular tenet of Christianity, they should follow the dictates or the requests of leadership in the church. I do not think it is proper. I do not think that democracy is ever well served when the members of a legislative body are essentially instructed on how to vote by people of any religious order.

I think you can take that, and it's a fundamental basis of the way the blossoming and the growth of democracy around the world has been the separation of church and state. There's a fundamental difference, a fundamental requirement for the two to be clearly separated. One can certainly be influenced. No question that one isn't influenced by their religious beliefs equally so, if not more so, by their moral beliefs. I do not believe that we should and that any member of this House should ever feel under the pressure that they must vote for or against a particular piece of legislation because of the direction of a religious leader. I just do not believe that serves democracy well.

If I could just enunciate a touch further on that. In most areas of the world where you have strongly religious states, they are usually the nations to have democracy come in at the latest. The most recent emergence of democracy is in those countries rather than in the more historic - and the growth of democracy has been in, perhaps one could say, less religious states where you do not have the dominance of religion over political matters.

Certainly, they have a moral suasion, but not the dominance as one has in many jurisdictions today. Take the examples of Iran, and Italy until relatively recently, just within our generation, so many other nations where the church had an oppressive impact upon the growth of democracy. So I totally reject the allegations and the charges made by the Leader of the Opposition in that regard.

I do have some, I guess, worries of how this particular aspect of the legislation will affect society at large, what the acceptance of it shall be. The paramountcy of this legislation over all other pieces of legislation, I believe, will probably lead toward the equating of homosexuality and normal sexuality or heterosexuality.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

I do fundamentally believe that they are not equal, that no biological species can sustain itself to grow on the basis of the equality of those two. The moral basis to equate homosexuality with race, with ethnicity, with family status, with physical disability, I do not quite accept.

I guess I'm willing to see this legislation go through to committee, Madam Speaker, but I guess from moral grounds of just how much this piece of legislation can affect an overall society, what it means to us as individuals within that society, and what our responsibilities are, quite frankly, to the overall society, whether it is pressure coming or not coming from the general public when we're dealing with a particular issue, to me that is not as great a concern as trying to look into the longer-term impact of this.

By saying this, I in no way implicate any support whatsoever for those who want to wantonly discriminate against homosexuals. I in no way imply that; I in no way condone people of that. I have known homosexuals ever since I was a small child. When you grow up in a small town, you know pretty well everybody in the town. You know everything from their sexual preferences to the churches they go to. Some of the individuals were fine, upright citizens of the town and contributed tremendously to the social life of that town, others less so.

But I in no way want to have my comments in regard to this taken as anything against or wanting to see wanton discrimination against people who are homosexual. (Interjection)- Well, I quite frankly wonder if some members opposite, from the comments that I've read in Hansard - and unfortunately I was ill yesterday and not able to be here - but from some of the comments that I've heard from members opposite, it seemed to go far beyond that.

I want to disassociate myself from not all members opposite on their comments but from many of the members who have been almost harassing in their comments towards this particular group.

It's exceptionally difficult for me, Madam Speaker, as you can well imagine, being able to get up and speak on a particular issue that you may have significant differences with the government or the wishes of the government to follow. It's not an easy thing to do. I do not intend to vote against this going to committee. I would like to see it go to committee, to hear the public heard, for the both sides to look at this issue, perhaps myself to reconsider more on it, as well.

I do want to see the committee when it is functioning, not just to deal with this in an hour and not just to deal with it in a partisan measure but to deal with it by delving well into the issues. And if it takes a bit more time, then fine, let it take that bit more time to do that, but I do not want to see legislation go through that will offend a large number of Manitobans perhaps.

And at the same time, I don't want to see a situation created where one would have a wanton discrimination against any particular individuals in society. And, in that instance, I refer of course to the individual homosexuals.

So, Madam Speaker, as difficult as it's been to address this particular issue and this particular bill and show publicly some of my own difficulties with it, I felt it was very important for me or other members as well who have spoken to clarify some of their positions. I think we have a responsibility as members to stand up and to let people know our own feelings and why we have some of the feelings that we do towards various pieces of legislation.

I really wonder if, with the paramountcy provision, some of the things that we have been told will not

happen as far as for acceptance of pensions, benefits, and spousal benefits and that sort of thing, passed on to homosexual couples, if this act would not override The Marriage Act, if it would not override The Pension Act and other such things as that. I believe that for The Human Rights Act . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. SCOTT: . . . to be paramount, it must have that in it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The hour being 5:00 p.m., I'm - the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: I believe there's an inclination on the part of all members to forego Private Members' Hour today, by leave.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed.)

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. D. ROCAN: Merci, Madame la Présidente.

Madam Speaker, I'm not going to stand here in my place and say that I am pleased to speak on Bill 47, La Code des droits de la personne, The Human Rights Code. But Madam Speaker, I, as an elected official, must represent my constituents at all times; and I want to share with this House a letter which was sent to the First Minister from a constituent of mine.

I believe his concerns sum up the feelings of the majority of the people in Turtle Mountain and also some of mine, Madam Speaker. And he writes:

"I am writing to express my alarm and concern over the Attorney-Generel's announcement to introduce legislation to end all forms of discrimination based on sexual orientation that come within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government.

"Why is such a move necessary? Discrimination on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, sex, age, or mental or physical handicap is already prohibited. These are natural factors that one cannot change. Why do you now propose singling out those with deviant sexual behaviour for special rights that no one else is to be given? Why should we give them tacit approval for their immorality by giving them a special status? This will confirm them in their unnatural behaviour, rather than helping them to change. They already possess the same rights as other citizens to freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of association.

"At the present time, they are discriminated against only when they are a threat to national security, or they seek to affect others with their lifestyle. It seems strange that at the very time that the people of the United States are recognizing the error of their ways in some of the changes that they have and/or have not made to their Constitution, this government is proposing this unnecessary change. Should we not be trying to learn from their mistakes? More specifically, should the Government of Manitoba not be evaluating the experiences of certain U.S. cities with homosexual rights ordinances, before introducing this legislation?

"To prevent discrimination based on sexual orientation is to open the door to flagrant abuses of

what the majority of voters regard as decent in our society. If it becomes entrenched in areas of provincial jurisdiction, then the courts will soon extend its application to the private sector as well. What will come next? Prostitutes and the like. Has this government really considered what this could mean?

"Will homosexual and lesbian marriages be given the benefits of legal recognition and their right to adopt innocent children and bring them up in their lifestyle? What happens to the age of consent? Do you and I want our children taught that homosexuality is a valid, healthy lifestyle that is a viable alternative to natural heterosexuality?

"As a parent, I do not want my children taught what is wrong as a potential good sanctioned by the state. Surely, as a parent, I have the right to exercise discretion in overseeing the moral character of those who come in contact with my children.

"At the very time our Federal Government is taking steps to curb teenage prostitution, why is this government wanting to endorse a lifestyle that encourages the sexual abuse of young boys? Moreover, at the very time that the spread of AIDS is of such a concern in North America, why are you taking steps to legitimize a lifestyle that is a proven carrier of this dreaded disease? We need to be seeking means of helping them deal with their problem, rather than contributing to them.

"In the name of all that is decent and right in the sight of the Almighty God, the Lord Jesus Christ, I urge you not to destroy our family-based society. Do not go down in history as the Premier of Manitoba who allowed the destruction of the moral fabric of our society just to please a few radicals who have hoodwinked Liberals and misguided human rights activists into believing that they are promoting human rights, when they are really infringing on the rights of the majority of decent people who voted for you in the first place.

"I urge you to reconsider in the light of the above question, the course that the Attorney-General has proposed that government follow, in removing all discrimination based on sexual orientation."

Now, Madam Speaker, I have to ask myself, what does this government intend to gain by legitimizing this type of behaviour? Madam Speaker, many people believe that the term sexual orientation means only homosexuality and lesbianism. But, Madam Speaker, the widest application of the term actually includes pedophilia, necrophilia and bestiality. Madam Speaker, these activities, including anal intercourse with persons under the age of 19 years, are serious criminal offences and members opposite support such perversions.

Other than the Member for St. Vital, is there nobody opposite with a sound mind? Truly, you are following the Red Rules.

Madam Speaker, the Red Rules are something that was found by the Allied Forces in Dusseldorf, Germany in 1919, nearly 70 years ago. Today, Madam Speaker, the Reds are still following them. I'd like to quote some of them, Madam Speaker:

- (a) Corrupt the young: get them away from religion; get them interested in sex; make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.
- (b) Get control of all means of publicity thereby.
 - (1) Get people's minds off their government by focusing their attention on athletic

sexy books and plays and other trivialities.

- (2) Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.
- (3) Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding the leader up to contempt, ridicule and disgrace.
- (4) Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and ruthlessly as possible.
- (5) By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit. Produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.
- (6) Incite unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of government towards such disorders.
- (7) By specious argument, cause a breakdown of the old moral virtues: honesty, sobriety, self-restraint, face and the pledge word "ruggedness."

Madam Speaker, I ask members opposite to please consider the consequences of legitimizing this type of behaviour. Churches and religious schools would be forced to accept homosexual employees. This would be a clear violation of rights of religious belief for any Bible-based organization. Madam Speaker, my rights as a parent to select appropriate role models for my children will be violated.

Madam Speaker, I am also one who polled his or her constituency on the question of special legislation for homosexuals. A majority of my constituents, indeed 87 percent of those who responded, are clearly opposed to this type of behaviour and are entitled to use their own sound judgment if necessary to discriminate. This could be for the benefit of their own peace of mind, the safety of their children, or for their health's sake.

So, in closing, I can honestly say that I would support this bill with the exclusion of the part of sexual orientation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

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

I rise to put a few comments on the record with regard to Bill 47. The first thing I want to say is the way it is structured now, as the Member for Turtle Mountain just said, with the particular phrase in it on sexual orientation, I will vote against this bill.

Madam Speaker, it is difficult, as other members have said, to speak from a position of voting against the prevention of discrimination. Madam Speaker, I grew up in Manitoba and I had the good fortune to live in other parts of North America. I lived and grew up in a community that had some Ukrainian people and it had some French people not too far away. I grew up in a home that did not practise discrimination, and I believe very strongly in the fact that you do not discriminate on any grounds. I believe very strongly in that and we imparted that principle to our children. So it's difficult now to stand and have to vote against this bill with that part in it. If that part was out, I would vote differently.

Madam Speaker, there was not a strong non-discriminatory attitude in my society. There was discrimination against the Ukrainians, against the French, against the blacks. It was the attitude of people. Madam Speaker, I probably would have had a discriminatory attitude had I stayed in that community all my life, but I was fortunate enough to spend some time in the mid-western U.S. in the mid-Sixties when the race riots were occurring in the United States, and I saw the plight of the blacks and I felt sorry for them. I learned very clearly not to discriminate.

I also lived in the community of Urbana, Illinois, at the point in time when they passed legislation to integrate the schools. We lived in the university housing. There were several hundred families, married people, living there, people going to university, people from all over the world. So we had the good fortune to see and meet and understand people from all over the world.

At that time, we had three children and they learned to accept people of various types, shapes and colours. My children also had the benefit of being involved in a busing program to integrate the schools. They picked on the university housing area because we were from different parts of the world and we obviously had some tolerance for different coloured skin. And our children were bused to the black school in the north end of Urbana. Nothing happened. There were meetings - there were strong meetings - by a number of people opposing this, and boy! was there discrimination. We saw it; we didn't agree with it. We allowed our kids to go and I think they and me are better for it.

Madam Speaker, I also had occasion to live in Ottawa at the time that they were blowing up mail boxes. We didn't know what was going on. We didn't know if it was French versus English or what it was. It turned out to be just a pocket of a few people. But, Madam Speaker, those are enlightening things to experience and you come to understand other people's way of thinking as time goes on.

Madam Speaker, when I look at this bill and I look at the responsibilities of the commission to promote the principle that all members of the human family are free and equal in dignity and rights, entitled to be treated on the basis of their personal merits, I agree fully with it. When I turn over to section 9(2), applicable characteristics, I have absolutely no problem with (a), (b), (c), (d), dealing with ancestry, nationality, ethnic background, religion. I have no problem with age or sex or gender determination or marital status or source of income or political belief or physical or mental disability. I can agree fully that there should not be discrimination on any of those grounds. But, Madam Speaker, 9(2)(h), sexual orientation, is another matter.

Madam Speaker, as many other members have said, there is no way that society is prepared to accept that homosexual activity and heterosexual activity are equal. Regardless of how members on the other side want to present that issue and how they say it isn't really equal, it is perceived by people who have written to me and talked to me that it is being legitimized as being equal. Madam Speaker, that is not true. It is not possible for people to accept it as being equal. It has never been an equal lifestyle and it never will be.

The Member for St. Vital and the Member for Inkster, this afternoon, both spoke as this being offensive, the

attitudes of homosexual people. They don't sanction it. Madam Speaker, I'm very interested in seeing how they vote on this issue, as well as other members over there.

I don't know the marital status of everyone over there, but the vast majority are married, Madam Speaker, and that is the basis of our society, the family unit. I believe very strongly in that. That means that we accept and promote the heterosexual lifestyle. And, Madam Speaker, my wife spoke to me when I got home the first weekend after it became obvious that this legislation was coming in, and the first question that she asked me, how are you going to vote? I said, it should be fairly obvious to you and she said, I'm relieved.

About a half-an-hour later, my daughter came into the house. She's 17, our youngest, and she says, Dad, how are you going to vote on that gay rights bill? And she had never asked me a question before on how I was going to vote on any legislation but, as soon as this word got out that this sort of legislation is being brought in, the young children talked about it at school. And they are opposed to it, Madam Speaker. I'm very comfortable in saying that the vast majority of Manitobans are opposed to this being in the legislation. We've put out questionnaires where over 90 percent of the people indicate that they would not support special status for the homosexuals.

I have a great degree of sympathy for their status. I feel for them and I'm sure that for many of them there's nothing they can do about what they feel is a lifestyle that they have to lead. And I really feel sorry for them because it's a difficult thing to have to live with in society.

Madam Speaker, I would think that this government and other governments in this country and around the world would be a lot better off if they were to try to find solutions to what causes this and ways and means of being able to help young people who tend to want to go this way in their adolescent years, to find solutions, medical or whatever. There's got to be some hormonal relationship that can be used, or find techniques or medical methods of finding a solution, rather than condoning it.

Madam Speaker, I've had several people write and make comments on our questionnaires about the fact that they would not want to see people in the educational system who are homosexuals because they do not want their young boys or young girls being subjected to the persuasion that they can influence over these young people during their education years.

These teachers are a role model for these young people and, since we don't know for sure or totally whether the homosexual activity is inherited or can be acquired, then certainly anybody who plays a role model who is homosexual has a tendency, I would think and I believe strongly, in influencing the sexuality of young people in the years when their sexuality is developing, Madam Speaker. And once we pass this legislation and legitimize that homosexuality is an acceptable lifestyle, I think that we are condoning those people who are in the grey area, condoning them to swing towards the homosexual lifestyle.

Madam Speaker, many people have said to me, I cannot tolerate, I don't understand how the government could allow people with homosexual tendencies to be

employed in the health services area. And the obvious reason that they're concerned about that is because of the presence of AIDS in the homosexual community. It's not exclusively there - I know that - but it's predominantly there. And, Madam Speaker, the word AIDS strikes fear in the heart of anybody. Can you imagine hearing of somebody that you know quite well, either a close friend or a relative, having to tell you that they have AIDS? There's nothing more terminal. And in the short term, there's no, you've got two years or three years; it's not that long. With the presence of AIDS in our society, this is absolutely the wrong time to be condoning the lifestyle that can spread this disease.

Madam Speaker, we should be finding ways and means of trying to find an answer to AIDS - a cure, a method of preventing it, rather than condoning a lifestyle that will spread it.

Madam Speaker, how do you tell your children? I ask the men over there, how do you tell your wife that you are going to promote AIDS? I ask the women, how are you going to tell your husband you are going to pass legislation that promotes the spread of AIDS? It's just counterproductive. I don't understand it, nor do the majority of Manitobans and, I would dare say, 95 percent of Manitobans don't understand what you're trying to do with this legislation.

There is another area that people do not want the homosexual involved in and that is food services because, naturally, they fear the spread of AIDS in that route also. The Minister of Health had a meeting one evening where he had some of his health officials try to explain to us what is going on with AIDS, what they know and what they don't know.

I was somewhat reassured that evening, Madam Speaker, that in the process of collecting blood, in the screening of it and the treating of blood, they may well have totally eliminated the spread of AIDS through blood transfusions, but it has happened. There are documented cases in the past, and there may be mistakes in the future that will allow it to happen again.

Madam Speaker, I think that there should be, in the health care field, some mechanism of screening out those who have AIDS because that evening the health officials very clearly told us that they only know of about 10 percent of the people who carry AIDS. The other 90 percent are undetected. We don't know who they are, or where they are. They probably don't know who they are themselves, but they have the ability to transmit that disease through sexual activity, through blood, and whatever other ways there may turn out to be as time goes on.

We are condoning the continuous spread of that deadly disease. We should be more concerned about protecting the innocent victims of the future rather than promoting the spread of a disease of this nature. I have no qualms with what consenting adults do behind closed doors, in their own bedrooms. That is their choice; they are free to do what they want. But I do not condone the legitimizing of an abnormal way of life.

I would like to find a way to solve their problem, because I feel for them. Madam Speaker, neither this legislation nor any other legislation can legislate people's attitudes and, as long as we have attitudes of acceptance or rejection, there will be discrimination. You can not legislate attitudes to stamp out discrimination, even though it may be illegal.

This legislation or the bringing in of this legislation has in some people's minds - and I would say in my mind - hardened our position on the homosexual people. It has brought forth a higher level of non-tolerance and just a couple of casual things I will mention. When I went to university, and I'm sure it goes on today yet, two young boys will live together to share expenses in an apartment or in a room. And now, there's a subtle concern that, hey, are they gay?

That is incredible that people will think that because two young men live together. We go to dances quite regularly in our community and we thought nothing of two women dancing together. In many cases, we assumed it was because their men didn't want to dance, but now there's a question mark there. Are they lesbian? I mean, we're promoting attitudes that shouldn't happen. I never thought anything of it before.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet, one evening when we were in committee, I asked him what he felt about this bill. He said, oh it's okay, it's going on anyway. He's going to vote for it. I quizzed him a bit further. He told me, he says, well we used to call them bachelors.

I never thought of bachelors as being homosexual. All of a sudden, the attitudes change, all because of legislation that's totally unnecessary. It's totally in opposition to the moral attitudes that I was brought up with, that at least 90 percent of the people in the province, in this country, are brought up with.

But, Madam Speaker, in the interests of conserving time, I won't read the letters and the comments I have here, but they more or less gave me the information that I needed to give this speech.

Madam Speaker, they are telling me very strongly, do not vote in favour of this legislation. As long as sexual orientation is in this act or in this bill, Madam Speaker, I will vote against the bill with that in there. If it's removed, I will then have to look at what's in the rest of the bill and probably what I'll find is that I will be able to support it.

Madam Speaker, we believe in a free vote over here because we represent our constituents. I'm appalled that there does not appear to be a free vote on the other side. I've heard some members speak and give reservations. I would hope that they would think about those reservations, and vote according to their true belief.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also consider it a privilege for me to be able to speak in this House on Bill No. 47, and I have to represent my constituency on that behalf.

I also have to go along with the Member for Virden, the statement he made that, if this portion of this bill, 9(2)(h), would be withdrawn from the bill, I would look at it once more. I'm sure possibly I would be able to see fit to vote in favour of the rest of the bill.

I also did send out a questionnaire, Madam Speaker. In my questionnaire, well over 90 percent of the people indicated on my questionnaire that sexual orientation - there should not be special provincial legislation passed to provide protection for homosexuals.

So, Madam Speaker, with that I believe I'm not speaking on behalf of myself, I'm speaking on behalf of my constituency, the constituency of La Verendrye. As much as I must say, I feel very much the same way as they have indicated on the questionnaire.

There's one point that I want to congratulate our leader for. He right away did indicate it was a free vote. Nobody has tried to persuade anybody on our side of the House which way to vote. We all can vote totally the way we see fit, Madam Speaker.

It is unfortunate, at least I am led to believe that the members on the government side, that they have basically been told, as one member did indicate, that they were supposed to vote united on this issue. So if that isn't being muzzled, then I don't know what else would be.

I must, in addressing this Bill No. 47 and 9(2)(h), I must go back to what the Minister of Health indicated. He indicated in his speech that it was a sickness. Madam Speaker, I truly believe, as many of my colleagues have indicated, it is a sickness. I believe we in this Legislature, we 57 elected members in this Legislature, should do whatever we can to protect, to help people eradicate themselves of this sickness, like we want to do in whichever area it might be, research and through whatever ways and avenues there are possible. But, Madam Speaker, to incorporate it, as what this is basically doing is recognizing it as a lifestyle, I must definitely speak against it.

I wanted to also speak against it on the moral issue. I believe that this country has been founded basically on the Bible and, with that in mind, I believe that, as one member did indicate - and I believe it was the Environment Minister, he indicated something to that effect, that we were - I'll have to just look that up here, what he did indicate exactly - holier-than-thou attitude.

Madam Speaker, I found that very disturbing that the member would indicate that. Basically, I believe what members on this side have indicated and what I would also like to do, is basically use only the Bible to make the judgment on it. I don't think any of us have the right to judge any person, and I think it's only the Bible that should tell us. Basically, our Constitution and everything has been based on the Bible and so we have, in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 15.(1), "Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefits of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability." Why does it even say again: ". . . and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination." It even states it twice.

Madam Speaker, I believe, that this Charter of Rights does include that freedom that these people have, but we should not recognize it as a lifestyle. That is basically what I feel this is doing; it is recognizing it as a lifestyle.

Madam Speaker, I do know some people who are homosexuals and I believe what they do, as other members on this side of the House have indicated, in their bedroom, that's their business. I am not here to pass judgment on anybody, and I took a great deal of offense from the Minister of Environment when he indicated that, to some degree, we were trying to pass judgment. No, we're not passing judgment.

But, I believe also that we are responsible for future generations. Legislation that's being put in place today, Madam Speaker, will be in place for a long time and future generations will have to deal with this type of legislation. Madam Speaker, I don't believe it's fair for us to even put them up to making them be responsible for this type of legislation for the future.

Madam Speaker, the other day, I heard this HIV virus, 55 people a day are being contacted with this virus in the United States. That's how fast it is spreading. Now if we look at that point alone, that should be very scary to even consider something of this nature - 55 people a day, and you multiply that times 365. I didn't do any calculations or anything of that nature.

But also, in the meeting we had the other day, in which the Member for Virden was relating to, where we had an update in respect to AIDS, it indicated that within six or seven years, 30 percent of them would have acquired the AIDS virus. Madam Speaker, I think that can become an alarming factor. We make this Province of Manitoba a nuclear-free zone. We don't have any control over it, but we pass legislation of that nature - a nuclear-free zone. We should try whatever we could do to help these people who are living this abnormal lifestyle, to try and help society for future generations, which today is our No. 1 killer, and eradicate ourselves and future generations from this lifestyle which seems to be the No. 1 spreader of this deadly virus, which we have no cure for today.

Madam Speaker, I also believe that it is the family tradition and the family values that we are eradicating. Madam Speaker, I believe totally in day care centres where it's needed and everything of that nature, but what I sensed, since I got into this House, is that the family and anything that pertains to basically scriptural living, is not being talked about from the government side or referred to at all.

I would like to refer to the Pause Day. I notice the Attorney-General, who I consider is a very smart and intelligent person but, in a lot of respects, not very wise.

And then the Minister of Labour talks of a Pause Day. Why do you want a Pause Day? It's the seventh day that it states in the Bible as the day of rest. Madam Speaker, we are trying to divert from the Bible into legislation of our own which never will work. I think if we would go to basically any type of legislation that we want - and the Minister of Industry and Technology, he should -(Interjection)- Okay, the seventh day.

I realize why the Minister of Industry and Technology isn't speaking on this bill, because he must be under tremendous stress; he must be under tremendous stress.

Madam Speaker, I have a letter here. We talk of it as a sickness, it is a disease, it is genetic and whatever we want to call it. I have a letter here where the person today has AIDS and he is alive. He is not practising homosexuality anymore. Madam Speaker, now he can quit?

I realize we are pressed for time because this bill shall be passed, but I do want to put on the record a few statements from some doctors. This one doctor is from Topeka, Kansas. "Homosexuality is an illness," and that is Dr. Harold M. Voth, writing that article. Then I have from Dr. Sarah Charles, Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, University of Illinois, she writes also: "I have

worked with many homosexuals and, in my opinion, they are individuals whose emotional development was arrested at a pre-adolescent level. When a massive lack of the development and maturation process occurs in any area, it can be referred to as an illness in psychiatric terms."

Madam Speaker, I have quite a few more that I would like to refer to, but I believe because of the time, the shortness of the time and other speakers also want to speak on this, I should not put them all on the record at the present time.

But I do want to state, in San Francisco, they passed the Gays' Rights Ordinance in 1978. Since then, sex diseases have risen by 2,400 percent, by 2,400 percent. All of these figures cannot be wrong, even though sometimes maybe, if I see how the government likes to distort figures, I mean, you'd figure they could be exaggerated at times. But they cannot all be that far out, Madam Speaker.

So I believe, Madam Speaker, that members of government, they should look seriously and with an open mind at something of this nature, what the scripture says, what the Bible says on this issue, not how human beings will want to judge them because we're not here to judge people. They can live their lifestyle, you can live yours, I can live mine. Some day, we'll be judged, not by human beings, and that's what'll count, Madam Speaker.

So, I would like to state to some of you, to this House that, in Leviticus 18:22 - and I won't read these passages but I want to have them for the record - Leviticus 20: 13, Romans 1:24, 29, and I could go on with about 10 more. The Government House Leader, he indicated what the New Testament indicated and I would like to, at a later date, give him some references of that as well because this country, Madam Speaker, was founded on religious and Christian beliefs. I think we should not allow any part of our legislation that we put in place for future generations to deviate from that.

Madam Speaker, with that I would wish that the Attorney-General, in his wisdom, would realize the mistake that he is doing by having this section 9(2)(h) incorporated into this bill, and I wish the members opposite on the government side would also realize how severe and what repercussions this can have on future generations as well, and realize it and vote with the Opposition, basically, against this bill.

Thank you very much.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. L. DERKACH: Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to speak in opposition to Bill 47 and I do it because of my own conscience, because of my own belief. In addition, I do it because of the responses that I have received from my constituents, and I feel it's a responsibility of mine to represent not only my conscience and my beliefs but also the majority of the constituents that I represent.

The major objection that I have to this bill, of course, is one that has already been talked about by most of my colleagues, and that is the section dealing with the sexual orientation. Other sections of this bill are of some concern to me, Madam Speaker, but I think our

House Leader has very ably pointed out some alternatives that could be used to perhaps make the other aspects of this bill more acceptable to us. I would hope that the Attorney-General, who presented this bill, would consider some of the alternatives that were presented by our House Leader.

Before addressing any of the contents of this bill - and I will try to limit my comments because of the constraint of time - but before addressing the contents, I must tell you, Madam Speaker, that the comments that I make are not directed or intended to hurt any individual or any group within our society. My comments, rather, are a response to the contents of this bill, as presented by a short-sighted, misdirected government.

As I said, Madam Speaker, there is no intent to discriminate against anyone, and I have no wishes to victimize homosexuals or lesbians. Although their behaviour is deviant and I do not condone or approve of it, I must say that these people do have a place in our society. They have the same rights and freedoms and have to enjoy those same rights and freedoms in this particular province, in this country, that we do. This is a great country, Madam Speaker, a great province but, if we do not preserve the foundations, the principles that this province, this country was built on, this country will fade into destruction.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Emerson pointed out very ably that what consenting adults do in the privacy of their homes is not a matter which government should interfere in. Neither should government interfere and pass legislation which promotes immorality.

We have not heard from many members opposite on this bill, and I have to congratulate the two members opposite who spoke with some concern about certain aspects of this bill because, although I have not had the experience of speaking against what a colleague of mine is proposing, Madam Speaker, I know that it must be very, very difficult to stand up and speak in opposition to something that one of your colleagues has proposed before this Legislature. I guess they have to be congratulated for having the courage to stand up and speak their mind according to their conscience, Madam Speaker.

I also have to congratulate, and I must say I'm very proud of my leader, who said, right from the very beginning and without hesitation, that members on this side of the House will have the opportunity to vote according to their conscience. This, Madam Speaker, shows sincerity and respect that this leader has for the members of his team.

It is with regret, Madam Speaker, that the Premier, the principal Minister of this province, does not show that same respect for his colleagues and does not have the integrity to allow a free vote on this particular subject.

I am opposed to this bill because I deeply believe and know in my heart that this bill is wrong, that this legislation is wrong. Proponents of this bill say that it is very innocent, that this bill does not set up a special status for anyone. To that, I say, not so.

I strongly believe that, through the inclusion of the sexual orientation aspect of this legislation, this government is creating a special status, a special treatment in our society for a group that has a lifestyle which we would term deviant. The group has lobbied very strongly for this special treatment, and it is shown

through the presentation of this legislation that they have won at least the attention of the Attorney-General.

This government is trying to group this group of individuals who have this behavioural problem along with other special minorities in our society, visible minorities, and I say that is wrong - visible minorities. I am a minority, I guess, because I belong to a certain ethnic background and I certainly don't associate myself with those kinds of people because that is a behavioural problem. Some of us who are in a minority were born into that minority.

Imposing this bill on Manitobans also creates all sorts of problems within our society. It puts the family unit in a very stressful situation. This country, Madam Speaker, was founded on Christian principles. This country was founded and is strong because of the family unit. The family unit in this country is strong and the country is strong. If we destroy that, Madam Speaker, we destroy the basic principles of our society. We destroy a way of life; we destroy our country.

The Minister of Health indicated that homosexuality is an illness, and I think most Manitobans would believe that this is an illness. What is this government doing to address the problem? How is this legislation going to address the problem? How is this legislation going to eradicate this illness that the Minister of Health alludes to? Well, it's not going to, Madam Speaker, and I think the Member for La Verendrye pointed out some statistics which show that in fact the problems will increase with such legislation. The sexual diseases will increase. And Lord knows, we all have heard about the AIDS epidemic in this particular province and country, and we know how it is escalating. What is this government going to do about it? They're going to legislate sexual orientation into the Human Rights Code. Well, Madam Speaker, that's when I say this government is misdirected. Why?

I have three sons, Madam Speaker. They are not all in school yet, but they are going to be in a very short time, and their teachers are going to be their role models. I can't see how I could ever stand for having a homosexual being a role model for my children. Yet, with this legislation, the school division is not going to have a choice. They are going to have to hire a homosexual if he meets the other criteria.

Madam Speaker, we have seen enough evidence throughout our province that shows that there is a tendency for homosexuals to perhaps influence small children, especially boys. I guess I feel strongly about this, Madam Speaker, because I do have three boys, and that's why I would never stand for having a homosexual teach my children. I think that is a right that I have. I should have the right not to allow a homosexual to have influence over my children because homosexuality is a deviant way of life.

There are other places, Madam Speaker, where I think homosexuals should not be allowed to work. There are groups in our society which should have the opportunity to say "no" to homosexuals, whether they are religious schools or perhaps places where there are children or health products that have to be worked with.

In my opinion, Madam Speaker - and I'll try to sum up my comments very quickly because perhaps there are others who would like to make some comments before we close - in my opinion, this bill would infringe

upon the rights of all of us by creating this special status for the homosexual community.

What about the spread of AIDS, Madam Speaker? Where is AIDS spread from? It is not spread through the heterosexual relationships. Where did it begin? Where did it originate? -(Interjection)- The Minister of Education says it is spread by heterosexuals. Now, Madam Speaker, that is probably the most ridiculous comment I have heard today.-(Interjection)- It is spread by heterosexuals, yes, but why? Why is it spread by heterosexuals today? Where did it originate? I would suggest that the Minister of Education get a little education and learn where AIDS originated and how and who spreads most of the AIDS in our society.

Madam Speaker, this particular piece of legislation is one that I suppose brings out the emotion in many of us because many of us feel so strongly about it, and perhaps we make some comments that if it didn't strike so close to our hearts, we would not normally. We have seen colleagues of mine quote the Bible where we have seen that homosexuality is wrong.

I wonder where the Minister of Natural Resources is on this particular topic, and I wonder where the Minister responsible for Workers Compensation is on this particular topic. Why are they so silent? Why have they not stood up? And yet they seem to be able to make comments from their seats as long as those comments are not recorded, Madam Speaker. But why don't they stand up and make their comments and put them on the record and let their constituents know and let the people who associate with them know where they stand? Let the people of the congregations of the churches that they attend know where they stand on this particular issue. But they won't do that, Madam Speaker, because they don't have the courage to do that.

Madam Speaker, I hope that, after all this debate, there will be some change in heart on the part of the Attorney-General who introduced this bill and on the part of the government, that they will see fit to bring in an amendment perhaps or exclude this particular part from this legislation. At that point, Madam Speaker, I am sure that they would see a definite change in attitude on this side of the House towards this bill.

It is my hope that the members who I have pointed out will reach into their conscience and will examine the negative effects of this bill and will try to convince their colleagues to withdraw this portion of the bill.

Madam Speaker, with those comments, I close my remarks on this particular piece of legislation.

Thank you for the time.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I spent a great deal of time reviewing this legislation, listened with care to a great number of the speeches given in this House, and I've probably given this speech many times in my own head.

But I'm finding it difficult to perhaps say the most important things as it relates to a bill that's trying to regulate human relations in this province. It probably should be one of the best speeches one can ever give. But unfortunately, with the shortage of time, one can't

rise to the level that one would like to achieve in the debate on this issue, because it is an important issue, and how we regulate the affairs of one another in our society.

I have several major concerns with this bill. In fact, there are four fundamental problems with it that I find objectionable. As a result, I will not be supporting it.

I note, Madam Speaker, though from the time that, I believe, I have some time to speak, but a question: Is this the time that the question is to be put? I'm asking because the House normally rises at six o'clock. I am prepared to carry on speaking, but is this now the time for the vote? I will carry on talking then. Okay?

Briefly, and I wish I had more time to expand on the areas in which I would like to - I find fault with this area of this legislation. One is in the appointment and what, I believe, is the attempt to create a permanent body of opinion that would be adjudicating on human rights matters and, at the same time, the removal of the court of law to review the activities and the decisions of the adjudicators in this area.

My third area of concern is in the area of discrimination. The discrimination - and we heard the Attorney-General, when introducing this bill, indicate that we had to be specific because the courts required specificity. We couldn't use broad, general terms. Well, I look at the particular areas of discrimination and, quite frankly, some of them are meaningless. One can't derive anything from them, and one wonders why they're there.

The draftsman may be attempting to achieve certain specific objectives. But given the rule that the Attorney-General laid down is that we have to be specific if we wish to enforce these things and have them substantiated by law - why they're in broad, general terms. Now I can appreciate the principle that maybe they're trying to attempt to give broad meaning to the problems that come before them. But some of the definitions, quite frankly, are obtuse. They make no sense. I think, when we're dealing with the rights of human beings and how people must interplay with one another and what is involved in trying to get a good society working, that we should have something that is a little more specific.

I adopt the concepts outlined by my leader and by our Government House Leader as it relates to the sexual preference concern, but I have concerns also in the area of discrimination. There is one area in there that says gender-determined characteristics or circumstances other than those included in another clause. I don't know what that means and I am not prepared to support something that is merely a shopping list of some ideas or some concepts that really have no meaning and in fact may end up causing harm in the future.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is Second Reading on Bill 47.

All those in favour, say aye; all those opposed, say nay.

In my opinion, the ayes have it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 47, all those in favour, please rise.

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

YEAS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Carstairs, Cowan, Doer, Dolin, Evans, Harapiak (The Pas), Harapiak (Swan River), Harper, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Maloway, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith (Ellice), Smith (Osborne), Storie, Uruski, Wasylycia-Leis.

NAYS

Birt, Brown, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, Manness, McCrae, Mercier, Mitchelson, Nordman, Oleson, Pankratz, Rocan, Roch, Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 27; Nays, 24.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: By leave, Madam Speaker, I would like to request leave of the House to make some committee changes.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? I ask again: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Member for Ellice, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Private Bills be amended as follows: J. Maloway for C. Santos; S. Ashton for the Honourable M. Hemphill; Honourable E. Harper for the Honourable V. Schroeder; the Honourable L. Harapiak for C. Baker.

I move, seconded by the Member for Ellice, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be amended as follows: Honourable A. Mackling for the Honourable R. Penner; Honourable J. Storie for J. Walding.

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