



**Fourth Session - Thirty-Sixth Legislature**

**of the**

**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report  
(Hansard)**

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Louise M. Dacquay  
Speaker*



**Vol. XLVIII No. 64 - 1:30 p.m., Monday, June 15, 1998**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Sixth Legislature**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Constituency</b>	<b>Political Affiliation</b>
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	N.D.P.
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	N.D.P.
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DACQUAY, Louise, Hon.	Seine River	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary	Concordia	N.D.P.
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Albert	Steinbach	P.C.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	P.C.
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	N.D.P.
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	N.D.P.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	P.C.
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	P.C.
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	N.D.P.
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Lib.
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	P.C.
HELWER, Edward	Gimli	P.C.
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
JENNISEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
KOWALSKI, Gary	The Maples	Lib.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	N.D.P.
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	P.C.
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane	Osborne	N.D.P.
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	P.C.
MIHYCHUK, MaryAnn	St. James	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	P.C.
NEWMAN, David, Hon.	Riel	P.C.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
PITURA, Frank, Hon.	Morris	P.C.
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
RADCLIFFE, Mike, Hon.	River Heights	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack, Hon.	Niakwa	P.C.
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Gladstone	P.C.
SALE, Tim	Crescentwood	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan	Dauphin	N.D.P.
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	P.C.
TOEWS, Vic, Hon.	Rossmere	P.C.
TWEED, Mervin	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosam	Swan River	N.D.P.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 15, 1998

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING PETITIONS

#### Rail Line Abandonment

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of F. Corbett, R. Patience, A. Kroeker and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the provincial government go on record requesting that CN and CPR do not proceed with any discontinuance of lines until the report has been tabled, that being the Estey Grain Transportation Report review.

### READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

#### Rail Line Abandonment

**Madam Speaker:** I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), and it complies with the rules and practices of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Madam Speaker:** Dispense.

*WHEREAS affordable transportation is a critical component of grain production; and*

*WHEREAS under the Crow rate benefit, Manitoba was the cheapest place on the Prairies from which to ship grain but became the most expensive following the abolishment of the Crow rate; and*

*WHEREAS the Canada Transportation Act proclaimed on July 1, 1996, gave railways the ability to discontinue and scrap branch lines without public input; and*

*WHEREAS several lines were targeted immediately by CN for abandonment; and*

*WHEREAS CN gave notice on May 6, 1998, that the Erwood Subdivision will be discontinued in 1998; and*

*WHEREAS the loss of this line would severely impact upon the communities of Bowsman and Birch River as well as surrounding communities; and*

*WHEREAS in 1997, western grain farmers lost millions of dollars due to backlogs and delays by the major railways; and*

*WHEREAS as a result the federal government set up the Estey Grain Transportation Review which is scheduled to release a report later this year.*

*WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the provincial government go on record requesting CN and CPR to not proceed with any discontinuance of lines until that report has been tabled.*

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

#### Committee of Supply

**Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Chairperson):** Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Charleswood (Mrs. Driedger), that the report of the committee be received.

**Motion agreed to.**

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister charged with the administration of The Civil Service Superannuation Act):** I would like to table the 1997 Annual

Report for the Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Board.

### Introduction of Guests

**Madam Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have this afternoon ninety Grade 5 students from Edward Schreyer School under the direction of Ms. Lorraine Kozussek. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik).

We also have twenty-five Grade 5 students from Landmark Elementary School under the direction of Mr. Russ Dirks and Mr. Tom Koop. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson).

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

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### City of Winnipeg Amendment Act Community Committees

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, a former deputy minister under a couple of different political parties stated that one of the few avenues that citizens have access to citizen participation in the decision making of their community, that is the community committees, is given the death knell by the Filmon government. The City of Winnipeg Act eliminates these community committees in terms of citizens' rights of participation.

I would like to ask the Acting Premier: why is this government eliminating a guaranteed right of citizen participation in community committees with their initiatives to go backwards in The City of Winnipeg Act?

**Hon. Jack Reimer (Minister of Urban Affairs):** Firstly, I would like to commend City Council for coming forth with some new directions, new visions as to the scope and the direction that they want to take the civic administration. It was with that in mind that the

Cuff report was initiated, and with that in mind it was a decision by council to forward their recommendations to the province for legislative change.

The member for Concordia is right when he says that one of the conditions is the elimination of what they called the RAGs or the Residential Advisory Group committees, but at the same time what it does is it gives the power and the authority back to City Council and the councillors themselves to set up a system of public participation. It does not take away the right for people to participate in civic administration at the city level. What it does is it gives the council the ability to set up their own structure and the procedure that they feel is the best way to have public participation, and it also takes away the prescriptive nature that The City of Winnipeg Act now has in regard to interpretation by the province.

\* (1335)

**Mr. Doer:** Madam Speaker, this government is taking away and eliminating a guaranteed right of citizen participation in the community committees. This Legislature is being asked to eliminate that citizen right and allow that citizen right to be at the whim of City Council, which, ironically, did not even have citizen meetings to deal with the Cuff report itself.

Mr. Kubi from the East Kildonan Transcona Residents Advisory Council says that removal of citizen participation and citizen participation at community committees is not more democratic; it will affect the long-term quality of life in our communities. Why is this government working in an antidemocratic way to eliminate the guaranteed right of citizen participation? What kind of leadership are we getting from this government when it takes away the right of citizens to participate?

**Mr. Reimer:** One of the fundamentals of a democratic system is public participation and electing people to make decisions. The structure that is put forth for consideration with the amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act goes even further than the community committees. Community committees were structured in a sense that there was a dictatorial and a prescriptive nature from the provincial government to the civic

administration of the City of Winnipeg saying that they shall have public participation. We are saying that, in areas where the City of Winnipeg can make the decision as to what type of form and what type of direction they want to go with public meetings, they have that ability to make that decision. They are elected to make those types of decisions. The provincial government should not be prescriptive in nature in trying to dictate exactly how and where they should have public meetings.

If City Council wants to have more public meetings, they have the ability to do that. I should point out, too, that City Council has forwarded me a motion that they are going to keep the status quo regarding the community committees until after a review of The City of Winnipeg Act, and also The City of Winnipeg Act now gives them the ability to form community committees in any way that they feel.

**Mr. Doer:** Well, that should be some consolation for the citizens' rights here in Manitoba. This minister is telling us in this House that the City of Winnipeg's present council is the organ grinder and he is the monkey in terms of enacting whatever they want. It is a serious issue because delegating the right of how the city is going to treat our boulevards in terms of cutting the lawns is one thing; eliminating the rights of citizens to participate in community committees is an act and responsibility of this Legislature.

I would like to ask the Acting Premier: why is he eliminating the democratic rights that are guaranteed by this Legislature in The City of Winnipeg Act? Why is he delegating that to the whim of City Council, rather than having those rights guaranteed under the act of the Legislature in The City of Winnipeg Act? Surely there is no greater right in The City of Winnipeg Act than the right to citizen participation, which this government is trying to expunge in terms of these amendments.

**Mr. Reimer:** Madam Speaker, I find it passing strange that the member there from the other side would say that we are taking back the democratic rights of public participation. It is that type of attitude on that side of the House that says that government should be the only way that dictates how people present themselves in public committees. I am saying and this government is

saying that the people that are elected within City Council have the right and the responsibility of holding public participation meetings. It is part of The City of Winnipeg Act. We are expanding that to give them that type of ability, not like the people on the other side who feel that it should be a government fiat and government dictate as to how and where and how many meetings should be done. It is totally against the democratic process.

We are giving the people of Winnipeg and the councillors of the City of Winnipeg more ability to make those public changes and the public participation that they want to have. That side of the government wants it dictated by them and them alone. That is not a go, Madam Speaker.

#### **City of Winnipeg Amendment Act Withdrawal**

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Madam Speaker, speaker after speaker this morning in public hearings on Bill 36 spoke of the lack of community input into the process on the Cuff report and Bill 36, the decrease in democracy that will be as a result of Bill 36, the decrease in accountability and the decrease in citizen participation if Bill 36 goes ahead. While no city councillor, no mayoralty candidate in 1995 spoke out on this issue at all, it is very clear that this will be a campaign issue on both sides of the pros and cons of Bill 36 this fall in the election campaign.

\* (1340)

I would like to ask the minister and the government today, in light of the fact that this will be a campaign issue, that people are starting to talk about it, and we need to elect people on the basis of how they feel about this bill and the removal of democracy that it entails, if he will please remove this dreadfully flawed piece of legislation until after the City of Winnipeg elections this fall so we can have the people speak on this issue.

**Hon. Jack Reimer (Minister of Urban Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I, too, was at that committee meeting this morning. It was also mentioned by some of the committee members, and in particular one of the city councillors who supported the idea, that this was brought forth by a decision of council and that council

had endorsed the approach that was taken by the Cuff report. In fact, the councillor said that he felt it was proper that it go through the process that we are now before and that the implementation proceed.

The interpretation, though, by the members on the other side is that government should have some sort of magical say and control over everything and anything that happens on Broadway. We are saying, no, municipal government has a responsibility as elected officials to make decisions, to be involved with their constituents and to manage in a way that is most appropriate that they are elected for. We are saying that is the way the municipal government should be handled on Main Street.

#### **Mayoral Powers**

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** I would like to ask the minister, who talks about democracy being guaranteed and preserved in Bill 36, how there is a guarantee of democracy when the mayor's powers under Bill 36 will be larger and bigger and broader than any mayor in any city in Canada and most likely any city in North America. How does that guarantee democracy?

**Hon. Jack Reimer (Minister of Urban Affairs):** The interpretation and the definition of democracy, I guess, takes on a different meaning when it is interpreted either by the New Democratic opposition or the government in office right now. We are of the opinion that democracy, in its way of decision making and the powers that should be, should be delegated to the people who make the decisions. This is one of the reasons why the Cuff report and a lot of the other recommendations are acted upon.

We do this on a yearly basis. We talk to the City of Winnipeg. They send forth amendments that they feel are adequate in dealing with some of the concerns with City Hall. Madam Speaker, this is the normal process of trying to accommodate the city in their ability to make decisions.

#### **Impact on Councillors**

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the minister how he believes

representative democracy, which is what we are talking about here, is strengthened when up to half of the city councillors or more may not have any input into the real decision-making powers of the City of Winnipeg because they are not appointed to the Executive Policy Committee, because they do not have to be appointed to a standing committee, and on the other side, without the requirement for community committees, they do not have the opportunity necessarily or do not take advantage of listening to the citizens. How is representative democracy strengthened under this bill?

**Hon. Jack Reimer (Minister of Urban Affairs):** The member is hypotheticalizing situations, you know, that a lot of these things are going to happen because of a perceived change in the City Hall.

Madam Speaker, the council themselves still have the ability to make those choices as to—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

\* (1345)

#### **Point of Order**

**Ms. Barrett:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I am far from hypotheticalizing; I am carrying the elements of Bill 36 to their logical conclusion, which is the reduction if not the elimination of democracy in the city of Winnipeg.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable government House leader, on the same point of order.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Yes, Madam Speaker, on the same point of order. In spite of the circumloquacious effort by the honourable member to accuse the Minister of Urban Affairs of hyp—whatever that was—we will leave that to you to look it up in your Oxford dictionary—there certainly was no point of order.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Thompson, on the same point of order.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Madam Speaker, it is fortunate that there is nothing in

Beauchesne about abuse of the English language. Certainly the minister may have been guilty of that. I have never heard that word before used, and I do not want to even pronounce it because it certainly is not part of any language that I am aware of.

Madam Speaker, I think there was a disagreement of opinion, rather than anything else, on the part of the two members.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. On the point of order raised by the honourable member for Wellington, the honourable member did not have a point. It is clearly a dispute over the facts.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Reimer:** Madam Speaker, I believe what I was trying to answer was a question from the member regarding the powers of council. Council will still have the ability to make the number of committees and who is going to be serving on them. The chairperson of those committees will have the ability to appoint councillors. Now who is appointed is not within our purview. It will happen at City Council, and they will be the decision makers.

### **Misericordia General Hospital Surgical Procedures**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Madam Speaker, quite rightly and appropriately, many of the supporters of Misericordia Hospital are quite concerned about government plans to close Misericordia Hospital. One of the concerns raised is that, while Misericordia is being closed and the surgical programs are being decanted—which is the new buzzword—the government has introduced a bill to allow surgical services to take place in private clinics.

My question to the Minister of Health is: will he indicate whether in fact surgical programs that are moving from Misericordia Hospital will not be going to private clinics?

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, first of all, the member's proposal is correct in that we are not intending for surgical procedures being

decanted from the Misericordia Hospital to go to private clinics. That was explained very clearly by the Winnipeg Hospital Authority when they made their presentation, and the member was there in the room at that particular time.

I find it somewhat disagreeable when the member would propose, as we are attempting through this bill to comply with the Canada Health Act—is the member proposing to us as a government that we should just eliminate those procedures today that are being done in those private clinics so that we increase waiting lists and put more strain on the system?

Madam Speaker, obviously we have indicated, in the process of complying with the Canada Health Act, we would negotiate with those clinics to continue a certain volume of service to ensure that we do not see anything added to waiting lists.

**Mr. Chomiak:** Madam Speaker, I take it from the minister's response that it was a negative and a no to that response. My question to the minister is therefore: can he explain, since there is a lack of anesthesiologists at Grace Hospital and since there is a lack of beds at Grace Hospital, where are those programs going to go insofar as we are eliminating beds and programs from Misericordia Hospital, and some programs were scheduled to go to Grace?

**Mr. Praznik:** Madam Speaker, first of all, of the medical beds in the Winnipeg system, we have had as high, I believe, as 280 or 300 of those beds being used by people waiting for personal care home placements. So the addition of 550 additional long-term care beds within Winnipeg and the province will allow for the freeing up of many of those beds for other purposes.

Dr. Brian Postl also talked about a proposal to make better use of beds with the swing surgical/medical beds, depending on seasonal use, which we know are there. Madam Speaker, that was discussed in the presentation that I know the member for Kildonan attended.

### **Employment Protection**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Madam Speaker, will the minister, since he has guaranteed today that

none of those surgical programs will be going to private, for-profit clinics and since the minister has said the reason that they are having trouble with employees is because they want to take the opportunity to transfer employees from Misericordia to other centres, guarantee today that all the employees who are presently employed in those programs will have a job that will go with them to another hospital or institution, together with that program, and that they will not lose their jobs as a result of the closure of Misericordia Hospital?

\* (1350)

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Madam Speaker, first of all, that is fully our intention, and that is the mandate that we have given to the Winnipeg Hospital Authority. That is why we have made the issue of common employer or the ability to move people in the system a top priority. It is regrettable that we have not had support from the New Democratic Party openly on that issue. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Doer) comments, in supporting a variety of positions by the volunteer boards like St. Boniface, would work absolutely counter to achieving that kind of labour stability, but that is our intention.

The only caveat that I put on this, Madam Speaker, is that if one procedure or two are done somewhere, and the member gets up and then accuses us of lying and not telling the truth, I would not accept that. Our intention with the private clinics is to maintain that status quo while we are building our system so we do not lose that capacity today, so that we put patients first and ensure that they are able to get procedures on a timely basis.

### Northern Communities Emergency Airlift

**Mr. Eric Robinson (Rupertsland):** I have some questions for the Minister of Northern Affairs. Last week we raised some issues about problems they were having in the North with respect to building materials that were stuck in Thompson. I would like to ask the minister today as to the status of negotiations with the federal government for the shipment of these goods to

Tadoule Lake and other northern communities, including Lac Brochet.

**Hon. David Newman (Minister responsible for Native Affairs):** Madam Speaker, the cost of transporting those materials has been determined, through our investigations, to be approximately \$400,000 to \$500,000 if done by air now. The cost to truck this material over winter roads is estimated at \$25,000 to \$50,000. I am further advised that the price is firm on the housing material, and that housing material could be shipped up within the next nine months if the winter road were permitted to be constructed by the forces of nature before the end of the freeze-up next year, and that would then permit the low costs of transportation to be utilized. This involves, of course, then, a delay within that nine months and chances that natural forces might not prevail in favour.

The federal government has indicated that they do not have any additional funds to cover the cost of flying in the material at this time.

**Mr. Robinson:** Madam Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to read the memorandum of understanding between the provincial government and the federal government on the emergency airlift. I would like to ask the minister whether or not he believes that the federal government has lived up to that memorandum of understanding. As well, I would like to ask the minister what he is prepared to do to assist these communities so that they are not penalized any further with higher costs for food, cutbacks and essential supplies for shelter by the federal government.

**Mr. Newman:** Madam Speaker, the role of the provincial government in a situation where the federal government has 100 percent responsibility for funding this kind of thing, when it involves our aboriginal Manitoba citizens, is to use our resources, abilities, leadership and advocacy skills to try and persuade the federal government, through the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, to invest as prudently as they can in this kind of situation. We are going to be, in fact, meeting with the federal representatives this afternoon, exercising that sort of role within our government. My hope is that we can come up with a solution, together with them, to empower the minister responsible,



Minister Jane Stewart federally, to effectively persuade other government funding bodies and departments to come up with the money to make this possible.

**Mr. Robinson:** I would like to ask the minister a final question. We need the Province of Manitoba to be a lead player in dealing with our national government to address these many needed issues that have to be addressed for the good of aboriginal people in the North. I would like to ask this minister what role he sees this government playing in facilitating this meaningful role with our national government to meet the needs of aboriginal people and northerners in general.

**Mr. Newman:** Madam Speaker, we indeed see a very important role for the Manitoba government to facilitate an effective working relationship with the federal government and the aboriginal peoples of Manitoba to accomplish not only overcoming the short-term challenges that are serious to our communities in Manitoba but also the long-term challenges. We have now a relationship which is based on a comprehensive approach and hopefully a lot more rational and long-term thinking directed at solutions in holistic ways for our aboriginal people of Manitoba. This is the first step that we have to climb over, and we are going to work at it diligently this afternoon and see what creative solution we can come up with. We will be doing that on a case-by-case basis, and hopefully we will get enough success stories that everyone knows that it works and it pays to work hard at it.

\* (1355)

### **City of Winnipeg Amendment Act Mayoral Powers**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** My question is for the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs. As the government tries to legislate a very powerful mayor by giving more authorities, my question to the minister is: does he not recognize that, whether it was Steve Juba or others that followed Mr. Juba, it is the personalities and the abilities of the individual that will dictate whether or not we have a strong mayor with a strong vision, that in fact the legislation might not necessarily be necessary, that you cannot legislate a powerful

mayor? Would the Minister of Urban Affairs acknowledge that you cannot, government cannot legislate a powerful mayor?

**Hon. Jack Reimer (Minister of Urban Affairs):** Madam Speaker, I believe the member for Inkster is asking me whether I agree with him that you cannot legislate leadership, and I agree with him.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Can the minister indicate to the House why the government believes it is necessary not only to allow the mayor to cause a tie in a vote but also then to break the tie, in essence, Madam Speaker, giving the mayor two votes? Why is that necessary?

**Mr. Reimer:** The member is right. This was one of the recommendations that was brought forth by the Cuff report regarding the powers given to the mayor. It is something that mayors did have before, and this was brought in in earlier times when I believe it was Bill Norrie, and I think it was three mayors prior to that also had that power. At that time, the structure of the council and the administrative authorities were different, and this was one of the reasons why the tie-breaking vote was allowed to the mayor. It is brought forth for consideration at this time during the consideration of the bill, and one of the recommendations that came forth from the Cuff report was the tie-breaking vote.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** I am asking the minister whether or not he or this government supports the fact that the mayor should be allowed to have two votes. Would that then equate to the Premier of the province? Does he get two votes inside cabinet? Does the Prime Minister get two votes inside cabinet?

**Mr. Reimer:** I must say the member for Inkster is speculating as to what may or may not happen in cabinet, so it is speculation on his part whether there is a vote type of scenario taken in the cabinet chamber. [interjection] Sometimes you get heckled more from your own side than you do from the opposition here.

But I will try to attempt to answer the member's question. The tie-breaking vote has been brought up this morning in presentations. There were some excellent presenters brought forth concerns. One of the

things that a number of the presenters brought forth was the fact that the mayor was given this tie-breaking vote, and it is something that, like with anything that is brought forth for consideration by the committee members, their input, their concerns are taken to note by this government. There is always room for consideration as the bill goes through committee stages.

### **Highway Maintenance Stop Sign Replacements**

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** On May 30, we had a terrible accident near Birch River where three people were killed. When you have this kind of accident, you start to look for answers. What we find is that a highway stop sign was knocked down but never replaced.

I would like to ask the Deputy Premier if they would change this policy and ensure that all stop signs that are knocked down are replaced along main market roads, so we do not have the kind of terrible situation we have had where four people lost their lives.

**Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier):** Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question, and I will certainly take it as notice for my colleague the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay). I want to assure her and all members of this House and the people of Manitoba that any tragedy like that hits each and every one of us because we can all relate to an incident or a situation of that kind. It is not acceptable, and I will ask for a review of the policy. I am sure that there will be favourable consideration to it.

\* (1400)

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Will the Deputy Premier admit that it is because of cutbacks by his government that people's lives are being sacrificed, because, in fact, Madam Speaker, in rural areas we have skeleton Highways crews who do not have the budgets to replace stop signs when they are knocked down? Is it this government who has brought in that policy.

**Mr. Downey:** With the greatest of respect, it was this government, Premier Gary Filmon's government and the Progressive Conservative Party that increased the

budget to Highways from \$80 million to a hundred million dollars. They were the ones who reduced it, not this government. The numbers speak for themselves in every record that this province has.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Madam Speaker, given that this is a very serious issue, I would like to ask the Deputy Premier if he will ensure that local employees who work in the various regions have the ability to put up stop signs when they are knocked down, rather than having to go to the regional office to get approval before they can erect a stop sign, because that is what is happening. There is no power with the local workers to do their work.

**Mr. Downey:** Madam Speaker, first of all, I will make the point—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable Deputy Premier was recognized to respond to the question asked.

**Mr. Downey:** Madam Speaker, first of all, it is my understanding that the support to the maintenance program also has increased, and if you check this year particularly over last year, you will find that there has been increased support for maintenance.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, I will also check as to how long this policy has been in place, whether it was a policy that was in place carried over from the previous administration or whether it was a new policy. [interjection] The members want information; I will find out about the basis of this policy and report back.

Thirdly, Madam Speaker, it was this government that decentralized government but took government closer to the people so decisions could in fact be made closer to those communities.

### **Point of Order**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Beauchesne Citation 417 is very clear that answers to questions should be as brief as possible, deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate. The member for Swan River asked a very serious question. These are questions being asked by the family of a

constituent of mine. They are very serious, very specific questions aimed at trying to make sure this does not happen again. I would like to ask you to bring the Deputy Premier to order. The people of the family who were affected by these tragic deaths want a straight answer, Madam Speaker, not this kind of irrelevant rhetoric from the Deputy Premier.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable government House leader, on the same point of order.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, on the same point of order. Indeed Beauchesne Citation 417 is very clear, and the honourable minister was dealing with the issues raised by the honourable member for Swan River, extremely serious issues. The minister's answers point out the seriousness with which this government views those types of circumstances and making comparison with the record of the previous NDP administration. There is nothing irrelevant about any of that. All of that was responsive to the questions put by the honourable member for Swan River, so, therefore, the honourable member for Thompson, in my humble opinion, does not have a point of order.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. On the point of order raised by the honourable member for Thompson, I believe the honourable Deputy Premier said he would bring the detailed, specific facts back to the Assembly in response to the question posed by the honourable member for Swan River. Therefore, there is no point of order.

### **Fishing Industry Federal Assistance**

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Madam Speaker, my questions are directed to the Minister of Natural Resources. As the minister is quite aware, in northern Manitoba the crisis in the fishing industry is as severe as it is on the East Coast and the West Coast. The Chemawawin First Nation, for example, has had to close their fishery for three years.

I would like to ask the minister today what kind of representation or lobbying he has done with the federal government in order to enable the fisheries in this

province to be eligible for assistance in the new TAGS proposal that is out there, or for any other federal support.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Natural Resources):** Madam Speaker, last winter, last spring and last summer we made representation to the federal government if they were interested in working with us on perhaps a reduction of some of the quotas through a buy-out process, or whether there was assistance that they were prepared to provide, given that we were receiving and can verify that there have been some problems, some considerable problems in certain areas with the ability to earn a living from the fishing operations as has traditionally occurred.

There have been a couple of pilot projects or one pilot project which I know the member is well aware that this minister has received some briefings on. There has been no positive response from the federal government, in any way, that they want to become involved in any kind of support program.

**Mr. Lathlin:** Madam Speaker, my second question is to the same minister.

Will he table any correspondence that he has with the federal government that would indicate to the House that he has diligently tried to assist the northern fishermen with their fishing crisis and the high unemployment?

**Mr. Cummings:** Yes, Madam Speaker, I can. I do not have it with me at the moment, but I think we should be very clear that there was one community, in particular, that was looking to have the fishery closed, and there was some considerable disagreement within the community about whether or not a viable livelihood could be made fishing and whether or not the fishery was recovering. In that particular case, no action was proposed because the following season seemed to show that the fishery was beginning to recover.

Frankly, my preference is if we can encourage better habitat, we encourage the development of the fishery, and that is a better approach than buying out or eliminating the fishermen from what is their traditional opportunity for livelihood.

\* (1410)

**Fisheries Committee  
Report Release**

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he has received any indication at all as to when the House of Commons Fisheries Committee that was touring Manitoba about a month ago—has he received any word as to when they might put out a report and recommendations?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Natural Resources):** Probably the member's sources for that information are about as good as mine, but I am led to believe that we should be hearing very shortly from that committee.

I am not sure what some of the outcomes of that committee might be. There was some feeling among presenters that they did come with a fair bit of prehistory concerning the fishery in Manitoba, given that some of the members on that committee had been known to make some very strong statements previously about the future of the inland fishery. Nevertheless, we will be awaiting their report and treat it appropriately.

**Man-Sask Short Line Initiative  
Government Support**

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Madam Speaker, CN continues to discontinue rail services in many parts of the province, but the lines that they put up for sale are not viable for short line operators to operate on. Given that CN has indicated that they are prepared to consider any proposal on their lines, a group has been formed in Swan River called the Man-Sask Short Line Initiative.

I would like to ask the Deputy Premier if his government will stand behind this committee when they ask CN to put together a reasonable package consisting of the Irwood, Cowan, and the Preeceville subs so that a viable short line railway can operate in that area and continue to provide service to people in that region.

**Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier):** Madam Speaker, I will take the specifics of the question as notice, but I can assure her that we are prepared to hear from, take a presentation from, and consider any proposals that would come to help assist in the area of transportation throughout Manitoba.

One thing, however, that it is not up to the province to do and that is backfill a responsibility that the federal government has left to the people of western Canada in an irresponsible way.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Madam Speaker, no one is asking the province to backfill. What we are asking this government is if they will work with this committee. In Saskatchewan, the provincial government has recognized the problem and is prepared to put resources and funds behind short line operators.

Is this government prepared to put financial resources to help the Man-Sask Short Line Initiative ensure that they can put a reasonable package together so that we can continue to have viable railway service in our region of the province?

**Mr. Downey:** Madam Speaker, we have programs available under Rural Development and through the different economic branches of government to support feasibility studies to look at that particular capacity, but what we have not done is got into the business of running a railroad. So, as I said, we would be most interested in seeing what the proposal would be, to assist in what way we could to have that communication linkage there, but we are not in the business of running a railroad.

**Helen Betty Osborne Murder Investigation  
RCMP Report**

**Mr. Eric Robinson (Rupert's Land):** It has been some time—November 1971—since Helen Betty Osborne was killed in The Pas by four white men, and in December 1996 Dwayne Archie Johnston—only one of the four who were convicted of her murder—was sentenced of course, and we all know that. In December of 1996, Mr. Johnston gave to the RCMP his version of events, and it has been several months now since the RCMP

tabled their report to the Attorney General's department.

I would like to ask the Minister of Justice at this time: what is the status of that report that was given by the RCMP to his department?

**Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Well, Madam Speaker, I understand that is a very serious issue, and I certainly do not want to make any comments that might jeopardize any opinion or any other aspect of that particular case. I do recognize that it was a serious situation, and as soon as I am able to share any more information with the member, I will do so.

**Mr. Robinson:** The minister has to realize that it has been 27 years that the family has been waiting for justice to be done. I would like to ask the minister when he will be able to report to this Assembly the findings of his department with respect to further charges on the ones that were not charged with the murder in 1986-87.

**Mr. Toews:** Again, Madam Speaker, that is a decision that the Crown attorneys in conjunction with the police would make. It is always a very serious situation when murder charges are being contemplated in any case. I would hope that anyone who is involved in that kind of deliberation does so on the basis of the evidence and not for any other reason.

**Madam Speaker:** Time for Oral Questions has expired.

## MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### Stephanie Friesen

**Mrs. Shirley Render (St. Vital):** On Friday, June 12, Stephanie Friesen, an 11-year-old student from Ecole Varennes, and also a member of the school's patrol team was the recipient of the CAA-Governor General's Lifesaving Medal. The medal was presented by His Honour Lieutenant Governor Yvon Dumont before a full school assembly.

Madam Speaker, on October 17, 1997, Stephanie and other members of the Ecole Varennes school patrol

were at their respective stations. Stephanie was preparing to release some children across the pedestrian crosswalk; however, she noted a truck approaching and believed that it was not going to be able to stop in time. She was right. She shouted a warning to her partner. Just then the truck struck the rear of the car that had already stopped, forcing this vehicle clear across the pedestrian corridor. However, thanks to Stephanie's quick action, her partner was able to jump to safety.

Everyone interviewed by the police agreed that Stephanie's observation, her alertness and quick action undoubtedly saved her partner from injuries and possibly a loss of life.

Madam Speaker, with level-headed young people like Stephanie on patrol, I believe all parents can rest assured that their children's safety is in good hands. So, on behalf of all honourable members, I would like to extend my congratulations to Stephanie Friesen. Thank you.

### India School of Dance, Music and Theatre

**Ms. Diane McGifford (Osborne):** Madam Speaker, as both the MLA for Osborne and the critic for Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, I was pleased yesterday to attend the 18th annual recital of the India School of Dance, Music and Theatre held in the Osborne constituency at the Gas Station Theatre. It was an honour to bring greetings from the Manitoba Legislative Assembly, particularly from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) and the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), who loves the recitals but had other responsibilities yesterday. I wish to thank the school's energetic and dedicated executive director, Pam Rebello, for the invitation, and the vice-president, Dr. Muni Mysore, for companionship and informative program notes.

The school, which began in 1980 with 25 students, now boasts, according to yesterday's program, over 120 students. The increase in number is a sure sign of the strong South Asian community in Winnipeg, student commitment to their cultural roots, and the excellent work of the teaching staff. I must admit that, among the resplendent, dazzling, brilliantly coloured costumes, I in my dowdy black and white felt like a poor western

cousin, but the warm and gracious welcome soon put me at ease. Parents, grandparents, family members and teachers can be justly proud of the performers, both dancers and musicians.

The program included young initiates, more advanced students and proven performers, as well as dance and music from northern and southern India. Scholarships were presented to award-winning students, and long-serving community members were honoured.

As a student of the culture, particularly the culture of the Indian subcontinent and particularly the literature of the Indian subcontinent, and as the MLA for a constituency which recently honoured Mahatma Gandhi, including a performance by the India School of Dance, I found the recital educational and moving. Indeed, I recommend this event next year to all MLAs. Thank you.

### Century Farms

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** This past weekend I had the pleasure of attending a century farm celebration near Sandy Hook. Leonard and Gladys Ciszewski and their family are carrying on the long-standing agricultural tradition of their pioneering ancestors. The four-member Ciszewski family left Nyrkow, Galicia, in the spring of 1898 to embark on a new life in Canada. Like countless other immigrants, they were eager to face the challenges of a foreign land, and after several weeks of travel by ship and rail, the Ciszewskis reached Winnipeg and eventually found a suitable homestead in the Sandy Hook area.

The living and farming traditions the elder Ciszewskis faced no doubt were radically different from what they are today. Inevitably, they encountered a great number of challenges as farmers in what had hitherto been a relatively uninhabited land. It is because of the foresight and determination of such early pioneers as the Ciszewskis that we have a fully developed agricultural community today.

I am pleased to see that so many Manitoba farm families recognize the importance of preserving their agriculture heritage. It is very commendable to see

families such as the Ciszewskis maintaining their farms for upcoming generations just as their ancestors left them in their care.

The century farm designation is something that Manitoba farm families hold in great esteem. That sign at the end of their lane means a great deal to family farms, and is an indication of the strength and commitment that the people who reside in those yards have towards agriculture in this province. Having established a farm business that has lasted a century is indeed a tremendous accomplishment, and I would like to congratulate the Ciszewskis on achieving this goal. Thank you.

\* (1420)

### Kids Fishing for a Cure

**Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of members to a unique event held this weekend for young Manitobans with a special challenge. The third annual Kids Fishing for a Cure was held on Saturday, June 13, at Selkirk Park. This event allows children diagnosed with cancer a day of fishing on the Red River and raises money for the Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, pediatric care unit.

This year, 32 children and young adults went fishing with guides who donated their boats, fishing gear and expertise. The largest fish caught and released was a 38-inch channel catfish. Organizers expect to raise between \$18,000 and \$20,000 from donations, corporate sponsorships and other fundraising activities. All of this money will be used to beat cancer.

Madam Speaker, this is a true community success story. I would like to congratulate the founder and chair of the event, John Harber, and his committee members, Bob Check, Lorraine Check, Jim Hyslop, Walter Kostinik, Mark Cram and John Fidler, as well as the over 120 volunteers who worked so hard to ensure the success of this event.

Madam Speaker, this group of dedicated individuals never lost sight of their goal, and that is to help find a

cure for cancer. On behalf of all Manitobans, I thank and congratulate them. Thank you.

### Elementary Classroom Teacher Awards

**Mr. David Faurschou (Portage la Prairie):** Madam Speaker, I just want to draw the attention of all honorable members present that I had the very great honour of attending the Lieutenant Governor's residence last Friday. It was the event to honour the elementary school classroom teachers award, and it was the third annual event to be held and hosted by our Lieutenant Governor. This opportunity is one to recognize the outstanding achievements in the classroom by our elementary school teachers across the province. Mary Lou Driedger, a Grade 4 teacher at Mitchell elementary school in Mitchell, Manitoba, a village represented by our own honourable member for Steinbach (Mr. Driedger), was this year's award winner.

I am very pleased that the Lieutenant Governor lends the dignity of his office to the award and honours the elementary school teachers and celebrates their most outstanding contributions in the classroom.

I also want to recognize the contributions made by the selection committee and the parents council, as well as the superintendents association, Canada Post and the Royal Bank for their contributions towards the success of this program.

It was a very great honour to represent the Minister of Education, the Honourable Linda McIntosh, at this event. I want to say, on behalf of all members here, that the province of Manitoba is indeed grateful to these elementary school teachers for their dedication and commitment to their profession. Thank you.

### Committee Changes

**Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas):** I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that the composition of the Standing Committee on

Law Amendments be amended as follows: Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar).

**Motion agreed to.**

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Gimli, with committee changes.

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** I move, seconded by the member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs be amended as follows: the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey) for the member for River Heights (Mr. Radcliffe), and the member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck) for the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render).

**Motion agreed to.**

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### House Business

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, there might be a disposition to waive private members' hour today.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent of the House to waive private members' hour today? [agreed]

**Mr. McCrae:** This reminds me of the days, Madam Speaker, when John Diefenbaker used to tell this story. They had a proceeding at the beginning of the day in the House of Commons. It was an opportunity for members to move motions, and they had to get leave each day, unanimous consent. Each day the Speaker would ask if there was unanimous consent. Of course, the Conservatives were in the opposition, and all the Liberal members would say no. So nothing really happened; they got on with Question Period. Well, one day John Diefenbaker was telling this story of a gentleman walking down a street of Prince Albert saying, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. Someone asked him who he was, and he said, well, I am a Liberal on vacation.

Having found something other than overwhelming success at comedy, I chose politics, and so here we are.

I move, seconded by the honourable Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey), that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to her Majesty.

\* (1430)

**Motion agreed to.**

**COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY  
(Concurrent Sections)**

**HEALTH**

**Mr. Chairperson (Gerry McAlpine):** Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This afternoon this section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 254 will resume the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Health. When the committee last sat, unanimous consent had been previously granted for all questions to be asked under one line. To remind the committee, it was also previously agreed that staff from the Department of Health could answer questions directly during these Estimates.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** Mr. Chair, when we adjourned last week, I believe it was the member for Thompson put a very in-depth question, and I do not have my note in front of me. Perhaps he could just refresh me as to the topic on which he addressed a question, and then I can provide the answer to him.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** I am wondering, given the lack of time, if I could just ask that the minister respond perhaps in writing. It was in regard to the funding for the Burntwood Regional Health Authority. Since we started a little bit late—we have about 25 minutes left in this committee—I do have a couple of other questions, but if the minister has some comments he would like to put on the record, no problem.

**Mr. Praznik:** Mr. Chair, I will be very brief. I know we have had exchanges in the House about this particular issue, and I think it is worthy of a bit of explanation.

When we embarked on the regionalization process, I think our planners in health and those who have looked at this, talked about—as I discovered when I came into being minister—a funding mechanism that would divide up the health care pie on the basis of population, health factors, risk factors, age, demographics, et cetera, and give to each regional health authority a block budget for which they would be 100 percent responsible for the purchase of health care services for the citizens in that region, and if those services were purchased in another place, such as the Winnipeg hospital system, et cetera, they would have to pay for those services.

When I became minister and after working with the boards, I recognized that may be a very good idea in theory, but one has to have a great deal of development, community development and board development before you could tackle that particular type of issue, that it was far too soon in the process to be able to use that as a means of basis for funding delivery of health services.

The other problem, and I say quite frankly to the member for Thompson, is within our ministry because so much of our funding was block funds to institutions. I could not tell him, nor my department tell me more aptly, what we were purchasing often, how we were paying for it, were we providing adequate funding for the service. There were many cases where dollars were siphoned or used for other things that I am sure the member and I would not agree are a health priority, but the nature of a very diffuse governance system and a diffuse budgeting system had led to that.

So what I have done as minister is we are building over the next two, three years a budgeting system that will indicate what services we will be funding in each region. It will be based upon need in that region. It will be an envelope-funding base as we try to tie dollars directly to services where purchased, and it is not in any way intended to diminish the health needs of specific regions.

In fact, I am working with our Treasury Board now, because we have recognized a whole host of inequities in funding across the province, by and large based on the historic development of health care. One that comes to mind is the placement of public health nurses. When that program was developed, they often developed in communities based on a community, and



we know we have had major shifts in population in the province that has not necessarily been accounted for in where service was delivered.

So we have found a host of these issues, and I think we have to be able to find out what we are doing now, provide some level of that based on need within communities, build up I think the expertise of our board, their structures, their community involvement, and at some point in the future I can see moving to that system. But as minister—and the member knows this very well—when you get working with organizations, you get working with scenarios, you appreciate sometimes you cannot push more onto people than they are ready with their skills and information to handle. We did not have the information to do that, we did not have the skills, and I think we would have had an even greater problem than we have seen in trying to sort out financing.

So I can assure the member that, as we fine tune our budgeting and we develop those skills, the kind of unique health issues around a Burntwood health district that we are learning more about as we get into this issue, we are addressing bit by bit as we get a better handle on expenditures, how money is being spent, what are we purchasing and needs of communities. I expect that I will be having some more announcements during the course of this year as we further fine tune our budgeting system.

So I hope I have given him a bit of a snapshot and put in a little bit different context than the exchange we had in Question Period.

**Mr. Ashton:** I will be pursuing this, because I do believe that the funding formula requested by the regional health authority is the only way in which the North is going to be able to deal with the health care needs, particularly areas where we do not have any services currently. There is no personal care home, for example, in the entire Burntwood region and what has essentially happened is we were caught in the previous freeze. People told us at the time, and I had discussions with people in the Department of Health, wait for regional health. So if there is any evolution, I hope the minister understands that people are a bit frustrated. They are hoping it will be a very quick evolution,

because issues such as this are crying out for action, and they have been ongoing for years.

I also, by the way, would like to indicate my own support for the efforts of the regional health authority, both the executive director and the board. I think they have already established a fair amount of credibility in the community. I am referring here both to staff with the health authority of the board and also some of the new initiatives of the staff, for example, at the clinic which is located in the City Centre Mall. I can tell the minister that the view that we need this funding model is clearly held by everyone at the regional health authority from the board through to workers. So when the minister received the correspondence he did from the acting chair of the board, it was a seriously held opinion and certainly something that deserves action.

\* (1450)

I want to move on to AIDS Strategy. First of all, I would like to indicate to the minister that, in terms of the provincial AIDS Strategy, I would certainly encourage the minister to consider the addition to the implementation advisory committee of a representative from northern Manitoba. The minister will be receiving correspondence from me supporting the appointment of Catherine Spence who is the co-ordinator of the Thompson AIDS Project, the northern representative.

I want to indicate, by the way, that I had the opportunity to attend a workshop that was held on HIV-AIDS this past Friday. It was a very excellent presentation. Some of the information I thought that was presented there was information that should be made available to the committee. I give Catherine and the others who organized the workshop full credit, and I certainly hope that she will be in the position of being on the implementation committee. She does have direct personal experience in her family with AIDS. She has been involved with HIV-AIDS issues for some time and has established quite a fair amount of credibility in Thompson and the North on this issue.

What I would like to ask the minister, because this came out of discussions I had with people at the workshop, is the status of the provincial strategy. I talked to one individual who is reactive on the HIV-AIDS issue, pointed, for example, to the program that

is going on in British Columbia. He indicated there was \$60 million being spent in that province. I think that compares to about a million and a half here. The provincial AIDS Strategy, which was announced a couple of years ago, is now in the process I guess of being implemented. What was striking about the presentation was the fact that we are seeing a real shift away from the population that previously was predominant, which was gay men, into other groups, particularly HIV drug users. There are also an increasing number of women, although the vast majority of sufferers of HIV and AIDS are still men.

What was particularly striking was the growth of HIV-AIDS amongst intravenous drug users. What was interesting, too, what was particularly concerning, was they had information both from Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and seeing some of the clustering that is beginning to occur already in Saskatchewan, where you are getting 10, 11 cases of HIV being reported in relatively small communities, and by and large, that is coming from intravenous drug use. I would like to add to that that there is a great deal of concern.

I know in my own community there have been a number of reported cases of heroin use recently. There was a heroin overdose, so that kind of drug, which has previously been perhaps associated with larger centres and certainly with Vancouver, which is considered I know the gateway for heroin access to North America, is starting to hit Manitoba. There is a real concern that, when you are dealing with this particular population, there is so much greater potential for spread than we have ever seen before.

This comes just at a time when there has been some real progress on HIV-AIDS in the sense that I think there has been a lot of work done, not just by governments, by the way. I think within the gay community, for example, there has been a lot of work done there on prevention. There certainly are improved treatments available. Fewer people are moving from HIV into full-blown AIDS because of the improvement in what is available in terms of drugs. What really concerns me is if you are dealing with intravenous drug use the percentage of transmission, whether it is an infection, is dramatically higher than anything that we have seen before in any population involving transmission through sexual intercourse.

It is virtually the equivalent of injecting anything into one's system, and that is essentially what it is, including HIV. I am wondering what action the minister is proposing to deal with this. There have been various programs in place, and I had this discussion, by the way, with his predecessor, Don Orchard. A number of years ago, when I was Health critic, I raised the issue of needle exchanges, and there has been a fair amount of indication of how effective that is. It has been put in place in a number of cases. This was at a time when it was very much a pilot project, but what actions is the minister planning on taking to deal with this dramatic shift in HIV-AIDS infection that we are seeing away from gay men into—and I am not saying it is not a problem in that community, but it is moving much more into drug use and much more into the general population.

**Mr. Praznik:** A very important area we have had some discussion on before earlier in the Estimates process. Part of the difficulty that I faced is we have somewhat limited resources in our ability within the department to tackle everything that we have to tackle. There is a lot of expertise and ability in the AIDS community, for lack of a better term, and the member knows that probably far greater than I would be able to muster within the department.

What we are attempting to do with our provincial AIDS Strategy is, and it does not answer the member's question directly, but the thrust in a sentence or two is to be able to have one central support program or co-ordination of programs so that someone who is diagnosed with HIV-AIDS can access the whole variety of service that they need through one-window shopping, in essence. That should include, in my view and the advice I am getting, access to housing projects, social allowance, if income is there, assistance with disability pension, health needs, medical needs, et cetera, Pharmacare, addiction needs, if that is part of the whole issue. Although we have a number of organizations out there who have sort of developed in an ad hoc way—and thank goodness for them, they are fulfilling needs. Bringing them together and be able to have this one-stop window for those who are suffering in this area, I think, goes a long way. That is the thrust.

The advisory board for this, we have asked for nominations. The member—I would be glad to entertain

his nomination from the north, and I hope to be able to make those appointments by the time we depart from this place, relatively shortly, before we depart for the summer.

In terms of housing this program, I felt it best, in discussion with my staff, that it would probably be best housed within the Winnipeg long-term and community care program as a provincial program, but having them, under contract, take on this responsibility. Simply, they have much greater experience in working with many of those organizations in terms of the people that they are bringing on board, I think much closer contact to the delivery of service. We have other programs that are province-wide programs that we have asked the Winnipeg Hospital Authority, for example, to run on a province-wide basis. So there is nothing unusual about this.

We also recognize that for many sufferers of HIV-AIDS, when it comes to support of housing and other things, there is a tendency to migrate to Winnipeg because just the sheer size of services that are available here makes it easier. That does not mean that services cannot be or should not be available in other parts of the province, but basically there are logistic issues around this. I see some of those services developing over time, but the logistics of the province are such that particularly many of the leading edge medical treatments are more likely to be available in a larger centre. So we recognize and the community has recognized that Winnipeg still tends to be the major centre for delivery.

So we have asked the Winnipeg Hospital Authority to be the host for this program. We will be appointing the advisory process shortly—pardon me, not the Winnipeg Hospital Authority. The Winnipeg Community and Long Term Care Authority is the host for it. We also expect to use them as a conduit for developing whatever type of promotional material or preventative programs because, again, they are working very closely with the community clinics. In fact, those clinics respond to them for funding. This health authority would be their funding source. So that is the best vehicle as opposed to having a stand-alone program within the ministry.

So those are the efforts we are taking, and I appreciate his comments. I also recognize the need to

ensure that the advisory committee is representative of other issues outside the province. The North, because of distance again, and particularly in the aboriginal community—Thompson is a community that has become a centre for activity in the North and within the northern aboriginal communities. So this program has to think about that and take that into advice as this issue develops. So I thank the member for his comments.

**Mr. Ashton:** In fact, I will even drop off the résumé, rather than send it through the mail. [interjection] I will mark it here for that purpose, and I would like to thank the minister.

I would particularly like to encourage the continuance of development of a strategy in terms of aboriginal people. It is certainly a concern. I know Albert McLeod from the Manitoba aboriginal AIDS task force and others have been working very consistently on this, and there is real concern that there is a great deal of potential for a traumatic spread in the aboriginal population because of some of the factors already mentioned. I would certainly strongly urge that that happen.

I want to ask another question about the nursing station at Sopotaweyak First Nation which I understand is listed in the capital projects. I know I was just talking to my colleague, the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), and there was some concern why it was even listed when the amount that is being approved is only \$80,000—certainly in comparison to other similar-sized facilities. I would like to raise that question. I know there is some frustration in the community, and certainly the member for Swan River did ask me to raise that. I do not know if there is information available right now. If not, I would be quite prepared to have it provided in writing at a later date.

\* (1500)

**Mr. Praznik:** Mr. Chair, we had a very lengthy discussion with the member for Swan River on this particular clinic in the early part of Estimates but, just for the member's information, this is a federal project. It is serving a First Nation. Because of the geography of that area, the Manitoba Health programs use or will use that clinic for some of our delivery of our programs.

We agreed to make a financial contribution towards the capital cost when the program moves forward. Our share of the capital cost, we understand through our negotiations with the federal government, will be \$80,000, but that is a small percentage of the overall clinic cost.

It is a federal project in the federal capital program with Health and Welfare Canada, Medical Services branch. We are not the driving force of that project. We are not the major funders. We have agreed, in essence, to pay for the use of the space that we will be using in this new facility, to deliver the provincial programs that we do to neighbouring communities.

I wish I could provide him more information, but, as he can appreciate, it is not our program. It is not our project. It is not in our Capital Branch. We can undertake to make an inquiry of the federal department as to the status of that project, but, again, we are only a small contributor to it to pay for the space we will need to utilize, for our provincial staff delivering their programs to, I believe, neighbouring communities.

**Mr. Ashton:** I have a whole series of questions I would love to ask on another issue. I will just briefly raise the subject now, and I will perhaps continue it. That is the ongoing problem with physician recruitment and retention in rural and northern communities. I have raised this with the minister, I know, with the minister's predecessor. I am aware of some of the things that have happened.

Certainly, in my own area the allocation of four salaried positions, I think, was a very significant step. In fact, shortly before the minister came in in his current role as Minister of Health, the previous Minister of Health was, I think, very influential on getting that through the system. It was just a question to my mind of recognizing the shift that is happening out there in terms of physicians, that is, more and more physicians not only are willing to work on salary but are very interested in that. That is particularly the case of newer physicians and younger physicians who want a balance of a reasonable practice and a reasonable income and a family life. I think that one of the elements that has been missing in the recruitment, quite frankly—and this is not a criticism I level at the government; it is a criticism at the local communities—is that far too little

attention is paid to the quality of practice and personal life for the physician involved. We are, I think, at risk right now in this province of burning out many of our long-standing physicians, many newer physicians, and because of the on-call situation in many communities that is very difficult.

We have people who have heavy workloads, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain adequate levels of physician services when you consider that Thompson is, for example, the third largest city, has significant number of amenities, and we have had difficulty. I think the minister can understand the seriousness of that. We have had problems similar to what other areas have had with surgical services. It was not that long ago as the minister is quite aware that people were being sent to Winnipeg for surgery, and it created a great deal of frustration, worry, anguish, concern. I talked to a number of people, for example, who had to have appendicitis operations in Winnipeg because of a lack of an on-call physician in Thompson.

What I would like to get from the minister is some indication, and I realize part of what is happening is going to be the MMA, obviously the negotiations, but I am wondering if there is going to be any movement on dealing with some of these particular issues, in particular whether the minister has looked at the kind of program that is in place in Saskatchewan, which does provide some limited financial incentives. I think fairly significant because what I have noticed talking to physicians is that when physicians are straight out of medical school and have significant debts and little cash, it is amazing what a difference a small amount, relative to overall salaries in the way of either direct grant or loans, conditional as it may be, can make in terms of recruitment. This was an issue that came up with me with many of the physicians who left Thompson. I actually talked to a number of them, and they said that one of the biggest problems was—even as immigrant doctors coming over—lack of resources.

So, I would like to ask in a general sense—and I realize we are short of time, but if the minister could respond in writing, or perhaps if we could continue this in concurrence over the next period of time. I would like to really focus in on what is a major concern in rural and northern communities.

**Mr. Praznik:** Mr. Chair, I imagine we only have seconds remaining in this most momentous event, the completion of Estimates. I would be delighted to have that discussion in concurrence with the member.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. I am interrupting the proceedings of this section of the committee of Supply, because the total time allowed for Estimates consideration has now expired. Our Rule 71.(1) provides in part that not more than 240 hours shall be allowed for the consideration in Committee of the Whole of Ways and Means and Supply Resolutions respecting all types of Estimates and of relevant Supply Bills.

Our Rule 71.(3) provides that where the time limit has expired, the Chairperson shall forthwith put all remaining questions necessary to dispose of the matter, and such questions shall not be subject to debate, amendment or adjournment.

I am, therefore, going to call in sequence the questions on the following matters:

Resolution 21.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,661,600 for Health, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 21.2: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$24,977,700 for Health, Program Support Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 21.3: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$73,234,400 for Health, External Programs and Operations, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 21.4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$177,594,400 for Health, Funding to Health Authorities - Community Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 21.5: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,566,122,600 for Health, Health Services Insurance Fund, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

\* (1510)

Resolution 21.6: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,662,800 for Health, Addictions Foundation of Manitoba, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 21.7: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$66,389,500 for Health, Expenditures Related to Capital, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

This now concludes the consideration of the Estimates in this section of the Committee of Supply.

I would like to thank the ministers and the critics for their co-operation. Committee rise.

### ENABLING APPROPRIATIONS

**Mr. Chairperson (Ben Sveinson):** Good afternoon. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This afternoon, this section of the Committee of Supply meeting in Room 255 will be considering a number of resolutions.

The list of items to be considered includes: the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote; Allowance for Losses and Expenditures Incurred by Crown Corporations and Other Provincial Entities; Internal Reform, Workforce Adjustment and General Salary Increases; Urban Economic Development Initiatives; Capital expenditures; Legislative Assembly; Emergency Expenditures.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** My question was, Mr. Chair, do we have 29 minutes, or how many minutes do we have?

**Mr. Chairperson:** I am told by our Clerk that indeed it is roughly 29 minutes. Is it the will of the committee to keep the clock running while we consider and pass these various items, given that Supply time will be shortly run out, or did the committee wish to recess in between consideration of these items?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Chairman, I think everybody's expectation was that we would use the next 25 to 29 minutes as efficiently as

we could, so that would obviate any suggestion of any recesses between votes. I do not think that has been anybody's intention.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Agreed by the committee? [agreed]

**Mr. L. Evans:** Well, I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) cannot be here because he did indicate previously he had to attend a very important federal-provincial Finance ministers' meeting, which we wish him lots of luck and come back with lots of money, reinstating health transfers, et cetera. We are asking, what is it, \$6 billion? At any rate, so I gather we can ask questions, but we will not necessarily get any answers.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. If we could now move on in the Estimates, on page 133, 26.1. Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote (a) Winnipeg Development Agreement (1) Operating.

**Mr. L. Evans:** Well, I gather, Mr. Chairman, that we can ask questions. The minister will take them as notice, but do I understand, he will have no answers for us on any of these items?

**Mr. McCrae:** I would suggest that we get the questions asked, and I will leave it to others to judge the quality of the answers given. There was an understanding that these matters would have been disposed of last Thursday when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) was here.

However, if the honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. L. Evans) asks the questions, I will do my best to answer them, and to the extent that I fall short of completeness, I have given the undertaking that the Minister of Finance and his staff will review Hansard for today and compile, in writing, the answers for the honourable members.

\* (1440)

**Mr. L. Evans:** We do not have too many questions in this area. My colleagues have questions elsewhere, but I do note that there is a considerable drop in the Agreement on Municipal Water Infrastructure, and I was wondering why there is such a large drop, or is that program coming to an end? It is dropping from \$825

million in 1997-98 to \$200 million in 1998-99, which is a considerable drop in expenditure.

Conversely, the Winnipeg Development Agreement has almost doubled. I guess there is material available explaining why both of these phenomena are happening. Why is the Winnipeg Development Agreement more or less doubled, both on operating and capital, and secondly, why is it that the Partnership Agreement on Municipal Water Infrastructure is taking such a significant drop?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. I just noticed here that the member for Brandon East said \$200 million.

**Mr. L. Evans:** Yes.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Did you mean two? It is \$200,000, I believe.

**Mr. L. Evans:** I am sorry, it was \$200,000. These are small potatoes. Pardon me. Excuse me—[interjection] Yes, what is a million, eh? C.D. Howe's famous or infamous statement that he could not live down many years ago. I am sorry. You are correct, Mr. Chairman. It is \$200,000. Okay.

Well, the question still stands. These are substantial percentage changes, and we should get some explanation. So perhaps we can get a note on that from the appropriate ministers. Similarly, on the general agreement and promotion of official languages, I am not sure how all this money is going to be spent. We do not have much of an explanation on that either. That would be a very interesting item to get some elaboration on. I am sure there could be a note or something from the minister on that.

**Mr. McCrae:** On their face, the numbers do seem to fluctuate from year to year in the areas of the Winnipeg Development Agreement as well as the Partnership Agreement on Municipal Water Infrastructure. Rather than my speculating on what stage projects might be at, whether there are new ones coming on, old ones finishing up and not requiring appropriations and so on, rather than speculating on all those possible answers, I think the questions are quite in order and in line, and I will certainly pass those questions on to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) for his attention.

**Mr. L. Evans:** Slipping along to item 3. Justice Initiatives, or can we not do that? Do you want to pass 1. first?

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is it the will of the committee to just run through the questions on all these areas, or do we want to pass each area as we go?

**An Honourable Member:** We could pass them.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Okay, we will pass each area then as we go.

Item 26.1. Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote (a) Winnipeg Development Agreement (1) Operating \$862,800—pass; (2) Capital \$507,000—pass.

Item 26.1. (b) Partnership Agreement on Municipal Water Infrastructure - Capital \$200,000—pass.

Item 26.1. (c) Framework Agreement on Treaty Land Entitlements - Operating \$450,000—pass.

Item 26.1. (d) General Agreement on the Promotion of Official Languages - Operating—1,200,000—pass.

Resolution 26.1: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,219,800 for Enabling Appropriations, Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

The next one is page 135, item 4. Allowance for Losses. The next one on the list that you have there.

**An Honourable Member:** I am sorry. Number one is all of page 133, is it not?

**Mr. Chairperson:** No. It is item one—[interjection] Order, please.

**Mr. L. Evans:** Just a clarification. I was not aware, but you are saying, the minister, or someone is saying, that we have passed 2 and 3 on a previous occasion. Item 26.2. Sustainable Development and 3. Justice Initiatives. Those are gone. That is news to me.

The question is: why were they separated out?

**Mr. McCrae:** There is a procedure set out in the rules whereby the opposition House leader and the government House leader work out a schedule for the handling of the various votes of the Estimates of the government. The Sustainable Development Innovations Fund was the subject of examination by myself and by the honourable member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) as scheduled by House leaders. The same with the other one—what was the other one?—the same as Justice Initiatives. They followed examination of the Estimates of the Department of Justice, and it has been the subject of ongoing collaboration between myself and the opposition House leader with respect to the scheduling.

The ones that you see on the list for today—Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote, Allowance for Losses and Expenditures Incurred by Crown Corporations, Internal Reform, Capital Initiatives—are all standing in the name of the Minister of Finance. They were supposed to have been disposed of last Thursday. The Legislative Assembly, I answer for on behalf of the LAMC; and Emergency Expenditures, the honourable Minister of Emergency Measures and Government Services (Mr. Pitura) is here, should there be any questions. The discussion, I understand, is completed, and it remains only to pass the Emergency Expenditures one. There is a brief explanation.

## OTHER APPROPRIATIONS

**Mr. Chairperson (Ben Sveinson):** Okay, so if we can now move on to page 135, item 27.4 Allowance for Losses and Expenditures Incurred by Crown Corporations and Other Provincial Entities.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** I would think that there must be some concern on the part of the government, and certainly on the part of the opposition, for continuing losses by Venture Manitoba Tours Ltd. I assume that is essentially Hecla Island. I am assuming that is the hotel operation up there.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Environment):** This Crown corporation operates the Gull Harbour Resort and Conference Centre as well as the Falcon Lake Golf Course. The province maintains a provision for potential losses related to these operations, which

recognizes the province's exposure on an outstanding loan guarantee.

**Mr. L. Evans:** I thank the minister for that information. Would he know where most of the subsidy is going? Is it going to Hecla Island, or is it going to the Falcon Lake golf club?

**Mr. McCrae:** The appropriation for 1998-99 for the Manitoba Potash Corporation is \$250,000, and that was voted at \$1,200,000 last fiscal year. For Venture Manitoba Tours Ltd., it is \$525,000 this fiscal year, a similar amount to that for last fiscal year.

**Mr. L. Evans:** I was not asking about Manitoba Potash Corporation. I was asking about the breakdown of Venture Manitoba Tours Ltd. and the \$525,000. What proportion, if any, is allocated for the Falcon Lake Golf Course, and how much, therefore, is allocated for Gull Harbour?

**Mr. McCrae:** I will ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) to provide that information with relation to the Gull Harbour Resort and Conference Centre as well as the Falcon Lake Golf Course.

**Mr. L. Evans:** I thank the minister for that. Could he also ask the Minister of Finance, or whichever minister is responsible: how long do you expect to continue to subsidize that operation, because at some point I thought this was going to be phased out and that it would be self-sustaining and, hopefully, profitable? So the question arises: how long are we going to carry this on?

**Mr. McCrae:** That is more of a policy question that I would be happy to leave for the Minister of Finance.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Item 27.4. Manitoba Potash Corporation \$250,000—pass; Venture Manitoba Tours Ltd. \$525,000—pass;

Resolution 27.4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$775,000 for Other Appropriations, Allowance For Losses and Expenditures Incurred by Crown Corporations and Other Provincial Entities, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

## ENABLING APPROPRIATIONS

**Mr. Chairperson (Ben Sveinson):** The next one is page 133, item 26.4. Internal Reform, Workforce Adjustment and General Salary Increases.

\* (1450)

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Chairman, would the minister take as notice, or if he can give the answer now, where can we find material describing and analyzing the internal reform initiatives?

Normally, when you deal with the department, you get a departmental review, and I do not know, Mr. Chairman, I seek your guidance. Where would we find this material on this particular item? We are talking about \$15 million, and we are talking about various internal reform initiatives and adjustments. So is there a report of some kind describing these initiatives and these changes? If so, we would like to get a copy.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Environment):** For the purposes of today's discussion, I refer the honourable member to the Supplementary Information for Legislature Review respecting these appropriations, in this case, Internal Reform, Workforce Adjustment and General Salary Increases, tabled by the Minister of Finance. I do not recall what date he tabled that. I think the honourable member has a copy of it. [interjection] Okay, well, we should be able to make another one available to the honourable member. The honourable member says it has been wrongfully removed, and I do not want to be part of that at all. If you look on page 5, with respect to this particular vote, rather than my reading it into the record, the honourable member can have a look at it. If he has further questions, he can ask them or write them down, and we will pass them on to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson).

**Mr. L. Evans:** Mr. Chairman, it really does not give us much more information, so I wonder if the minister could ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) if there was some more detailed explanation, some report of what is happening here. I mean there is a very, very brief explanation, but there should be more material, I would think. Departments usually have annual reports, and they go into a lot of detail. We do not have that



luxury in this case. So my question is: could we have some more information describing what has been happening?

**Mr. McCrae:** I am not sure how the discussion goes with respect to this particular appropriation year in and year out at the Estimates. I do not know how much time is devoted to it. I dare say, though, the Finance minister would be well equipped to provide more detailed responses to detailed questions should they arise. Therefore, the opportunity is there at various stages in the concurrence process, but also that information can be sought, and I am sure the minister will be as open as he always is with respect to these matters.

**Mr. L. Evans:** There is a reference to \$12 million for the year 2000 costs, so if there is some kind of a report analyzing or detailing how those monies are being spent.

**Mr. McCrae:** Mr. Chairman, I do not know if there is a written report. The honourable member's experience in this area is far more vast than my own, and he might have a better idea about that. If such information exists, these questions are being recorded and will be passed on to the minister.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Item 26.4. Internal Reform, Workforce Adjustment and General Salary Increase \$15,000,000—pass.

Resolution 26.4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$15,000,000 for Enabling Appropriations, Internal Reform, Workforce Adjustment and General Salary Increases, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

### OTHER APPROPRIATIONS

**Mr. Chairperson (Ben Sveinson):** The next one is 27.2 Urban Economic Development Initiatives on page 135. Do we have any questions on that?

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** I gather by looking at the Supplementary Information there is some kind of a breakdown. This is what our interest was. There is some sort of a breakdown of where this money is being spent on various activities in the city of

Winnipeg, including the Convention Centre, Winnipeg 2000, Tourism Winnipeg, et cetera. I imagine, therefore, a lot of information on these specific programs could not be found in various departments, although I am not sure, like Tourism Winnipeg. I imagine the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Downey) would have a lot of information and answer questions in that respect.

Anyway, I guess, the overall concern of the Legislature has to be how effective are these monies being spent? What are we getting? What results are we getting from them? The Winnipeg Convention Centre obviously is another organization which one had hoped would be self-sustaining but obviously is not and is requiring—as the Keystone Centre in Brandon, its counterpart—ongoing subsidy. But that information is not available here, although I suspect we get it in Public Accounts, after the fact.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Environment):** Well, this information, some of this relates to the Urban Affairs department. As I read, the Supplementary Information provided under this appropriation is in addition to the financial support directly provided to the City of Winnipeg by Manitoba Urban Affairs. In respect to all this, I am sure the Urban Affairs department is very much a part of the discussions and negotiations leading to support for these various activities like the Convention Centre, Winnipeg 2000, Tourism Winnipeg, Winnipeg Green Team, policing, business expansion—all of these different things listed on page 7 of the Supplementary Information. There is no point at which questions related to these matters cannot be put and responses made. We all want to make sure that the dollars are spent well and that we are getting what we need for our investment.

The member refers to the Keystone Centre in Brandon with which we are both very familiar and attend functions on quite a regular basis. It is true. Even the Keystone Centre, with all the spin-offs that it creates for our community in Brandon, still operates with some assistance. For as long as we do that and for as long as we have been doing that, I can speak about the Keystone Centre a little better having been a former board member there. These dollars are well spent in terms of the economic health and vitality and cultural and educational and all these other aspects of life in western Manitoba. They are well spent.

Now, someone has made the decision that money spent on all these other initiatives is also well spent. I am sure the minister can provide the honourable member with some more background, as well, and I will ask him to do so.

**Mr. L. Evans:** Mr. Chairman, I think, as I listened to the government House leader, I am reminded of the fact that, one, when it comes to the Keystone Centres or the Winnipeg Convention Centres, these types of organizations, I guess one has to measure them over and above and beyond the narrow financial bottom line. You could make a good case for arguing, you know, what is it doing to the quality of life in the community. How many organizations are assisted? How many tourism dollars are you bringing into the community? Those are all good questions, and if you want to determine whether a subsidy of a certain amount is justifiable, one has to look at all those other factors obviously. But having said that, pass.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Item 27.2 on page 135, Urban Economic Development Initiatives \$16,750,000—pass.

Resolution 27.2: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$16,750,000 for Other Appropriations, Urban Economic Development Initiatives, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

The next appropriations are Capital Initiatives on page 136. Item 27.5 Capital Initiatives.

**Mr. L. Evans:** Well, Mr. Chairman, now we are talking about big dollars—\$50,000,000 of Capital Initiative. There are so many items here we simply do not have time to discuss all these items. Not that we are necessarily opposed to such expenditures; in fact, we might even make a case for increasing the expenditures in some areas such as Highways Construction or the Innovations Fund. [interjection] Page 136. Is that right? Am I correct?

**Mr. McCrae:** I am on page 9 of the Supplementary Information. That corresponds.

**Mr. L. Evans:** We are talking about the same items, and, as I said, we do not necessarily object to these particular expenditures, and, certainly, we do not have time to discuss them.

I would only make one observation, and that is the Port of Churchill Dredging. I find that it is interesting that the Manitoba government is involved in dredging, because I would have thought that this is a federal expenditure, unless this is federal monies that have come over into this pot that we are spending. Maybe the minister, the government House leader, would know that.

\* (1500)

The Port of Churchill Dredging, ports are still federal jurisdiction, and yet we are spending, what is it, \$3 million there. Is this because we have federal infrastructure monies allocated to us to spend in that area?

**Mr. McCrae:** I do not think the honourable member wants me to speculate on the answer, so I will not. But I remind him all his words are on the record, and they are going to be read carefully by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) and responses put together for the honourable member.

**Mr. L. Evans:** Specifically, I wonder if the Minister of Finance would provide us with some more information on the Dredging, and to what extent—is this purely federal monies that have been transferred into that, or is the Province of Manitoba spending money there as well?

**Mr. McCrae:** Your questions are noted.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Item 27.5 Capital Initiatives (a) Manitoba Innovations Fund \$7,000,000—pass; (b) Health Equipment \$5,000,000—pass; (c) Highways Construction \$5,000,000—pass; (d) City of Winnipeg Residential Street Repairs \$5,000,000—pass; (e) Rural Sewer and Water Supply Projects \$4,000,000—pass; (f) Port of Churchill Dredging \$3,000,000—pass; (g) University of Manitoba Nursing Building \$2,400,000—pass; (h) Correctional Youth Centres \$2,100,000—pass; (j) Waterway Crossings \$1,500,000—pass; (k) Northern Communities Infrastructure \$1,000,000—pass; (m) Other \$14,000,000—pass.

Resolution 27.5: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$50,000,000 for Other Appropriations, Capital Initiatives, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**Mr. Chairperson (Ben Sveinson):** The next appropriation is on page 9, Legislative Assembly.

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question under Legislative Assembly. I have been told that the Legislative Assembly does not come under the SHL contract. They can purchase their computers separately. Is that true or not?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Environment):** I see Fred Bryans approaching, and he can help me with this response. As the honourable member for Elmwood would know, the Legislative Assembly Management Commission's decisions and recommendations are reflected in these Estimates, and the question was?

**Mr. Maloway:** I would like to know why the Legislative Building is not included in the SHL contract. That has been what has been suggested to me.

**Mr. McCrae:** The SHL contract is the contract with the government, not with the Legislative Assembly. The Legislative Assembly is separate and apart from the government, and its affairs are administered by the Legislative Assembly Management Commission on which members of the honourable member's caucus take part.

**Mr. Maloway:** But I also understand that the Provincial Auditor's office and the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs are not required to purchase their computers from SHL as well.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please, minister and members of the committee. I would ask that the minister have that answer perhaps put in some form of writing to give to the member. I am interrupting the proceedings of this section of the Committee of Supply because the total time allowed for Estimates consideration has now expired.

Rule 71.(1) provides, in part, that no more than 240 hours shall be allowed for the consideration in Committee of the Whole, of Ways and Means, and Supply resolutions respecting all types of Estimates and of relevant supply bills. Rule 71.(3) provides that

where the time limit has expired the Chairpersons shall forthwith put all remaining questions necessary to dispose of the matter and such questions shall not be subject to debate, amendment or adjournment.

I am therefore going to read the list of resolutions that I will call, and once I have finished reading the list, each resolution will be passed individually without debate, amendment or adjournment.

Legislative Assembly and Emergency Expenditures,

Resolution 1.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,343,200 for Legislative Assembly, Other Assembly Expenditures, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 1.2: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,398,300 for Legislative Assembly, Office of the Provincial Auditor, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 1.3: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,747,300 for the Legislative Assembly, Office of the Ombudsman, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

\* (1510)

Resolution 1.4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,007,500 for the Legislative Assembly, Office of the Chief Electoral Officer, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 27.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$100,000,000, for other Other Appropriations, Emergency Expenditures, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Committee rise.

\* (1430)

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau):** Would the Committee of Supply please come to order. This section of the Committee of Supply has been dealing

with the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. Would the minister's staff please enter the Chamber at this time.

We are on Resolution 3.6. Policy and Economics (a) Economics (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$1,060,900.

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister one question with respect to Crown land leases. I have a letter which was sent to the minister in February from Pine Creek First Nation. Pine Creek First Nation was attempting to lease some land adjacent to the reserve. They said that when they made their application they were advised that First Nations could not apply to lease Crown land. But they have written to the minister.

I have since talked to departmental staff, but I would like the minister's explanation and how he proposes to resolve this matter. The Pine Creek First Nation has interest in bison ranching. They have interest in elk ranching, and they are in need of additional land. But the way the policy is written right now, I understand that a First Nation cannot apply. They must apply as individuals, but I am sure that the minister must be looking at the situation to see how he proposes to resolve it. I would like his explanation.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for Swan River is correct in her assumption with respect to the policy. Bands as such are not eligible under the current criteria for application to access Crown lands. Individual First Nation members, if they meet the qualifying criteria that govern the selection of individuals eligible for Crown lands use, agricultural Crown land use, are eligible. I might add, we have a number of First Nations members who lease agricultural Crown land.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** So the minister is indicating then that if the band owns cattle as a whole, they will not qualify to lease the land, but if it is individual members who lease the land—this is, I would assume, a long-term policy. Would it have anything to do with the scoring of how Crown land is given out to people, or is it just the policy that you can only lease as an individual?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to be so formally announced by you in such a forthright and direct manner. It kind of challenges me to respond to the legitimate questions of the honourable members opposite.

Yes, it is a long-standing policy that has been in effect—certainly my director of all Regional Services advised me it has been in effect for some many years. If the honourable member is suggesting a change in that policy, well, that is a fair question and one that is open for debate. I suspect some of the development of the policy originally has been in the sense that governments, both federal and provincial, treat with bands as a group, as a whole, in land entitlement questions, for instance.

The honourable member is well aware that the province and the federal government of Canada are currently in the midst of transferring many, many thousands, indeed, if not millions of acres of land in what we all hope will be a final recognition of the unfulfilled commitments with respect to land that were made under various treaties with First Nations communities. Those now, in many instances, I think, have reached kind of the final negotiation stage, and they do involve very significant amounts of land.

By and large, the position of Manitoba has been that where possible, we will meet our obligation by the transfer of unoccupied Crown lands in these circumstances, and we look to Ottawa to provide in some instances where land is not available. In some of the southern reserves where the availability of unoccupied Crown land is limited, there is the equivalent of dollars, money, funds to be provided in lieu of, which the bands then can and in some instances, I am advised, are interested in using to, in fact, purchase private lands to add to their overall landholdings.

But I would suspect that this as a background was the determining factor, that when this policy with respect to accessing agriculture Crown land was developed, it was deemed to be fair that we treat everybody on an individual basis, First Nations or other aboriginal groups, Metis farmers, or the non-Native farmers.

But I should add, I am advised, that the same thing applies—corporations, for instance, farm corporations are not eligible for Crown land leasing. I suspect the same thing would apply to a colony if it were, and most of them are, incorporated as a corporation.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Shall the item pass? The item is accordingly passed.

Item 3.6. Policy and Economics (a) Economics (2) Other Expenditures \$245,100—pass.

Item 3.6.(b) Boards and Commissions Support Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$373,000.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** We are on 6.(a), are we?

**Mr. Chairperson:** No, we are on 6.(b) now. I passed 6.(a). We are moving on 6.(b) Boards and Commissions Support Services (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits \$373,000.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I just want to clarify. I thought we were doing Crown Lands. That is what you were supposed to be passing, was Crown Lands.

**Mr. Chairperson:** No, Crown Lands passed on Thursday. We were dealing with 6.(a) Economics (1) Salaries and Employee Benefits. That is what I read at the opening of the committee meeting. Did the honourable member want to revert back to 6.(a)?

**Ms. Wowchuk:** No, Mr. Chairman. I just missed you passing Crown Lands, and that is why I was still asking a couple of questions on that section, but that is okay.

I want to move on. If we could deal with this section, we are on Boards and Commissions. I want to raise with the minister an issue that has been brought to my attention and that being the pricing of milk in rural communities. Several smaller stores have indicated that the price of milk is going higher, and these store owners see milk as an essential item and are concerned with what is happening.

This came about when this government changed a policy on minimum price of milk. I would ask the minister whether, recognizing the importance of milk

as an essential product and taking into consideration the concerns that have been raised in northern communities, particularly this year because of roads breaking up early, but aside from that, whether the minister is giving any reconsideration to bringing back a minimum price for milk.

\* (1440)

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, that is an interesting question. Because I am well acquainted with the debate that took place when, in fact, we moved from most types, I have to be careful of the need for the maintenance of a minimum price. The honourable member will recall the complaint that was being registered by some retailers, one in particular I can well remember, was that that regulation prevented him from dropping the price of milk to the level that he wanted to. It was quite frankly sometimes a difficult regulation to explain to the price-conscious consumer that, it was the business of our government, of any government, to prevent retailers from reducing the cost of milk when and, if they chose to, some perhaps using it as a loss leader. You know, that phrase is used in marketing to attract customers to their stores. But it was that general debate that took place in the late 1980s, '89, '90, in around that place that led to that revision of policy that removed the requirement for minimum pricing.

I suspect that that really is not the issue that the honourable member is dealing with, particularly because of the actions just recently taken by the Milk Control Board and the Manitoba Milk Prices Review Commission which is chaired by Dr. Kraft, which is the agency that from time to time looks and supervises the affairs of the milk industry in the province of Manitoba, has, in fact, ordered price reductions. Since May 1 or earlier on this year there have been two price reductions implemented by the milk producers, that is the Milk Producers Board of Manitoba, as a result of the recommendations of the milk pricing commission headed by Dr. Kraft and a different arrangement that has to do with their pooling arrangement in the western pool. They met, in essence, the Alberta price that brought down their price of milk by a few cents a litre down. I hasten to add, whether or not these savings have been in effect—and that is, of course, a legitimate argument passed on through to the consumers—is

always another question, but I do know that my milk producers are receiving less today than they were a few months ago.

I should indicate I was indicating a date. It was since May 1, 1989 that the commission has stopped setting the minimum wholesale jobber or retail prices in milk, so it is now a practice that has taken place for the last eight or nine years.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Mr. Chairman, this year we saw an increase in the amount of money that was going to be going into agri-food research. I was very pleased to see that increase. It is something that we have been asking for, for a long time. With the changes that we are seeing in agriculture, we have to do more research.

When I talked to the people from the food-processing industry, people in the food-processing industry indicate that Manitoba is not doing their fair share of research into produce research. Quebec does a lot of research. There is some work being done in Portage la Prairie, as I understand it, but what they say is that the Food Development Centre has just become designated as a general centre for research, but we have no specific centres for and no specific research being done for that sector.

I would ask the minister if he recognizes this as an important area of production for Manitoba and whether this is an area we could be targetting for more research to be done to ensure that the food processing industry can continue to thrive in Manitoba and not fall behind other provinces.

**Mr. Enns:** You know, I can recall that that probably has been one of the persistent comments or pieces of advice that I have received from the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) over the last number of years when we discuss Agriculture Estimates. I have always, always indicated to her that I agreed, in essence, with the point that she was making and putting on the record. It is extremely important to dedicate some of the earnings, some of the dollars that the industry makes, back into basic research. If we want to stay ahead of the game and hopefully in some instances be leaders in the game, then that is absolutely vital and even more so for a province like Manitoba

where so much of what we do in food generally is done in competition with the outside world, if not the world, then certainly right here in Canada.

So it is with that kind of ongoing support that I have had from my official opposition that I am convinced that it was helpful in enabling myself to establish a fairly significant agricultural research and development fund known as ARDI. That is in total with the federal contribution, upwards to \$19 million of monies that is dedicated for the very purpose that she advocates. I might also indicate to her that in the main, although we have not carved it in stone, because that is not always possible, we will be looking very favourably to those kinds of projects coming forward from proponents where they can bring money to the table.

We have targeted a general guideline of we hope a 50 percent contribution from, say, the Canola Council or the Manitoba Forage Seed Association. When they want specific research done, they bring some of their money that they now have as a result of check-off legislation that has been put in place some time ago, and that dollar is matched by the ARDI fund. So that \$19 million can, in fact, become significantly more dollars in total research and development that is now being made available to the food, the agricultural industry in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I am the first one to acknowledge that this is a new venture under the direction of the chair, Dr. Clay Gilson. I am certainly hopeful that they will find the appropriate vision to conduct the kind of award, the kind of research projects that are being directed towards them. I am told that they are coming in at a fairly good clip. We have currently had some 131 applications to that newly set up board—that board is only barely four months old—of which 71 already have been approved.

The total approved to date out of that fund is some \$3.9 million. That is very close to \$4 million. That is fairly significant activity that is being generated this spring, this year, that was not there last year or the year before and the year before that when the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) used to, at this stage of my Estimates, be telling me that I was not doing enough with respect to research.

So, Mr. Chairman, being that kind of a person who can accept good advice when it is given, I accepted that good advice from the honourable member for Swan River, and we are now embarked on what I believe and hope to be a very worthwhile research and development program. It does not have maybe quite the focus that the research dollars in Saskatchewan have, and we have talked about that from time to time.

Saskatchewan has done a very creditable job, an enviable job, indeed, in focusing on biotechnology at the university of Saskatoon, coming together with the private sector and so forth. Our research and our effort will be of its nature a more general, broadly based type of research. But I make no apologies for it. That is the nature of our agriculture, and, quite frankly, I think there are some strengths in that. If we can move forward on a very broad front of food production, we may well, at the end of the day, find ourselves being served quite well. Thank you.

\* (1450)

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Mr. Chairman, the minister is right. Saskatchewan has become very focused on biotechnology and is becoming recognized for that. I understand that Quebec is becoming a leader and the centre of research on production, such as various types of vegetables. So they are becoming focused. We were doing more work in centres like Brandon where there is federal research on hog production, and we seem to have lost that. I think that, although we do have to have general research too, it might be something to consider to become more focused in our research so that Manitoba would become recognized for a particular field of agriculture research that would then attract the kind of money that Saskatchewan has been able to attract to its area.

I leave that with the minister, and I think that his staff, and hopefully the committee that is working on this that has been appointed, can maybe focus the attention in a particular area. There are lots of opportunities in Manitoba.

I want to ask the minister a question relating to the Manitoba Rural Adaptation Council and the agriculture food research development. It has been suggested by

farm groups that the minister, when he was setting up this Agri-Food Research and Development Initiative, that he did not have to set up another board. There was a board in place with MRAC. These people were prepared to work, and they are committed to development in rural Manitoba. There are federal dollars in it, as well, and I wonder whether the minister has given any consideration to the suggestion that there could have been one board that could have dealt with all of this rather than having two boards, as has been suggested by some farm organizations.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, the answer to the honourable member's question is that, no, we have not given consideration to the establishment of a board. We believe they are two separate entities, and as such we are very much concerned, though, that we avoid, wherever possible, duplication of roles. We have ensured that there is a reasonably close association with the department and the two boards. On both boards, we have nonvoting members from the Department of Agriculture who sit in on the meetings, both at MRAC and on the ARDI board, of course, so that provides a fairly direct and instant communication as to what the boards are up to and what kinds of projects they are considering.

So with those kinds of mechanics in place, I believe that I can say with some confidence that duplication will be avoided, and the role of the two boards will proceed as they are mandated. It must be remembered that the MRAC initiative is entirely a federal initiative. We were not consulted; I was not consulted. The Minister of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture were not consulted.

I do not want to get into yesterday's arguments, but the rural municipalities of all the municipalities of Manitoba unanimously agreed that these monies that were some residue monies out of the Western Grain Transport, these are Crow monies, that the fairest way to spend those monies would be on the improvement of the roads. Everybody recognized that our road systems are being hammered.

The provincial governments and all provincial departments, the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), the Minister of Highways (Mr. Findlay), the

Minister of Agriculture, I must confess I did not particularly want to just automatically give that over to roads, because there are initiatives. I had research in mind. I had other things in mind for Agriculture. But I agreed and we jointly sent the president of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, Minister of Rural Development, Minister of Highways; and we passed on this unanimous recommendation about how those \$4 million or \$5 million should be spent in Manitoba.

But somewhere there on the—I was going to say on the road to Damascus, but it was not on the road to Damascus. It was my own M.P., Jon Gerrard, you know, who during the last election decided that this money should be better spent in setting up this council, much to the surprise of all of us. But that is fair game. If the federal government wants to do it, they can do that, but I do not think it is quite fair. Meantime, with my senior staff, we had been working diligently for the better part of a year. The year before that at the Estimates time was the first \$3.2 million that we got set aside provincially. We were then told to now try and get the federal dollars, and it took us the better part of a year to put that into place.

All of that was taking place well ahead of the establishment of the MRAC board, but I look forward to hoping that both ARDI and MRAC will dedicate themselves and the dollars that they have to the kind of worthwhile program that will assist Manitoba in adapting to the new phase of agriculture that it has to adapt to in this post-Crow era.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Mr. Chairman, the funding for agriculture research went up by \$3 million. Can the minister indicate whether that is going to be ongoing funding or is that one-year funding to start the project up? Can we expect that this money will continue on the following year as well?

**Mr. Enns:** We have been able to secure that kind of commitment for two years now from the funding that makes up the provincial portion of that grant. My understanding is that a further third year, if it is shown that it is required, it will be certainly my intention to once again put it in place. These dollars, of course, are the residue of some of the dollars that ensure that we expend the maximum amount available to us in the

safety net envelope from Ottawa, that we triggered that amount. It is also fair to say that in answer to that question of whether we can count on these dollars being there longer term, it will to some extent depend on how successful we are in negotiating the next five years arrangements with Ottawa re the safety net programs as a whole. It is all part of the package.

The honourable member is familiar enough with the NISA programs, with the basic crop insurance, which are both kind of client driven, customer driven. They can always be, while well within the ballpark, people that were easily under or over by \$2 million or \$3 million in any given year on one program. We get about \$180 million out of that for basic crop. Our share is what it is, and I believe that I have found an acceptable way of making sure that in every year we use every dollar that is available to us from Ottawa, and that has been, quite frankly, the leverage that I have been able to exercise on our own Treasury Board here in Manitoba to ensure that that, in fact, takes place.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Can the minister indicate then, the money that is designated this year, if it is not spent, will it be carried over to next year and be available for research, or is this money that if do not spend it we lose it?

**Mr. Enns:** You are beginning to sound like my deputy minister, honourable member for Swan River. You are not supposed to ask those trick questions, Mr. Chairman.

\* (1500)

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Does the money carry forward if we do not spend it, or is it lost? If it is going to be lost, does the minister anticipate that we will have enough projects this year to use up the money?

**Mr. Enns:** The honourable member puts her finger on an issue that is of concern to us. Our ability to bank it or roll it over is limited, is not there quite frankly. It is our intention to encourage the board to more or less try to expend the limit in any given year that we have available to us.

The situation is made somewhat more complicated by the fact that my understanding that Ottawa has a



greater capacity to what officials tell me, describe, to be able to roll over the funds, but it is also tied up with the overall allocations to the safety net envelope that each province gets. So it is somewhat complicated, but there is an element of truth in what the honourable suggests that if we do not use it, we lose it.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Then can the minister indicate what steps are being taken to pursue people to begin doing more research in this province? How are you making people aware, and is there somebody aggressively out there working to ensure that we can take advantage of this opportunity of having this money and ensure that we build the base that when the money comes up again next year or the year after, we will be doing the research that we are not going to lose this money?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, the board, when finally put together and off and running, they actively provide and solicit applications by means of advertising. They have an attractive brochure that sets out the guidelines as to how individuals and organizations can access and make the applications.

It should also be pointed out to the honourable member that certainly an important agency, like the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba under the direction of Dean Elliott, has been eagerly awaiting the establishment of this fund and needs no prodding, I might add, to have his applications roll in. In fact, if you looked at the number of approvals, of the 71-odd approvals to date, then certainly the Faculty of Agriculture at the university has done fairly well.

To date, I am advised by staff, the University of Manitoba projects have, in fact, received 49 or near half of the total for \$3.9 million of programs that have been approved. Certainly, I am further advised that it will be the intention of the board to revisit their public relations strategy, if you like. They will be meeting with groups to hopefully to create the kind of interest for organizations where research dollars can be applied and new ideas can come forward in the various organizations throughout the province, whether it is the food processors, whether it is organizations such as the various farm organizations, and, in particular, the farm commodity groups.

What we are seeing in Manitoba in many instances is some real interesting risk-taking, if you like, on some of the crops that heretofore have only been dabbled with. We have an operation that has to do with extracting various food—[interjection]

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. I am interrupting the proceedings of the section of the Committee of Supply because the total time allowed for the Estimates consideration has now expired.

Our Rule 71.(1) provides in part that not more 240 hours shall be allowed for the consideration in Committee of the Whole of Ways and Means and Supply resolutions respecting all types of estimates and relevant Supply bills.

That concludes Agriculture.

Our Rule 71.(3) provides that where the time limit has expired the Chairman shall forthwith put all remaining questions necessary to dispose of the matters, and such questions or resolutions shall not be subject to debate, amendment or adjournment.

I am therefore going to call in sequence the resolutions on the following matters: Agriculture, Resolutions 3.1; 3.6 and 3.7.

Resolution 3.6: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,120,900 for Agriculture, Policy and Economics, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 3.7: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,800,800 for Agriculture, Agriculture Research and Development, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

Resolution 3.1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,518,500 for Agriculture, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1999.

This concludes our Estimates. I am going to recess until such time as the other committees are finished

their Estimates, and we will call the House back when they are concluded.

The committee will come to order. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

### Committee Report

**Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Chairperson):** Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck), that the report of the committee be received.

### Motion agreed to.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to all the members of this House and ministers and critics and House leaders and everybody like that who has been involved in making that process as smooth as it has been. The committee Chairs have done a marvellous job, and the Clerk Assistants at their sides have kept them out of trouble for the most part. The whole process is an example of, I think, an efficient and proper way to get through a rather large number of hours of Estimates review.

### House Business

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, would you be so kind as to call bills in the following order: Bill 8, 10, 28, 32, 33, 38, 39, 40, 45, 54 and 55.

\* (1510)

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### Bill 8—The Real Property Amendment Act

**Madam Speaker:** To resume adjourned debate on second reading, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate

Affairs (Mr. Radcliffe), Bill 8, The Real Property Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels), standing in the name of the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers). Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** No? Leave has been denied.

**Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood):** I will not keep you very long on this Bill 8. In fact, the minister, in his earlier address, I think covered all of the issues on this bill. This bill deals with the land sold following foreclosure, and there is evidently potential conflict between current Sections 141 and 137 in regard to such sales, and this is, in essence, really just a housekeeping section to this legislation.

I might point out, though, Madam Speaker, that this bill certainly does nothing to deal with stagnant property values in the city of Winnipeg. I could go on at considerable length discussing that whole issue and the government's lack of action in that area over its last 10 years inaction in government, but I will leave that for another day and would move that this bill go to committee. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading Bill 8, The Real Property Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

### Bill 10—The Mining Tax Amendment Act

**Madam Speaker:** To resume adjourned debate on second reading, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Newman), Bill 10, The Mining Tax Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la taxe minière), standing in the name of the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers). Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** No? Leave has been denied.

**Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk (St. James):** It is our opportunity to put on the record a few comments on Bill 10. Bill 10 indeed has two parts. One increases the Mining Reserve Fund amount from \$5 million to \$10 million, a move that we support strongly and wish to put that on the record. It has been set at \$5 million for 27 years, and it is high time that that was increased.

Number 2, the second part of the bill, is one that we strongly oppose. For that reason we will be voting against this bill. I would like to put a few comments on the record as to why we are so strongly opposed to the idea that the Minister of Mines (Mr. Newman) has put forward, which is to allow the Mining Reserve Fund, a fund that was established to specifically assist mining communities, existing mining communities, the workers, the businesses, and those communities to have a viable future. In case there was pending closure, or the actual closure of a mine, this fund would be available to assist those mining towns.

So the purpose of the fund was quite specific in the act. Unfortunately, it is the decision of this minister and this government to change the purpose of that fund quite dramatically by allowing the funding of MEAP, which is a grant program for exploration companies, to be funded out of the Mining Reserve Fund, so what is a fund that is constructed by taxes from mining companies who are profitable at certain times, and those profits are put into a fund to assist those very communities in tough times. Madam Speaker, the times are very tough right now, and it is very ironic to have this bill before us suggesting that it would be indeed proper to use this money for what I would consider fairly speculative exploration programs and, in particular, the Superior Province.

I do not wish to suggest that exploration is not needed in Manitoba. Hardly. I believe that we need more exploration and that we need a real and active Prospectors Program. The Prospectors Program, in particular, has been a dismal failure because of the lack of leadership by the Minister of Mines (Mr. Newman). We have seen hardly a 50 percent take-up on the

money that was allocated. That unfortunately is a legacy of incompetence and bungling in terms of dealing with the shortage and crisis in developing prospectors in Manitoba.

But, Madam Speaker, they have provided a special incentive for doing exploration in the Superior Province which is an area on the east side of the province, an area that is undeveloped. We know that exploration projects like this take considerable lead time. If we look even at the Cross Lake project, back in 1986, when I worked in the Cross Lake area as a geologist at that time, we knew of the deposit. We knew that it was potentially very significant. Here we are in 1998, we are still proving up reserves and we have not started production. That is a deposit that we would consider on the fast track. That is on a fast track. So the exploration that is going to occur in the Superior Province will perhaps lead to a mine. Ten, 20 years from now, we can be hopeful that something will happen.

Well, Madam Speaker, for the workers and the community at Leaf Rapids who have been given a sentence of three years, that is not going to cut it. Those miners in Leaf Rapids will not be working in the Superior Province, will not be supporting their children from the money that they make in a new mine in the Superior Province. In fact, they are going to need support from this government in terms of direction and in terms of the Mining Reserve Fund.

So we feel that it is a betrayal to those northern and southern mining communities, those mining companies who have invested in this fund for the purpose of helping those miners and the mining communities, and it is a betrayal to the workers themselves. This is not the purpose of the Mining Reserve Fund, and we strongly oppose the use of the fund for the MEAP program.

I want to just conclude saying that, indeed, the Mining Reserve Fund is a very important initiative and one that we are going to need in the communities of Leaf Rapids, perhaps in Flin Flon. We have seen layoffs in Thompson and downsizing. Our mining community right now is seeing a very stressful period. Commodity prices in all sectors, perhaps the first time

ever, are at all time lows. It is time that this government retracted this amendment to this bill, particularly in terms of the Mining Reserve Fund focused on keeping those mining communities sustainable. The time is now, not tomorrow, as the mining industry faces a very serious crisis.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** I, too, want to put a few words on the record on Bill 10. I think the general principle of Bill 10 would appear, on first-hand, to be fairly positive in the sense that it is important to recognize the importance of sustainability, in particular within our communities, the mining communities. The greatest advantage that Winnipeg has is its diversification of its economy. You take that and you compare that to a one-industry town, it could be absolutely devastating to that community if you have a mine or the industry in that one-industry town shutting down. The idea of having a community mining reserve is very positive, and we understand that it is going to be, in fact, funded by the 3 percent of the annual mining tax.

Madam Speaker, this section, if you like, allows the minister to use the money to stimulate exploration within a reasonable distance, if you like, of closed mines. I think that government does need to do what it can in order to look at communities, in particular those one-industry communities, and seeing what we can do to allow for that particular community's ultimate advancement if, in fact, it is practical.

With those few words, I am prepared to see the bill go to committee. Thank you.

\* (1520)

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** I just want to put a few words on the record, because I think it is important to emphasize the current situation in the mining industry. As someone who represents a mining community, I can say quite clearly that we are concerned in mining communities at the present point in time. Prices are down. Nickel, for example, which is the backbone of Inco, has dropped to about \$2.05, \$2.06 a pound. We are in some very difficult

circumstances. I want to urge the government not to do the kinds of things we saw happen with the Mining Reserve Fund recently, and to recognize that the mining taxes and royalties that have come out of northern Manitoba by and large have gone to support many programs throughout this province in the past.

We have had years where we produced \$100 million, \$120 million, \$130 million of royalties in one single year. I must admit there is some frustration in the North that it seems that when times are good, money is taken out of the North, not reinvested in the way of services, whether it be Health or Education or Highways. When times are tough, of course, when we need the money, we now see this government taking money out of the Mining Reserve Fund and putting it into general revenue.

My message to the government, particularly this year when it is running a surplus supposedly, is when mining communities are not in a surplus position—in my own community, for the information of government members, we have had 150 contractors laid off, 45 staff people laid off, another 90 currently, both hourly and staff at Inco, in the process of being laid off. We are going through some tough times in our community, and it is the same in other communities, whether it be in Flin Flon or Leaf Rapids, Lynn Lake.

Any community that is dependent on mining now is dealing with a dramatic drop in commodity prices. That, by the way, Madam Speaker, is being reinforced as we speak by the very difficult circumstances in Asia. The more the Asian economy drops, the Japanese economy drops, the more we are in a sensitive position, the more that demand for nickel and other minerals, base metals, drops, we end up with the kind of situation, \$2.05, and that compares to upwards of \$3.50, \$3.60, \$3.70 a pound U.S. only a short two years ago.

I want to urge the government to listen to mining communities. I want to take the opportunity of speaking on this bill to say to the government that the money they have taken out of mining, particularly the money that was in the Mining Reserve Fund, they should put it back. Put it back where it belongs, in

northern Manitoba, and take it out of the sticky hands of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson).

Our communities need that money right now. We need the money for diversification. We need the money to deal with the potential in some communities, if we have continuing low commodity prices, that those mining communities may be hit with the kind of circumstance we saw in Lynn Lake and Snow Lake only a few years ago, very difficult situations for individuals.

Madam Speaker, I say to this government what they did when they took the money out of the Mining Reserve Fund was unacceptable. It was unacceptable to northerners. Northerners have told me to tell them through you to say to the government: get your hands off the mining revenues of northern Manitoba. Get it out of general revenue, put it back in the Mining Reserve Fund, and preserve what I think was one of the excellent legacies, many of the legacies of the Schreyer government affecting northern Manitoba, that is, the Mining Reserve Fund.

So, with those few words, Madam Speaker, I send the message to the government: listen to the North, listen to mining communities, and do not take our Mining Reserve Fund and do anything other than what needs to be done, which is to keep the money in it and improve it and enhance it. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 10, The Mining Tax Amendment Act.

Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? No?

#### Voice Vote

**Madam Speaker:** All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

**Madam Speaker:** All those opposed, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Madam Speaker:** In my opinion, the Yeas have it. On division.

**Ms. Mihychuk:** Madam Speaker, I would like to just have it recorded that that was on division. That is all.

**Madam Speaker:** I thank the honourable member for St. James, and I believe that was done.

#### Bill 28—The Employment Standards Code and Consequential Amendments

**Madam Speaker:** To resume second reading debate, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Gilleshammer), Bill 28, The Employment Standards Code and Consequential Amendments (Code des normes d'emploi et modifications corrélatives), standing in the name of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** No. Leave has been denied.

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Madam Speaker, I have a few comments to make on Bill 28, The Employment Standards Code and Consequential Amendments. This is something that has been talked about by this government. I think, if I recall correctly, it was the now Minister of Justice (Mr. Toews), then Minister of Labour, who talked about these changes and consolidating these three acts into one when that particular member was first elected to this Chamber. So it has been a number of years that this issue has been in the works by the Department of Labour. Of course, we saw that while that work was ongoing that particular minister was transferred out of the department, but the department continued to work on the consolidation of those pieces of legislation.

This act, Bill 28, will combine The Employment Standards Act, The Vacations with Pay Act and The Payment of Wages Act into one Employment Standards Act. It is our understanding that, in listening to the comments that were made by the Minister of Labour and talking with people in the workforce of our

province that have to deal with these, it will make it much easier for an interpretation of the act itself, much along the lines that the former minister had indicated. At that time he said he had a specific interest and some expertise in that area and said it created some problems in trying to interpret the act when you compared one against the other.

Madam Speaker, that is along the lines of what we have been hearing as well, that this will in some ways streamline these three pieces of legislation by incorporating them into one act and making sure that each of the sections or clauses of the legislation is consistent with the overall purpose of the Employment Standards Code. This legislation, as I said, will combine the three acts: The Employment Standards, Vacations with Pay, and Payment of Wages Act.

It would have been nice if we could have seen some modest improvements by way of this legislation since you are opening up the Employment Standards Code of this province, and I look along the lines of your Vacations with Pay Act, for example. There have not been some changes in that area for a considerable period of time. I am sure there are other changes that we could have proposed, some amendments or some improvements to the code that would have increased the ability of the Employment Standards Code to make the lives of working people much easier in this province because of the conflicts that they come into from time to time.

No doubt the employers face similar problems as they try to interpret the current act that is in place. We perhaps could have suggested some other improvements to the Employment Standards Code, but the government was intent only to combine the three at this point.

Of course, it was not that long ago that this government, through its actions in the budgetary process, eliminated the Payment of Wages Fund in this province, something that assisted working people and the government has eliminated that now. It has made it much more difficult for working people to obtain the wages to which they were entitled in a timely fashion. I know I have received calls just recently on this, last week as a matter of fact, from members that are having

some difficulties with the payment of wages that are due and owing to them. I think, if I recall correctly, there was a letter that has gone to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gilleshammer) in that regard.

This legislation, Bill 28, will co-ordinate the definitions and eliminate any redundancies or inconsistencies in the legislation, and will make it easier for those members of the public, employers and employees in the province, to understand the act more clearly without having to compare one act to the other. It will no doubt make it easier to have some definition of what the act was intended to do and, of course, the interpretation by those who are charged with the enforcement of the acts themselves, not only from the Employment Standards Branch of the Department of Labour, but also by legal counsel and the courts who are charged with the ultimate enforcement of any legislation.

\* (1530)

This bill, I believe, will modernize the legislation by clarifying those clauses of the act that were in conflict with the other two acts. So it will provide some greater clarity in that regard. I also want to indicate that there will be more opportunities for effective and efficient enforcement of the law itself by the combining of those three acts into one.

It is my understanding through this bill that there was a requirement now that will allow for some consultation to take place between employers' and employees' representatives prior to the enactment of any new regulations that I think, if the government of the day is willing to listen to the players, to the stakeholders when they move to change regulations, will allow for some consultation, and also hopefully a broad consensus to be reached by any regulation changes that would be proposed at that time.

Now, it is my understanding that the act itself under this new code will allow for the vacation pay to be equal to 4 percent of wages earned during the vacation entitlement year for an employee entitled to a two-week vacation. Of course, if you have three weeks entitlement under the current law, then the vacation pay earned would be 6 percent. This approach is much easier to understand and is not a significant departure

from the existing legislation. But, nevertheless, it will make it easier for those who are affected by the legislation to have a greater clarity or understanding of what the act intended under The Vacations with Pay Act, incorporated under the new Employment Standards Code.

In regard to the other provisions of the act itself, there is a specific section dealing with overtime provisions. I know in past employment opportunities, there had been discussion at those times with respect to pay and people being required to take pay for any overtime that is worked at the prevailing rate of time and a half for those in the first eight hours of overtime. But in changes with this act, it will allow some flexibility in that the employees themselves will now be able to, in consultation no doubt with their employers—there is some flexibility built into the code now that will allow the employees to take their overtime worked, their hours worked in overtime, take it off with time in lieu of pay and at the prevailing time and a half or overtime rate. This will allow the employees, of course, those that are already in a tax bracket for which they were not feeling comfortable perhaps and felt that this could boost them up into the next tax bracket, meaning that they would have to pay more tax by claiming the overtime in pay, would be allowed to take the time off in lieu of receiving that pay. So it does provide some options or some flexibility for people who do or are required to work overtime.

In this Employment Standards Code, revision to it, there are changes dealing with employees who are called into work on their regular rest days, their regular days off, and there was a provision that would require them to receive at least three hours at their regular rate of pay. Now, it is my understanding that under the current act, at present they must be paid for three hours at the minimum-wage rate. There is a change in this regard now, and I think it is probably a move in the right direction. So anyone who is called in to work on their regular rest days would be required to be paid the minimum of three hours of their regular rate of pay. So there is some clarity or some change in that regard as well.

There is also a change in the Employment Standards Code for persons against whom payment of wage

orders have been issued by the director of the Employment Standards branch, that there will now be an administrative cost or an administrative fee attached that would now be owing against the person who is charged or required to make payment of those particular wages. It can be also based on a percentage of the wages found owing, and I think it is up to a maximum of a thousand dollars. So the fee is variable in that regard, dealing with the administrative cost. So there will be some recovery of costs in that regard.

It would hopefully be a discouragement in cases where individuals or employers have chosen not to make payment of wages and have been found guilty of that infraction, would also have an additional charge levied against them. So they would have to think clearly about not paying wages that are legally due and owing.

Also, there is going to be interest now charged on unpaid wages as a result of the Employment Standards Code streamlining, if we can call it that. The director of Employment Standards will be required to pay interest on any money held in trust. So, if there are items that are in dispute between an employer and employee, those monies could be then forwarded from an employer to the branch, and the branch would hold those monies in trust. Of course, any interest accrued to those monies, would then be forwarded as well.

The fine levels have changed under the code and will be increased substantially. I think this would probably be viewed as a progressive move, in the sense it would be a discouragement from one stakeholder group taking advantage of other individuals in our society in an employer-employee relationship. We would want to make sure that we minimize the number of cases that would have to come before the branch dealing with issues like this. By increasing the fine levels under the code, if this goes a ways towards acting as a deterrent in this regard, we think and would view this as a positive move.

It is my understanding, too, that the director of Employment Standards will be authorized to settle differences between employers and employees. Well, perhaps that is something that is commonplace in the current legislation that is in place. The Employment

Standards branch, from my experience and from understanding, tries to work through a conciliation process to try and solve these differences and, hopefully, obtain the monies owing from the employers on behalf of the employees after some investigation is undertaken by the branch.

Now, the director of Employment Standards, of course, will be authorized to settle these differences. I would take it that that would mean that there would be more powers in that regard and that the director, even though they can issue a director's order now, are still appealable to the Manitoba Labour Board as a quasi-judicial body in dealing with such matters. The Labour Board, as we know, has those powers and can have final say in regard to directors' orders that are issued. I believe that employee or employers, themselves, can appeal those directors' decisions to that particular body still, if they feel so aggrieved.

Madam Speaker, there may be a number of members of the public that want to come out and debate or talk about changes to the Employment Standards Code. We wish that there had been perhaps some other changes incorporated with the act, but nevertheless, this is a modest step with some, perhaps, minor but important changes that the government has incorporated into this legislation.

We know in looking back on their past labour standards that they have had during the term of their government, you have taken a much more heavy-handed approach. In fact, many times your government has disregarded the viewpoints of the Labour Management Review Committee dealing with various pieces of labour legislation, and it was convenient. Obviously, that was at the beginning of your term or your mandate. You felt that you could get away with your actions, and you had no need to consult and you had no need to take into consideration the viewpoints of a consensus reached by employers and employees in this province, but it is interesting to juxtapose those two positions now that you are much later in your term. You are taking a much more conciliatory approach in dealing with these changes than what you have done in the first year of your mandate. So, it is interesting to see how this process works, how our democratic process works, depending upon what point you are at in your legislative term.

So, Madam Speaker, I wish this could have been the case back in 1996 and '97 when we were dealing with changes to The Labour Relations Act, The Essential Services Act and others, but that was not to be. It is interesting that the government has chosen to take that more conciliatory approach this time. We hope that members of the public will come out and speak on this bill and let us know their thoughts. We look forward to this bill moving through to committee in a very short period of time. Thank you.

\* (1540)

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, generally speaking, when we have had labour legislation before the Chamber here, at times it can become quite an emotional debate. I can recall individuals like Jay Cowan, and even to a certain degree the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), who really get and sink their teeth into the philosophical debate of labour and people and so forth.

With respect to this bill, as the member for Transcona points out, no doubt there could have been substantially more done when you were bringing together the legislation to come across as being more friendly to labour, but that is something which the government really has not made a fine art of.

Madam Speaker, having said that, essentially the bill is a major overhaul of The Employment Standards Code. Acts affected by this bill include The Employment Standards Act, The Vacations with Pay Act and The Payment of Wages Act. This bill, to be presumably replaced by stipulations more in line with standards, will eliminate several parts of those acts deemed redundant or outdated. Some of the features of this particular bill, we will see an overall streamlining of labour regulation, which I think can be a fairly positive thing. In areas, we will see fines being increased, changes to regulations regarding holiday pay, and a number of other things that are happening.

But with those few words, we are prepared to see it go to committee. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading Bill



28, The Employment Standards Code and Consequential Amendments. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

### **Bill 32—The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Speaker:** To resume adjourned debate, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), Bill 32, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités et modifications corrélatives).

**Mr. Clif Evans (Interlake):** I would just like to make a few comments on Bill 32, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act. As previously stated by the Minister of Rural Development in '96 and prior to the enactment of Bill 54, The Municipal Act, in which The Municipal Act was completely revised and, being part of the process, it was stated at that time, of course, that with all the changes and the overhaul of The Municipal Act, that we anticipated and had indicated to the minister and the government of the day at that time that there may be changes within The Municipal Act, Bill 54, that we would seriously have to be considering once all the municipalities, urban and rural, had an opportunity to be under the focus, under the umbrella of Bill 54, that we would be seeing some recommendations and changes to the act to better streamline some of the issues that, of course, were very important to most of the municipalities.

As a whole, Madam Speaker, I realize that there have not been too many changes that have been requested by municipalities and by the organizations such as UMM and MAUM. Bill 32 has proposals to make some changes and clarifications that certainly we on this side of the House look forward to hearing from municipalities and others as to some of the changes.

One of the issues, Madam Speaker, that the minister refers to and has had requests from not only the UMM,

the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, but also municipalities as a whole from across Manitoba is with respect to the drainage issues that we know are so important to some of the municipalities in Manitoba. Some of the drainage issues that, of course, we have, specifically in my constituency, are long-going and need to be changed. The responsibility of drainage and the responsibility of how people drain their land and where they drain it to and how they drain it and at what rate has made it a problem for some of the municipalities in being able to control that issue and in being able to control just where individuals who are not licensed, or licensed, are able to drain to.

Madam Speaker, that is an issue and part of Bill 32 that certainly interests me because the Union of Manitoba Municipalities is urging and has urged its member municipalities to present and pass resolutions and send them to the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) appealing the fact that in the amendments municipalities have been given clarification about the type of drainage for which they are responsible and to which standard they should be maintained.

The UMM has urged the government and the Minister of Rural Development to make these changes, and the minister's response is that he is not going to make any changes. We are certainly hoping that prior to or at committee and through presentations that we have to Bill 32 that the minister seriously look at the requests by the municipalities in undergoing some of the changes. Basically what they are asking is, in fact, to ask the government of the day to give municipalities the opportunity to close unlicensed drains which increase water flows in municipal drainage areas.

Now, the municipality at times does not have the opportunity. If the Department of Natural Resources, the Water Resources branch, issues a licence without a proper review, Madam Speaker, then it is impossible at times for municipalities to act upon a drainage system, a new one or existing one, to be licensed. Then that proponent of the licence and the request for drainage seems to have the opportunity to be able to drain water from his or her property onto other properties and, at times, onto and into drainage systems that are overburdening the drainage systems responsibility to

the municipalities. They want some control over that, and I think that they are requesting that they want the right to obstruct or close the drains and that this amendment and this portion of Bill 32 did not support that request.

I wonder where the minister and where the government of the day are at with this, because it seems to be a great concern for most municipalities. We have received resolutions, Madam Speaker, and I want to read into Hansard an example of the motion carried by some of the municipalities that has been sent to the minister. It says: The Municipal Act amendments on drainage. Therefore be it resolved that the R.M. of Bifrost requests that the Minister of Rural Development include in The Municipal Amendment Act, Bill 32, a provision which will allow municipalities to close an unlicensed drain which is impacting on a municipal drainage system.

Now, I have received copies of resolutions from my constituency in the R.M. of Bifrost, Armstrong, Grahamdale and others who are requesting the same principle to be implemented by this minister and by this government so that there is better control of the drainage issue that will provide municipalities that little extra to be able to control how drainage systems are implemented in their own constituencies and in the rural municipalities.

Some of the other issues that Bill 32 addresses—and as I said, Madam Speaker, there are times and places that we support some of the issues that are brought forward and changes to The Municipal Act and hopefully streamline even more the initial act and the initial changes in Bill 54. Certainly, there is support not only from UMM and MAUM and from the communities as a whole and from this side of the House for some of the issues that Bill 32 addresses. We certainly look at some of the main changes that Bill 32 brings into perspective, and that is clarifying procedures from municipalities to amalgamate.

\* (1550)

I know that the minister has implemented this portion of Bill 32 as far as amalgamation. He seems to want to see an easier process, or provide an easier process, to

clarify if municipalities or jurisdictions want to look at the option of amalgamating in the future. The portion of that, what I approve or what I agree with is that it provides them with more clarified opportunity for them to make that decision as to whether they want to or not, not provide the opportunity for the government of the day or the minister of the day to force municipalities, jurisdictions into amalgamation. If amalgamation is not good for municipalities and jurisdictions that want to consider amalgamation, and if it does not work out for them in their own minds and in their own study about it when it affects them and their infrastructure, when it affects their population and communities and services, we want to see the opportunity that these jurisdictions have that right to be able to deal with the issue of amalgamation, if they so wish, to be able to have that.

It also addresses the issue of PUB approval for anticipated deficits in water or sewer budgets. That portion, too, provides—I hope and believe that it will provide—the jurisdictions with the availability to deal with their infrastructure and deal with the costs that, if sewer and water are an issue in certain municipalities and urban centres, this can be addressed by the jurisdiction, by the municipalities to deal with it and to be able to have the opportunity to speak to it through the PUB. Of course, as we all know in some of the areas now, Madam Speaker, we have the issue where water and sewer is a problem and systems have to be implemented and put in place.

Dealing with this, I know that some of the municipalities would have to be approved for a budget and be approved to have a deficit within their budgets in specifically dealing with the issue of providing a service such as sewer and water to their community.

Again, part of this Bill 32 clarifies the procedures for collection of taxes. As we all know, that at times can be a problem in certain rural communities. We have a problem with being able to collect the taxes and who is responsible for the taxes. In Bill 54, of course, changes were made to the initial bill, and now we are seeing that this amendment and these changes to the procedure for collecting these taxes also has been clarified, hopefully on behalf of the jurisdiction in which it lies.

As I mentioned, in special services and other issues, special services for which reserve funds can be created, Madam Speaker, I think a positive note for this amendment, because what I believe it will do is be able for a municipality or a jurisdiction to be able to plan more for the future of being able to provide services to the communities and be able to plan and have reserved funds implemented and put in place, so that a project such as water to a community, a water treatment plant, or any other special services as we can say will be available hopefully for the best.

We talk about rural communities and changes to The Municipal Act and how it will improve our communities, in which fashion and which direction we are going with rural Manitoba. Without totally accepting this government's proposals to Bill 32, of course, we talk about services. We talk about infrastructure and how this government deals with the needs and wants of local jurisdictions and municipalities, both rural and urban. We talk about services and how important sewer and water, how important Main Street projects, how important roads, how important health care services, and how important education services are available. How important the services of drainage and support for our local people that live in small communities, who want to expand their services, who want to be able to provide and have the opportunity to be able to expand their local area, not only to bring in people but to bring in businesses both local and from outside the areas to be able to expand.

We have to address this, and we have to be able to have the support put in place so that our rural communities can benefit, can be able to go ahead into the 21st Century, so that they are available to provide a good safe economically based community for people to live and to work. We certainly on this side of the House support that, and this side of the House continues to urge the Department of Rural Development to work not only within their own department in dealing with some of these matters but in dealing with the other departments, supporting rural communities and being able to put in place the fact that we do need support not only from rural development but from the other departments to make it viable for a community in rural Manitoba not only to survive but to expand for the future.

So, Madam Speaker, with Bill 32 that we have short of the opportunity and with the request of the UMM, I wonder out loud where the minister is with their request to make available to the municipalities the power to remedy the unlicensed drainage activities that will have a negative impact. I wonder what response the minister has given these municipalities that have presented him with their resolutions and how he has responded to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities in their request for this, and I understand that there are ongoing talks. Certainly I hope the minister is listening to the municipalities.

In our discussions, it seemed that the minister at that time, and hopefully someone has changed his mind—if not us, the municipalities individually through their resolutions or UMM through meetings with the minister, to acknowledge their request and to address their request in being able to provide this amendment to have that availability to control the drainage system in their own constituency and in their own system.

So it will be interesting to hear presentations from UMM and from others that will be attending the committee hearings on Bill 32. I am certainly hopeful that the minister, during those committees, will accept and address any requests, Madam Speaker, either from members on this side of the House or from presenters to acknowledge what UMM is requesting and acknowledge what the municipalities are requesting to address the issue of drainage within their own jurisdictions.

I look forward to the committee hearings and to the presentations and hopefully we will be able to deal with those that are in attendance and work with the minister and encourage the minister to deal with the issues that the hearing and the committee will be bringing forward to us, Madam Speaker, in dealing with Bill 32.

With those short words, again, we would like to just pass Bill 32 on to committee and then we might be able to deal with, in third reading, some of the other issues that this government does not address when it comes to rural Manitoba.

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** I would also like to make a few comments about Bill 32, The

Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act. Of course, my colleague the member for Interlake (Mr. C. Evans) has indicated that one of the major issues of this amendment act is the issue of drainage enforcement and the municipalities' jurisdiction over drainage in municipalities, not considered provincial waterways.

For those people who do not live in rural Manitoba, they may not realize how important the issue of proper management of drainage is, but I happen to live in a constituency where there is a lot of drainage that has been done without licences. This kind of drainage causes a lot of heartache for people who live downstream of the land that is being drained but also a lot of heartache for councils who up to this point have not had the ability to deal with this.

\* (1600)

You know, Madam Speaker, as you have reduction in staff in various departments by this government, you see that water management becomes a bigger and bigger problem. I can recall trying to get somebody from water management to come and look at a drainage in the Pine River area. The one person was offered a retirement package. He left, and then someone else was not able to do it. The water problems continued to increase.

It shows that there is a lack of commitment on the part of the government to fulfil their responsibilities in controlling drainages. That is why municipalities have requested this responsibility from the province, so that they can start to monitor some of the drainage.

The municipalities have asked for a licence for the ability to close drainages that are unlicensed. Many people have written with regard to that, and I believe that the minister has indicated he is going to address that one. But certainly if municipalities are going to take on this additional power, this responsibility, they have to have some power that goes with it. As I say, this is one section of the bill that is a good section.

I have to say that there is another section of the bill that is causing concern in rural communities. One that has been brought to our attention is the length of office.

My understanding is that there is a change. At the present time, when you run for public office, whether it is school board or municipal office, you run for a three-year term. This legislation will change this to a four-year term. This is causing serious concern in many municipalities. First of all, municipalities say that they were not consulted on this and school boards did not even know about it. When they found out about the legislation they were very upset.

I say, Madam Speaker, it is different in rural Manitoba than it is in the city, because when you serve on council or in Winnipeg or on school boards you get a fairly good return in comparison to what you would get in rural areas. So then it is much more difficult to get somebody to make that commitment to serve as a councillor or a school board trustee.

In many cases, I should not say in many cases, but in some cases someone will not even seek to run in a particular area of a municipality and the municipality has to appoint someone. So if you are asking somebody to be appointed for three years, they have not wanted to run, but they will agree to run for three years. To ask them now to run for four years or take on an appointed position for four years, when there is very little remuneration for this responsibility, there are going to be fewer and fewer people that are prepared to take on that responsibility.

I had a call from the school board where they indicated exactly that same thing. They are worried that this change is going to result in people saying, well, I was prepared to give it three years; I am not prepared to do it for four years.

I do not think that there is a recognition that there is a different reimbursement in rural areas. Certainly, the councillors and the school divisions do not have the revenues, particularly the school divisions. Given the offloading that they have had and the cutbacks in funds that they have had, they certainly do not have the extra money to pay school trustees. In municipalities, we have had a tremendous offload by the provincial government onto municipalities, and it has caused a great burden on their budgets. Again, they will not have the money to pay extra for municipal councillors to run, to serve in those positions.

So, Madam Speaker, I think that is one area of the bill that should be reconsidered. I hope that the minister will recognize that this is a problem, and it is not something that is supported by rural municipalities, and an area that the minister should consider changing and listening. It takes away the ability of people who want to serve in public office, not to be able to do it. The other one is, in many cases in rural Manitoba, that it is the older people that take on the responsibility of serving in these positions. They have a little bit more time, but, again, these people have indicated that they are not prepared to make a commitment of four years. They would prefer to have three years and then, when the three years are up, make that decision.

If they want to have a four-year term within the City of Winnipeg, and that has the support of councillors and City Hall, that is one thing. This certainly does not have the support of people in the rural areas, and, again, I have been told that school boards, for example, did not even know that this change was coming.

So I wanted to put on the record that particular concern. It has been brought to my attention both by municipal councillors and school trustees. I would hope that the minister recognizes this is a concern with this piece of legislation and addresses it when we go to committee; but, with respect to the part of drainages, municipalities, if they are going to take over the responsibility because government is not doing it properly, then have to have the legislation to support them. Hopefully, again, the minister would recognize the concerns brought forward by municipalities, in many letters that have been written, that they have the ability to close drains when they are made illegally and impact on municipal drains.

With those few comments, Madam Speaker, we are prepared to let this bill go to committee.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, it was in 1996 that The Municipal Act was virtually completely revised. The amendments for Bill 32 are two-pronged. Some are simply housekeeping measures, while others pave the way for locally initiated municipal reforms the government would ultimately articulate. I am not too sure in terms of

whether or not the government has consulted with the many different communities out there with respect to the reforms that they are presenting before us today.

The amendments should enable municipalities to have greater flexibility when it comes to some restructuring. The minister suggest that municipalities could amalgamate, but this should be approached keeping in mind that municipalities should retain a local focus as opposed to becoming regional bodies. I think that is in keeping with the laissez-faire attitude that the government has had with certain issues.

The local municipalities, the number of rural municipalities, the number of rural school divisions are excellent examples of that, where the government seems to be more content on defending the status quo. As they articulate and argue for change in different areas, they completely ignore the need for change at the local governing level. The government has done little, if anything, toward leading any sort of creative dialogue or debate on the needs and the benefits of amalgamation or making life a little bit easier in those rural municipalities.

The member prior, from Swan River, made reference to where we have councillors being appointed because there is no one that was running or seeking a three-year position. I know the same principle also applies for the school divisions in rural communities where we do not see that. The need for change is there; it is very strong. This government, over the years, has chosen to ignore it because ultimately I believe that they believe that their vested interest is the status quo. If they make any sort of changes that rub the wrong way, they feel somewhat threatened and intimidated by the potential support that they could have in the next election.

Municipalities will also be afforded fewer restrictions on how they may use their funds. Municipalities will also have to work with the Public Utilities Board, as an example, in situations where sewer and water systems incur a deficit. There are many other changes that are all bundled into this bill. The member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) makes reference to the drainages, from the three years to four years, and I think that the government is attempting to be consistent with what is happening with Bill 36 or The City of Winnipeg Act

where it is quickly jumping on the bandwagon of fewer elections.

\* (1610)

I think one of the things that they are not taking into consideration as much as they should be is that at the local level there is not the organized party structure in the sense that you do not have things like an official opposition per se, that in many of the local municipalities there is a very high sense of co-operation and so forth, which is always encouraging to see.

One of the things at least assists in ensuring the accountabilities, when you go back to the polls. The extension from three years to four years is one of those things that does raise some concern, in addition to what I have just said, what was made referenced to earlier, from a three-year commitment to a four-year commitment when the honorariums or the money you are receiving for that commitment maybe is not anywhere near as could be warranted for the type of commitment that, in particular, municipal reeves put in in fulfilling their obligations.

With those few words, we are prepared to see it go to committee.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading Bill 32, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act.

Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

### **Bill 33—The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Speaker:** To resume second reading debate, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'évaluation municipale et modifications corrélatives).

**Mr. Clif Evans (Interlake):** Just a few comments on Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act. I was reading into the record that this Bill 33, and again, part of the process, Madam Speaker, of making sure that Bill 54, parts of Bill 54 are addressed when it comes to the issue of having to streamline or having to make some changes, as openly discussed during committee in 1996 when it came to Bill 54.

Again, the issue was brought up to the minister that when an issue and when an opportunity to bring to the government of the day suggestions and/or concerns about different parts of Bill 54, that they be addressed. Certainly, Bill 33 does address some of the issues, issues that ensure the owners of land are assessed and responsible for the realty taxes when it comes to the landholdings or any holdings within a jurisdiction.

Madam Speaker, one of the other issues that Bill 33 addresses, of course, is the assessment on specific air site improvements and the exemption to those improvements such as runways, aprons and fencing. The government of the day has proposed this amendment and certainly being consistent, as the minister had indicated, with other provincial jurisdictions where the airports have been transferred to regional airport authorities. It seems to be a portion of the amendment that certainly municipalities that have airport sites, landing strips in their area, the opportunity to be able to be exempt, and certainly Bill 33 addresses that, that is a portion that I believe is important to the communities and certainly a portion of the amendment that we do support.

Bill 33 addresses the issue of nonprofit organizations being exempt from education taxes. Now, I can certainly understand in one aspect why this provision would be allowed or put in, and certainly I am hoping that the minister is acknowledging these requests and acknowledging what may be needed in situations like this, but certainly I am hoping that the minister and his department undertook to make sure that he had the support of UMM and MAUM in being able to bring this to the amendment and bring this to legislation. [interjection]

Madam Speaker, one of the members indicates that perhaps there has not been any consultation with UMM

and MAUM and others that may have reasons to address this specific change and that feel that it is not the way to go, and it is not the type of legislation amendment that they want. I certainly have not heard of anybody making an issue of this amendment. I certainly have not heard from UMM and MAUM as far as this amendment. So given that, I can certainly say here today that, usually, we do get concerns brought to us by these organizations and by people who may have a problem with a certain type of amendment in an act, in legislation, and we will certainly see in committee whether there is any concerns brought to committee before this House, and, of course, maybe perhaps we will be dealing with this in third reading.

A portion of the bill that we find rather, perhaps odd, and it raises the issue of bringing the opportunity of the assessment of MTS. We all remember the MTS issue. Of course, Bill 33 addresses the small portion that takes the assessment of MTS as a former Crown corporation and puts them in a different category when it comes to the assessment of municipalities. As always, the MTS issues—and it still is an issue out in rural Manitoba—

**An Honourable Member:** No, it is not. Only in your mind.

**Mr. C. Evans:** The Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) says that the MTS is not an issue now that it is a private organization, that everything is hunky-dory out in rural Manitoba when it comes to the phone rates, when it comes to the increases that the privatization of MTS has brought in, in the rates to rural Manitobans. I talked about services and infrastructure and how MTS, in providing phone services to rural communities, a service of bringing private lines to rural Manitoba that the former NDP government initiated and we were able to complete it under this government, and when this government completed our initiative to have private lines provided for all rural Manitobans and northern communities across this province, this government decided, lo and behold, now that we have done what we are supposed to do as a Crown corporation, let us get rid of it. It is costing us too much money.

The debates were long and hard about MTS, but I want to point out that people are still, whether it be local people, whether it be municipal councils, whether

it be mayors or reeves, whether it be the guy or the person or the people who have businesses, just private citizens, still, in my area and when we go out in meetings, we still hear about the rates. We still hear about the services. We still hear about the MTS issue, and the fact that 67 percent of rural Manitobans did not want to see MTS privatized still points out that, I believe, if that number of 67 percent has not increased as far as saying that MTS should never have been privatized, it is certainly at the same level, if not higher.

Well, Madam Speaker, in Bill 33, the different changes—and the changes are small. The changes are there as the minister has indicated to clarify some portions of The Municipal Act and to make things easier in some aspects of legislation and support from UMM and support from MAUM. Yes, that support is there for Bill 33, so it would be interesting if we have any people address the issue of MTS at committee and down the road, because I know it is still on the minds of many Manitobans in rural areas of the MTS privatization, the rates that have increased for rural Manitobans. If rural Manitobans look at their bills in the past two years, in the past year alone, rates have increased.

\* (1620)

The rates of rural Manitobans' phone bills have increased, and I say shame, because that is a tremendously important part of rural Manitoba. Whether they change or make amendments to any part of the legislation, the fact that privatizing MTS has created for rural Manitobans—and we see now CRTC hearings in the North. We see people still referring to the cost of the phone rates and the cost of their phones in their communities, in their council chambers, in their stores, in their garages, an issue that will never go away for rural and northern Manitobans.

I am hoping that this government, now that we see them flip-flopping a bit and saying, well, you know, we have to make presentations to CRTC so that they do not make MTS and the phone rates too high for northern rural Manitobans. Well, they would have been satisfied, and there would not have been a problem with that if we had kept it as a Crown corporation as people in rural Manitoba, as the people

in Manitoba have said and said over the years prior to—and the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) says people from Winnipeg and that is certainly a point well made, and without taking anything away from the member of Inkster, I certainly support what he says that the people of Winnipeg and the larger centres are also saying.

This bill addresses MTS in such a small way, but the fact of the matter is that the issue of rates is important in rural Manitoba, still is important and will always be important. Had this government listened to people in this province, had the promise of not to privatize MTS—broken as it was, I think the Manitobans across this province of ours would be favourable to having services such as MTS, along with good services in our roads, our education and health care services in Manitoba that have been offloaded onto the people in our rural and northern communities, as well as to our larger urban centres such as Winnipeg. So, Madam Speaker, we pass Bill 33 on to committee.

Certainly, I am hoping that people will be in committee to address Bill 33. If there are any requests for changes to make amendments to this legislation, the minister will listen to the people, listen to the presentations and, if changes are requested, let us hope he listens to those changes, not like they did not listen to rural Manitobans when they wanted to privatize MTS. Thank you.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, this bill, in essence, will result in some minor changes to The Municipal Assessment Act. Among some of those changes is a clause to exempt things such as certain airport-related improvements. It makes reference to the not-for-profit organizations. There are also provisions in place to assist in the process of collecting information in order to make assessments. The formula used to calculate charges to municipalities for assessment services will be taken out of the legislation and will be put in the hands of managers, in essence, in regulations.

Assessments have always been somewhat of a thorny issue at the best of times. I know, critics prior to me, in particular, one that was in a very heated discussion. I can recall the lineups outside of committee rooms when

we were making some of these changes back in 1990. There were a lot of ideas, everything from the one-year reassessments to what we currently have today. I have a general feeling that this is going to be one of those ongoing acts that will be changed from time to time.

With that, Madam Speaker, we are prepared to see it go to committee.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

#### **Bill 38—The Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Speaker:** To resume adjourned debate on second reading, Bill 38, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), The Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire et modifications corrélatives).

**Mr. Clif Evans (Interlake):** Madam Speaker, again, a few comments on Bill 38, that we are passing on to committee. Today and hopefully, again, as I have indicated in the previous two comments I have made to Bills 32 and 33, as this goes on to committee, as we go on to committee, we will be able to address the issues that we have here with Bill 38, The Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act.

Certainly, in discussions, and certainly long discussions with the minister on this, we certainly want to say that we appreciate the minister's providing us with an inch and a half thick set of notes to deal with, that he would take the opportunity, along with his staff, to bring to our attention. The honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) and the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) were in attendance along with myself.



This bill is a very important bill. It changes the scope of what has been in the past. Certainly, what the minister addressed to us was that these changes were requested by the advisory committee to the minister for a change that I can see. I have spoken to administrators in my constituency and members of UMM and MAUM, that the minister and his department listened, consulted, and had people from the UMM, MAUM and municipal administrators and members of the planning district, lawyers, private consultants, deal with this act.

Madam Speaker, the minister had indicated that in this bill they were providing discussion and elements in four major areas, and that was streamlining The Planning Act, standardization, flexibility and improved public participation. We certainly support that when it comes to making things a lot easier for communities, and planning now seems to be a very integral part for the future of local communities, rural communities and urban centres. The Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act certainly addresses that, but there are some concerns that we have as always when it comes to certain aspects of any bill that this government brings through.

Madam Speaker, provisions have been changed to allow municipalities to regulate an increase in intensity or nonconforming use; as well, councils or boards can now amend a nonconforming use to allow for continuation of such use by variation order rather than having to apply for development plan amendment. That certainly will be something that we will be watching for and being concerned about in the future.

\* (1630)

Madam Speaker, another concern that we have is the elimination of required elements to be undertaken for a development plan, such as land use, agriculture, forestry, econ base of the area, transit and communication needs, natural resources capacity, et cetera. This legislation will now give municipalities or planning districts the right to undertake studies the extent of which they determine. Of course, all this and part of Bill 38 does have something to do—and, of course, it does—with the future implementation of The Sustainable Development Act, which we are all looking forward to seeing what this government does and how

this government addresses it—perhaps an opportunity to not be able to address this Sustainable Development Act and implement such an act because, by the time that occurs, there could be changes within the Province of Manitoba, big changes when it comes to government and who does run the Province of Manitoba.

Some of the other points that we do support on this, Madam Speaker, one point certainly is that the bill will standardize notice provisions throughout the act to make them consistent with The Municipal Act. Certainly, between these two, The Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act and The Municipal Act, we have to have a co-ordination between them so that both can complement each other, and where we see the public notices required, more flexibility in this act and the amendment has been brought in. So the 40- to 7-day window will allow councils or boards the options to advertise for a longer period of time, and this standardizes the advertising, including in remote communities, and it gives opportunities again.

Madam Speaker, as always, we look with apprehension at times when it comes to this government bringing in legislation, and certainly when it comes to rural development. I am always concerned and I think members in this House are as always, I always say to this Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) that it is not just the Department of Rural Development that should be the main concern because the Department of Rural Development is only a small part, I believe, or a lead part but a small part, when it comes into play on a whole scope of how services, infrastructure, and the benefit to all communities in rural and northern Manitoba are brought forward. The Minister of Rural Development, I would hope, would not only through the bills, legislation, that have been brought through but as a whole be the lead department in being able to get all the other departments onside with how important rural Manitoba is, how important economic benefit of rural Manitobans is.

So, Madam Speaker, with those few words, I would just like to say that I look forward to committees for Bills 32, 33 and 38, and, certainly, hopefully, we will be listening to the people of Manitoba who make presentations to us in committee. If there are changes

in any one of these bills that are being requested or deemed to be necessary, I certainly hope that this government and this minister respond favourably to the people of Manitoba and to legislation.

So, with those few words, Madam Speaker, again, I look forward to the committees, and we will see what the people of Manitoba have to say. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading Bill 38, The Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act.

Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

### **Bill 39—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2)**

**Madam Speaker:** To resume second reading debate, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. Toews), Bill 39, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route), standing in the name of the honourable member for Osborne (Ms. McGifford).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** No? Leave has been denied.

**Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns):** Madam Speaker, well, finally we see the legislation promised three years ago in the election campaign to seize the vehicles of johns.

**An Honourable Member:** Be patient, be patient.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** I hear from the members opposite, well, be patient, be patient. The communities and neighbourhoods of Manitoba have been more than patient with this government on this issue. Meanwhile, what we have seen spreading throughout the city of

Winnipeg, in particular, is street prostitution. We are seeing condoms lying in the streets, needles in the streets, young girls on their way to and from school or playing in the neighbourhood being propositioned by johns in their vehicles, and this government says, well, be patient.

Madam Speaker, we are fed up. We are not patient on issues like this. Three years ago the government got up during the campaign and made a big to-do about seizing the vehicles of johns, and we know exactly where that idea came from. This government actually, I do not think, had an intention of implementing that promise, but what they heard was that Allan Rock, the federal Minister of Justice, was going around the country, saying: we are going to get serious about johns, and we the federal government, Mr. Rock is quoted as saying, was going to seize the vehicles of johns and forfeit those vehicles on conviction.

So I presume that what the government decided when they were looking at their platform for the last election was a decision to borrow, if you will, that federal idea, no intention to implement it provincially. What they thought would happen was the federal government would, in fact, go along and implement their promise, and they would be off the hook. They would not have to implement it at a provincial level.

Well, a strange thing happened. The federal government decided not to go ahead with their promise to seize the vehicles of johns and forfeit those vehicles, and the members opposite were put in a very embarrassing situation. Here they had made an election promise that they had no intention of fulfilling. In fact, after the federal government had decided not to proceed, the government was left with the thought that perhaps this was not even something within the jurisdiction of the province to enact.

So we asked the government during Question Period a couple of years ago, whatever happened to that promise. The then Justice minister got up and said: well, we wrote to the federal government asking them to act on it. What a ridiculous response given that the election promise certainly was not simply to write the federal government to seize vehicles of johns. This government made that promise.

Well, Madam Speaker, last year we caught the government trying to finagle another way around their election promise. We caught the government even avoiding mentioning legislation to amend The Highway Traffic Act to allow for a program for johns, a one-day seminar. The Minister of Justice then got up in this House, and after he was caught and tried to get around the embarrassment by suggesting that the legislation did, in fact, allow for the seizure of johns vehicles, which, of course, it did not. So this government has a very embarrassing history on this election promise. One of the virtues of an opposition, I think, has been shown here that it holds the government to its campaign promises, and particularly, of course, those promises that are important to communities of Manitoba.

So, finally, we see the legislation before us, and, of course, we support the principle of this bill and are in favour of it at second reading. Indeed, the first time I heard of this approach to dealing with the challenge of prostitution, I thought how important it was that we focus on the johns and not, as we have done, historically, always focus on the prostitutes.

Now, this legislation has been characterized by the government as something wonderfully innovative and unique in North America; to the contrary, Madam Speaker, we are aware of this kind of legislation across North America, south of the border. Usually this kind of legislation, though, in the seizure of johns' vehicles is accompanied by other measures to counter prostitution. So, this is nothing new. Other jurisdictions report somewhat favourably, though, as long as the legislation is used in concert with other kinds of responses to prostitution, but we all recognize, and I would like the government to recognize, that this kind of legislation is enforcement driven. In other words, unless the resources are put in place for the police to enforce this kind of legislation and ensure that johns' vehicles are indeed seized, the legislation will not really serve to counter the challenge of prostitution in Manitoba.

Now, I want the government to start turning its attention to the serious challenge of prostitution, particularly child prostitution in Manitoba. I noted earlier the effects of street prostitution, for one, on the

neighbourhoods of Manitoba. We are fed up, and solutions must be brought to bear. Madam Speaker, it really bothers us when we hear the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Toews) when he introduced this legislation by saying that the legislation hoped to address one problem, and that was traffic congestion.

\* (1640)

I do not know where the government has been. It just shows you how out of touch they are to the realities of Manitoba today. The real challenge is not just traffic congestion. It is much more serious than that. It includes the issues of the condoms and the needles and the children that are being propositioned; as well, children, in particular, and others seeing prostitution take place in their communities, seeing sexual activity take place in the neighbourhoods. I ask this government when is it going to face the reality of Manitoba and the real challenges, the real damage that is being done to Manitoba neighbourhoods by prostitution?

Indeed, I think the legislation which, of course, only speaks to street prostitution is not accompanied by a more substantive approach to prostitution that is required. Again, that tells me that this is a government that has isolated itself from the needs of Manitobans. You cannot in a real substantive way deal with prostitution in Manitoba in any effective way unless you deal with the challenge of street gangs that is driving much of the prostitution that is taking place.

You cannot provide a real meaningful response to prostitution when a government such as the current government appears to completely ignore the Report of the Working Group on Juvenile Prostitution from the Manitoba Child and Youth Secretariat. This report was completed in June of 1996, almost two years ago. The report contained 23 main recommendations. There are other subsidiary recommendations in that report, and yet this government has seen fit to ignore that report, table it, shelve it, put it in the pile of other reports that this government has hanging around in its closets and drawers.

Finally, I say the government has to get serious about prostitution by providing at least the resources necessary to give this bill real meaning. It is not

enough to say to law enforcement agencies, here is another tool, and providing them with no additional resources to adequately use that tool. There are many provisions in this bill that will visit on law enforcement officials a great deal of paperwork and mechanical doings that require more than lip service. It requires the government to put resources where its mouth is.

Now, with regard to the more specific provisions of the bill, we recognize that there is a constitutional issue that comes along with this bill. The legislation, if enforced, likely faces challenges on the basis that it is arguably criminal law, punitive, which is, of course, federal jurisdiction, and that it imposes a significant sanction before conviction when, of course, a person is presumed innocent. We on this side take the view that given the threat to neighbourhoods of street prostitution, we should nonetheless support this effort set out in this bill, and we are prepared to damn the torpedoes.

We also believe that when one abuses the privilege that vehicle licensing and registration allow, when one disregards the proper use of a motor vehicle, it is appropriate for the provincial government, which is after all the licensing authority, to take away that privilege or right. Now that certainly would be extended to licensing and registration, but I think by extension that would apply to the ownership of a motor vehicle where the motor vehicle is used for a criminal purpose and one contrary to the interests of our communities.

So we recognize that there is a pitfall perhaps to be encountered down the road. But that will only happen, of course, if the bill is vigorously enforced, and that is where we have our concern. We find that the impact of the legislation is essentially avoided if a vehicle owner simply consents to go into a program of alternative measures, and that would be the one-day seminar for johns. I understand in the last year there has not been a single john that has turned down the offer to avoid a record and go to john school. By the way, they call it john school, but I am not aware of any school that only lasts a few hours.

No john is expected to reject such an offer, so in law and in this bill, there is the prospect that there will be

no more criminal sanctions and records for johns, including, and this is where our greatest concern rests, johns of children and repeaters. Now, I know the minister stated that the bill will help address the plight of child prostitutes. However, the bill does not in any place detail specific sanctions for johns who solicit children. I know the minister has said, well, johns with prior criminal records involving prostitution would not be eligible for john school. However, the bill is silent in that regard.

I wonder, Madam Speaker, for example, if someone who was picked up last year for prostitution and agreed to go to john school thereby not having a record, how a person can ever be a repeat offender since the person never faced conviction, never had a record. So we have the very serious concern that this bill, in effect, decriminalizes johns who solicit child prostitutes and does not provide enhanced sanctions for repeat offenders. It is not enough that there be administrative policy that john school is not available to repeat offenders and johns who solicit child prostitutes. If we are serious about restricting access to the john school and ensuring sanctions for johns of child prostitutes and repeaters, it is important that the legislation reflect that concern. So we will be looking at that very seriously and proposing alternatives and committee in that regard.

It will be important, in our view, Madam Speaker, that the bill specifically provide that there can be no release of a vehicle to johns of child prostitutes and repeat offenders, even if they consent to going to the john program.

We note in the bill that the owner can simply obtain the vehicle back by paying a security to the value of the vehicle. Now that security is forfeited on conviction, but here money talks. Now, is that really getting serious on johns? We think that we can be more effective. We think it is important, if we are going to seriously get cracking on street prostitution, that there be the ability to suspend the drivers licences of these johns on conviction as well.

The bill is weaker than we want it to be, Madam Speaker. So with those thoughts, we are prepared to move the bill to committee. We will raise these

concerns with the committee at that time to seek amendment. We look forward to hearing the input of Manitobans on this important challenge of street prostitution, the government's response set out in this bill, as well as our contribution.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading Bill 39, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2). Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

\* (1650)

**Bill 40—The Domestic Violence and Stalking  
Prevention, Protection and Compensation  
and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Speaker:** To resume adjourned debate, second reading, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. Toews), Bill 40, The Domestic Violence and Stalking Prevention, Protection and Compensation and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur la violence familiale et la protection, la prévention et l'indemnisation en matière de harcèlement criminel et modifications corrélatives), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**Some Honourable Member:** Yes.

**Madam Speaker:** Leave has been granted.

**Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns):** Well, Madam Speaker, here is the second bill in a row now that is long awaited. Indeed it was back in December of 1995 that the NDP caucus Task Force on Violence Against Women recommended such legislation.

This kind of legislation was first introduced in the province of Saskatchewan and was found to be very effective in dealing with many aspects of the tragedy of domestic violence. Subsequently, Prince Edward Island and Alberta have brought in legislation modelled on the Saskatchewan law, and, finally, Manitoba is bringing in legislation. Unfortunately, it took this

government the tragedy in the deaths of Rhonda and Roy Lavoie and the report of the commission of inquiry into domestic violence by Mr. Justice Perry Schulman to act and get serious about domestic violence in this regard and bring in this kind of legislation.

I think that is very unfortunate. It certainly speaks very loudly about this government's lack of real commitment to dealing with this justice issue. When the NDP caucus Task Force on Violence Against Women travelled around Manitoba, it heard of how many shortcomings there were to protect women, in particular, who were victims of domestic violence.

For example, in Dauphin we were told that the current kind of protection orders and restraining orders take a long time to get—weeks—and they cost a lot. We were told that not only a swifter but a meatier order for the protection of victims was necessary.

Now we know that a restraining order is often needed on an emergency basis. It requires legal documents, indeed, is costly, and an order can only protect a victim and her child, but the victim's family and friends are often subjected to ongoing harassment by the abuser. Neither restraining orders nor breaches of bail conditions appear meaningfully to protect the victim. The women are inundated constantly with media stories about battered spouses who have been beaten or murdered by an abuser. The abuser often was on a restraining order or recognizance which had already been breached a number of times.

In Brandon, we heard an in camera presentation where the woman said, and I quote: "My ex had five breaches of recognizance orders for noncommunication, and he was let out every time within hours."

The caucus task force found that it is particularly difficult for women to remove themselves from a situation of spousal abuse as this often means leaving home. Many women are in situations where their children are enrolled in schools, where they have personal property in their homes which they fear will be sold or damaged, or where the sheer inertia of battered-women syndrome might mitigate against taking such a step.

The Aboriginal Justice Inquiry report spoke very loudly when it said, and I quote: "The emphasis in the past seems to have been to encourage an abused woman to go to a shelter. It is the abuser who should leave, if anyone has to."

So, Madam Speaker, when the Lavoie commission recommended the Saskatchewan model, we were heartened. Indeed, we came into this Legislature shortly after the report was released asking for the government to immediately assure us that it would bring in the necessary legislation. A rather cryptic response followed, but nonetheless we are certainly pleased that the legislation has been introduced. As this is second reading, we certainly will support, in principle, the bill, but we want to say this bill is not going to get a free ride in this House or in committee.

As I said earlier, this is the fourth bill to be introduced to deal with victims of domestic violence in Canada in this way, and it is the weakest of its kind. Here, after three other jurisdictions have introduced this kind of legislation, one would think that Manitoba would have learned from the shortcomings of the other legislation, would have by now been able to rally itself to be the best and strongest legislation in Canada. But, no, Madam Speaker, it is the weakest of its kind, and that is with regard to the protection orders.

The provisions dealing with stalking, in particular, are even weaker than the Law Reform Commission recommended in this regard. We acknowledge that the legislation which deals with stalking in this bill is the first of its kind in Canada, thanks to the Law Reform Commission, by the way, a body which this government has, in effect, almost killed, but even with the recommendations from the commission on stalking, the government has taken a very restrictive view of those recommendations and could have done better.

Now, the provinces of Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island and Alberta have all brought forward legislation on the domestic violence part and have all included a provision to grant exclusive occupation of the residences to the victim through emergency orders. Manitoba is the only jurisdiction that seemed fit to leave this protective provision out of its legislation.

I know from reading the Lavoie report that Mr. Justice Schulman was not convinced that that kind of power was necessary in Manitoba. However, it is our view that there is a very strong reason to indeed include this kind of order. The main reason is that it is very important that the courts be given the ability to allow the victim of abuse to remain in the family home even if the victim's name is not on the lease. That kind of provision only follows the main provision of allowing exclusive occupation of the residence. The NDP caucus Task Force on Violence Against Women indeed recommended that an order be available for exclusive occupancy of the residence.

Madam Speaker, the other three provincial acts all have an emergency provision allowing a magistrate to make any additional order in addition to the kinds of orders set out in the legislation as may be appropriate under the circumstances. Domestic violence circumstances can vary greatly as much as individuals are different from one another and different circumstances present themselves. So such a provision is essential to fully protect women and other family members in our view. It is present in both the emergency and the longer-term orders in the other legislation, but it is missing in respect of both those orders in this government's legislation.

As I said, in the other legislation where temporary possession of personal property is assigned, it is understood that, again, circumstances vary. Classification of personal effects which may be important for emotional or financial reasons will differ from one person to another. For that reason, the other provinces have left the provision regarding temporary possession open-ended. In Manitoba, this government has closed off this provision so that, if the type of property a victim is concerned about does not come within this government's narrow classifications, the victim is out of luck and will not be entitled to take that personal possession with her.

\* (1700)

The other provinces have provided not only for counselling for the primary victim of domestic violence, that is, the abused spouse but also for secondary victims, that is, the children. As witnessing

domestic violence has been linked as a strong predictor to subsequent depression, suicidal tendencies, and youth violence, this is an important aspect, but the government here in Manitoba has seen fit to leave children out of the picture and does not provide for their counselling within this act.

The bill also does not deal with situations where the abusive spouse or a stalker uses an accomplice, a third party, to harass the victim spouse or stalking subject. This government, again, stands alone in its omission. Generally, in terms of the protection of women and children, as I have stated, the bill is the weakest of its kind in Canada, although we acknowledge that the stalking provision is new. The domestic violence part ignores existing legislation which has been proven viable and effective in reducing domestic violence. It weakens, of course, the Law Reform Commission recommendations on stalking, and interestingly, and I do not know the reason exactly why, the government has seen fit to place both the stalking and domestic violence aspects into the same bill. In many senses that is like mixing apples and oranges. It appears to us in certain parts of the bill that the result of this mixing of these two areas is that the legislation does not protect victims of either stalking or spousal assault to the extent that it otherwise could.

So, with those concerns, I can tell the House that we are looking at amendments to correct what we see as significant deficiencies in the bill as I have outlined. We are therefore prepared to see the bill go to committee in short order, although I understand that there are other contributions to the debate from members on this side.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, initially my speech on this particular bill was going to be somewhat brief. It still will be short, but I did find it interesting that many of the comments the member for St. Johns has put forward, anticipate that maybe he might even be able to provide a copy of some of the amendments in advance that he has made reference to and some of the shortcomings of Bill 40.

Madam Speaker, I look at Bill 40 as a bill that is movement in the right direction. Today, I think very little is there for the victims, and I think this is the type

of legislation that we might have been able to see years prior in order to address the very serious issue of stalking. One can only be sympathetic, as opposed to let us say empathetic, to individuals that have been a victim of a stalking and only imagine, in terms of the type of terror, horror that one has to live through as a result of a former ex or individual that has chosen not to end a relationship on a positive note, but rather gets gratification, for whatever reason, out of stalking a person. I think, in most cases, this particular victim is in need of some sort of assistance socially in order to try to get his, or, in the odd case, her mind back on the right track.

But having said that, I think it is absolutely critical that government do what it can to ensure that the victim, in particular the victim in this case, Madam Speaker—in her rights and in the odd case, possibly his rights are, in fact, being respected. We all expect to live in harmony and in peace and not have to fear having to look over one's shoulder to see whether or not someone is out there observing every move that he or she takes. I appreciate the fact that really what might be necessary here is stronger criminal legislation from Ottawa. Actually, I think to a certain degree there has been some movement from Ottawa in this area, as now it is classified, for example, as a criminal offence. It was only a number of years ago that, in fact, that was not the case.

What I like about the legislation is it does open a new door, a new door of civil suits. So we have our courts in the province of Manitoba which will now have the opportunity they did not have before of allowing the victim, through tort law, the opportunity to recover some of the financial hardships that have been caused as a direct result of them being stalked. It will be very interesting to follow and see what actually comes of some of these cases, as no doubt it is only a question of time before we see it in court, and we will be monitoring very closely as to what actually does take place.

So, the expansion or the enabling, if you like, of courts to look for civil remedies I think is a very strong positive. There are other things that are done, such as the protection orders, which are further enhanced; availability, for example, which again one can be fairly

supportive. I think the only thing in which the government could be criticized with respect to Bill 40 would possibly be actions that they could have taken into consideration prior to bringing this bill into being.

But I would caution that, Madam Speaker, in the sense that there are, no doubt, additional things that could take place, or that could be brought in, in this particular bill to make it even that much stronger or that much better, but the only concern I would have is at what potential cost. If it would have meant the not bringing in of this particular—or the government not bringing this legislation in this session, I believe that cost would have been too great. At the very least, we have some legislation which is, to a certain degree, groundbreaking. Other provinces, a few other provinces have moved in some direction of addressing the issue of stalking.

This is Manitoba's, in my opinion, real first attempt at trying to address or to do what it can at the provincial level at trying to look at the victim in particular. I think that action should at least be, to a certain degree, applauded. It is not to say that there are not other things that can be done, and that is why I found the member for St. Johns' (Mr. Mackintosh) comments most interesting and would like to see a copy of the amendments. I am not sure if I am going to be able to make it to the committee when it is actually there, but would be interested in receiving the amendments.

If it is at all possible, even for government—I noticed today in Question Period, for example, the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer) seemed to be somewhat open-minded, seemed to be, Madam Speaker, to the mayor and the double vote issue. Well, maybe the Minister of Justice (Mr. Toews) can be open-minded to some of the amendments that the member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh) might have to introduce to the committee, in hopes that it would even give more strength to, in particular, the victim, because I do believe very firmly that stalking is one of those horrific crimes that are out there. We, as legislators, should do what we can to ensure that the victim has some tools to be able to access in order to make the experience not quite as brutal as it can be.

\* (1710)

Having said that, I understand that the legislation also allows for some form of recourse for the assailant or the respondent, and even though the natural instinct is to come down hard, I think that you also have to build in something that allows for the respondent, their day in court, if you like. I believe that the legislation does accommodate that also. But all in all, Bill 40 is a positive, or would appear to be a very positive piece of legislation, and we look forward to it going to committee. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** As previously agreed, this bill will remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

#### **Bill 45—The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act**

**Madam Speaker:** To resume adjourned debate, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation (Mr. McCrae), Bill 45, The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société d'assurance public du Manitoba), standing in the name of the honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. L. Evans). Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? Yes, no?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** No. It is also standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), who has 34 minutes remaining. Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** No. Leave has been denied.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, before we pass Bill 45, I did want to get on the record with respect to it. It is interesting, at the time when—is it PIPP, the Personal Injury Protection Program which was what we are actually amending was brought in, the Leader of the Liberal Party, at the time, raised a number of concerns. At least, in part, these amendments are addressing a couple of those concerns, the biggest one, of course, being that of age, lifetime retirement income benefit and how that was being taken off.



So it is encouraging to see that the government is, albeit, somewhat late, I believe this is something in which, as I say, Mr. Edwards had brought up to the government at the time as something that was not fair and not right, and finally the government has seen fit to make some of those changes, Madam Speaker.

The minister also made reference to, I believe it was in reading a speech, something in the neighbourhood of \$200, an average of \$200 per policy holder has been saved since the bringing in of the no-fault insurance program, and that is because at the time I had very strong personal feelings with respect to no-fault, but abided by the party line, if you like, in opposition to the no-fault.

But having said that, there is a need today very strongly for MPIC to be more arm's length from the government. You give it its mandate, and the mandate is quite simple. It is to provide automobile insurance, a basic package which would, in fact, be affordable to all Manitobans. We should be leaving it up to the board to do its job in the best way that it can. I believe MPIC has been manipulated politically in the past and, to a certain degree, even today. I have asked questions in QP with respect to it, how you tend to see a graph, and that graph somewhat coincides with the election cycle, with the one exception.

The one exception was the year in which I was fortunate enough to have gotten elected and might not have gotten elected had it not been for that particular election. Actually, I am probably being a little bit modest there, Madam Speaker. I should not say probably—I would not have gotten elected back then, so I take this issue very seriously in the sense that had it not been for the politicization of MPIC, I would not be here today.

But having seen that, I do believe that the government should be depoliticizing where it can at MPIC, and that means—[interjection] The minister says “done.” That means we do not need to have a government MLA sitting on the MPIC board. It was shortly—[interjection] Nor do I want that job. What I believe is that you need to have that arm's-length distance. It is funny that I had asked the question I think about two weeks ago about if I had a crystal ball, my projection would be that we would be seeing no increase next year.

Well, Madam Speaker, it was only a week or two after I had posed the question that we, in fact, found out that there would not be an increase. Was I surprised? Well, of course not, not even a bit. I can recall a couple of years ago asking the question about MPIC, and I presented a Crown report, I can recall, in which in the Crown's annual report they were saying that MPIC needs to build up a reserve fund. Well, here we have some years of zero percent increase while MPIC could have and should have been building up on that reserve fund.

Madam Speaker, as long as—[interjection] To the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), I was going to be sitting down, but now you are prodding me to stand, and I do not necessarily care for the implications which he is implying, so I am somewhat at tiffs on whether or not maybe I should sit down and respond just to say I told you so to the member for St. Norbert, or to continue on.

Well, Madam Speaker, I would like to think that I am not necessarily a filibusterer per se, unless, of course, there is a good reason to extend a discussion or a debate, but suffice to say it is good to see that the government is finally seeing some of the wrongs in what it did. Mr. Edwards could have saved a good deal of time and money if the minister would have listened to at least some of the things that he was saying with respect to this being brought in. But having said that, we are glad to see it go to committee. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 45, The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**An Honourable Member:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

#### **Bill 54—The Engineering and Geoscientific Professions and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Speaker:** To resume second reading debate, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of

Labour (Mr. Gilleshammer), Bill 54, The Engineering and Geoscientific Professions and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur les ingénieurs et les géoscientifiques et modifications corrélatives), standing in the name of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**An Honourable Member:** Leave.

**Madam Speaker:** Leave? Leave has been granted.

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to add my comments to Bill 54, The Engineering and Geoscientific Professions and Consequential Amendments Act. I note that we have received some correspondence on this particular piece of legislation. I believe all members of the Assembly did from the Association of Professional Engineers of Manitoba dealing with this particular piece of legislation.

This bill appears to be supported in large part by the geoscientists, who apparently responded to a survey that was conducted by the Department of Labour, and they reference in their letter that 73 percent of their members who responded, however many that may have been, because they do not tell us, seemed to be in favour of this particular piece of legislation.

\* (1720)

Now, we do know that in past years, in fact, we raised this issue with the minister in Labour Estimates. I believe it was last year dealing with this matter, because at that time there was a dispute between the landscape architects and the other engineers who deal with similar matters. At that time the minister, if I recall correctly, indicated that the issue itself had not worked its way through the process towards a consensus between the parties or the stakeholders that were involved and that the minister was going to delay making any changes in that regard until perhaps the parties arrived at a consensus.

If my understanding of this is correct, the minister has now received that consensus, and from our understanding with the people who had raised the

matter with us earlier, they just very recently arrived at an agreement with the Association of Professional Engineers from some separation in their responsibilities and duties that they legally perform under their various employments. So I am happy to learn that the two parties are now in agreement and that they have now come to an understanding or a consensus on what rules will apply to their two organizations and the members involved.

This particular bill applies to professional engineers, and I think is probably best described as being part of or joint with Bill 55, which we will deal with in a few moments, because I think the two of them are linked in the definitions that they have in the sense of describing rules of conduct and codes of practice and ethics and other matters affecting those particular professions.

This particular bill that we are dealing with here today, Bill 54, deals with the professional engineers in our province. It will cover geoscientists, including geologists and geophysicists and geochemists. I believe, Madam Speaker, this bill will establish new rules and standards for these professions and that the minister's department has come to an understanding with them. Otherwise I believe they probably would not have come forward with the legislation at this time. It no doubt was developed in conjunction with the affected professions.

As I have already indicated, the department has surveyed or apparently has surveyed the members, and I hope that there was a large number of people who responded to the survey. Perhaps when we move into committee the minister can indicate on his department's behalf the number of respondents, people who responded or members of the association who responded to the survey that went out, if 73 percent of those returning their survey were in favour of this new act.

It makes a very strong claim in this letter that we received from the APEM indicating that this particular legislation will go a fair way to protecting against occurrences involving the Westray mine disaster and Bre-X. That is a pretty strong claim to make, knowing the circumstances involved with the Westray mines more closely related to my own critic responsibilities.

Perhaps it would have helped to have a code of practice or ethics or standards in place but from what we read in the Westray report, the judicial report that came out, there was much more than just codes of practice that were involved. There was much more by way of coercion and intimidation that was involved in that particular scandal as well. While I am not a person who has a geological or geophysicist experience, the Bre-X gold fraud or scandal was something that the APEM are saying that now they can protect against by way of this act. Again, I am not really sure how you can make that claim, but perhaps, I guess, if everybody adheres to codes of practice or standards of conduct, then we would expect 100 percent compliance, but since as we see in various situations in our own personal lives experiences not everyone adheres to codes of practice.

I am not sure how the APEM can make that claim at this time and it would be interesting to hear, should they come forward in committee, how they can describe their abilities to prevent against the Westray mine disaster and the Bre-X fraud. This bill will introduce new definitions of practice of engineering and the practice of geoscience consistent with those adopted by the national body. I guess the first question that comes to mind with respect to that: has the Department of Labour looked at the standards or the codes of practice that are in place by the national body, and does the province subscribe to all of those codes of practice; what role will the province play in ensuring that they are kept informed of those changes in codes of practices and whether or not they have some say in how they are brought forward and how they are implemented?

This act will also consolidate the regulation of engineering and geoscience under a single association. I take it that there was some consensus with the parties, the stakeholder groups that were involved in that area as well. As I have already indicated, this legislation will establish rules of practice and codes of ethics and also have the ability to utilize disciplinary measures for those geoscientific activities for the stakeholder groups, although it is not quite clear what disciplining measures will be available to utilize.

One of the things that I have never been quite comfortable with in my own life is the ability of

group—[interjection] Well, confession is good for the soul. One of the things—and perhaps the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) will one day rise and make a confession in this House as well. One of the things I have had some discomfort with in my life is having groups being able to be self-regulatory in the sense of only the people working within those trades or professions would be able to regulate themselves and pass judgment on themselves.

We have that quite often for lawyers, for example, with the Law Society, where they have hearings, and perhaps if my understanding is correct, can conduct those hearings behind closed doors. I am not sure that is in the best interests of the public to have that. Doctors, through the College of Physicians and Surgeons, have that power to pass judgment on their own peers. Engineers, I guess, are now under this new legislation going to have that power to pass judgment on their peers.

I am not sure that is in the best interests of the public, and perhaps if I was to give any advice to the minister in regard to these two bills it is that we may want to consider having some member of the public or members of the public, plural, be involved in such panels or groups where we sit in judgment of people that are involved in those particular professions. We do not necessarily have to do it from a technical or a professional point of view, but we can do it from a public interest or public safety point of view. Perhaps the minister might want to take that into consideration for Bill 54 and Bill 55.

It is my understanding that the association, by way of this legislation, will have the ability to make professional development compulsory and will have the ability to do monitoring of quality assurance, in other words, of the operations of people that are working within these particular professions wherever they may be in our province. The association will also have the ability to discipline members, current or past, through this legislation and be able to levy fines up to \$25,000, although that is not what I would consider to be a steep level of fines. Looking at, if we can use the example of Workplace Safety and Health, where we have had \$15,000 fines and we never even come close to the

maximum, never even been requested in this province. I am not sure whether that maximum is applicable even in a case like this, if there is not a will, and, if there are not members of the public involved on those bodies to ascertain the seriousness of any charges that may come forward and to pass judgment on behalf of public safety and public interest.

This bill also allows for the granting of temporary licences to foreign-trained professionals. I am not exactly sure what standards the association is going to attach and whether or not they are going to have people, who are coming as new immigrants into our country and into our province, that have the ability to challenge any kind of test or standards examinations that may be applicable to this particular trade, or profession, I should say. But I would think it would be in the best interests of the province and the association itself to make sure there are some type of standards available in the tests that they have, and that the province, through the Department of Labour, is aware of what those standards are. If it does meet, perhaps in a general way, acceptance by the province, to make sure that we are not allowing a body that is now becoming the judge and jury of people that are working within that profession, to pass judgment on people coming into the province to work in that particular chosen profession.

We want to make sure there are standards in there that meet our criteria as representatives of the province, to make sure that the public is protected but, also, to give new immigrants to our province the opportunity to work in their chosen profession. So I think we would want to make sure what rules and regulations would be in place to provide some criteria for those people coming into this profession.

I am not sure how many members of the public are coming forward to speak on this bill but, when this bill does go through to committee, we are prepared to listen to any public comment that may be made. If there are any recommendations, perhaps we can propose some amendments at that time.

Madam Speaker, with those few words I thank you for the opportunity to add my comments on Bill 54.

**Madam Speaker:** As previously agreed, this bill will remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

\* (1730)

### **Bill 55—The Certified Applied Science Technologists Act**

**Madam Speaker:** To resume adjourned debate on second reading, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Gilleshammer), Bill 55, The Certified Applied Science Technologists Act (Loi sur les technologues agréés des sciences appliquées), standing in the name of the honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. L. Evans). Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**An Honourable Member:** No.

**Madam Speaker:** No? Leave has been denied.

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to add my comments on Bill 55, The Certified Applied Science Technologists Act. These perhaps are good acts, as the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) indicates. I hope that he has read these pieces of legislation, so that he is fully aware of them. I know it took a fair amount of reading to go through them, and it is somewhat technical in nature. Dealing with professions, they are outside of my realm of experience.

But we have received correspondence once again from the Certified Technicians and Technologists Association of Manitoba dealing with Bill 55. We do note that, once again, as there was by way of Bill 54, a component dealing with public safety that this particular association references, as did the previous one dealing with the Association of Professional Engineers of Manitoba.

The Certified Technicians and Technologists Association or Manitoba Society of Certified Engineering Technicians or Technologists is comprised of over 2,000 members in the province of Manitoba. It is my understanding that the CTTAM is a nonprofit, self-governing association, so my comments from Bill

54 dealing with self-governing bodies can also apply to this particular piece of legislation. I hope that the minister will add my comments that I made on Bill 54 to this one dealing with self-governing bodies again.

This one has procedures in place to provide for recognition of foreign academic credentials of immigrants to Canada. My comments on Bill 54 from the APEM side, where we have new immigrants coming to our province that perhaps have credentials in those areas, that there should be in place some types of standards, or testing, or the ability to challenge for certification or licensing in this province for these people. Therefore, my comments from Bill 54 would apply to this particular piece of legislation as well.

It is my understanding that this legislation is not new in Canada and that there are perhaps four or five other jurisdictions, other provinces, in Canada that do have similar legislation, and that this was done in conjunction with the Association of Professional Engineers, and there is a separation of their duties or responsibilities as is now identified or laid out clearly between the two bills.

They do reference in their correspondence to us that the two organizations, the CTTAM and the APEM, have reached a new level of accord or consensus amongst the organizations, something that we referenced with the minister, I believe, when we were in Estimates last year, that they have now developed, they say for the benefit of Manitobans and our economy and the people working here, recognizable standards of applied science technicians and technologists, people who are working in the industry in our province, that they have brought forward enhanced quality-assurance programs for the certified practitioners working in that particular profession, that they have increased choices, they say, and protection for consumers, and that they have also built in, as the APEM did in Bill 54, a code of ethics that holds paramount the safety, health and welfare of the public.

The same thing applies to this bill as it did for Bill 54 with the engineers, where you have a national body of people that are involved here, self-regulating bodies of people, that perhaps the province would want to make itself aware of the standards and the code of ethics that

are in place and the standards under which these organizations function. Perhaps it may be applicable here, as well, to have members of the public sit in on those bodies to make sure that the public interest is indeed represented.

It is my understanding that under this bill, because it does have two parts of it—you have the technologists' duties and responsibilities, certification, et cetera—that technologists are responsible for equipment design and for processes and systems, and can do testing and development of prototypes, trouble shooting, et cetera. They supervise, train and co-ordinate activities in their part of the field where the technician—now his duties and responsibilities seem to be somewhat subordinate to the technologists' particular criteria. So it is laid out fairly clearly in their correspondence to us, and if the areas that are identified in their correspondence with us, and the comments made by the minister, are indicative of the intent of the legislation, we would be supportive of this particular piece of legislation as the parties that were involved, the stakeholder groups that were involved now for some time, have tried to work towards a consensus and appear to have achieved that by information brought to our attention.

Madam Speaker, we hope that this spirit of good will will continue amongst these parties, and that they can work together to achieve the goals of their particular associations and the people they represent, and to the best interests of the public. So with those few words, we are prepared to see Bill 55 move through to a committee and allow members of the public the opportunity to add their comment as well. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading, Bill 55. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

### House Business

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I understand debate has proceeded on

the bills that I have already asked you to call. It appears we will not proceed this afternoon to consideration of concurrence.

I would like, though, if you would call Bill 2, and after that, if there would be leave of the House—how this works exactly, Madam Speaker, but the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has expressed a wish to speak briefly about Bill 39 which has already passed at second reading stage. I do not know if there is—I seek the guidance of the House on that one. I certainly have no problems if it does not change the status of the bill. If there is any kind of leave as required, I would grant it. But after Bill 39, then we would ask that Bill 13 be called once we settle up on what the rules are with respect to Bill 39. Let us hear from Steve on this.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I was going to suggest that if the member has some comments to put on the record, concurrence allows for open discussion debate. I would suggest that that would be the proper way. There are actually quite a few bills we would like to go back and revisit the second reading, but I think it is a precedent that might be somewhat dangerous. I think if we finish Bill 2 and go straight into concurrence, we will make sure the member for Inkster is recognized.

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, that is certainly acceptable to me, if it is to the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). It is somewhat unusual, but we could go with Bill 2, and then I would move a motion to move us into concurrence.

### **Bill 2—The Elections Amendment Act**

**Madam Speaker:** To resume adjourned debate on second reading of Bill 2, The Elections Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi électorale), standing in the name of the honourable Leader of the official opposition (Mr. Doer). Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing?

**Some Honourable Members:** Yes.

**Madam Speaker:** Yes. Leave has been granted.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, I did want to put a few words on Bill 2. It is one of those pieces of legislation in which it is very rarely where there are actually amendments. I know in Bill 2 the government did, after consulting with Elections Manitoba, make some amendments. I understand as the result of those amendments there will have to be some further amendments to Bill 2, and I hope I have the order of those numbers correct there.

Bill 3 was amended in committee. As a result of the amendments in Bill 3 in committee, I understand that there might have to be some amendments to Bill 2 also, but I wanted to comment on Bill 2 prior to it going to committee. I think there are a number of positive things that are actually happening through Bill 2.

\* (1740)

For a long time, we have talked about the automation of a voters list. This bill allows for that to take place, something that is long overdue. I know the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau), in particular, recalling what has happened in LAMC. We have talked quite extensively in the past about the need to become more computerized. It allows options for the voter to put the ballot in the ballot box, and I think that that is a very strong positive. I know I have witnessed where I have gone in to do what most other politicians do to say hi on election day and thank volunteers that are out there.

You always get some individuals that really question why it is, after they received the ballot, that they actually have to go back and hand the ballot over. A good number of them, I would suggest to you, would feel much more comfortable if they were the ones that were putting the ballot actually in the box. I think this is something, as I see it, positive.

Madam Speaker, there are a number of positives, but my concern is a couple of the things that I think that are missing that could have and should have been taken into account. What I argue is the need to get people involved in the political process. I am sure each and every one of us have had constituents that become somewhat apathetic, that are more upset that they do not want to vote for any of the candidates that are running.

This is the reason why I would have liked to have seen on the ballot itself a box that would allow you to tick off a declined ballot, so then it is not making any show of it in front of other individuals. It is not a show in the sense that you walk into the voting booth and say to the returning officer, well, I want to decline my ballot after getting it and then just handing it back to the returning officer, because even that to a certain degree will discourage. I would like—and I believe that it is, in fact, very democratic—the opportunity to be able to say even to the person that is completely disinterested, that has been frustrated through elections, maybe because of voting in the past, that want to be able to express that frustration.

To me, it is more important for someone to go and vote and put an X on the “decline the ballot” than not to vote at all. I think that whatever we can do to encourage participation, which has to be first and foremost in our minds when we go into elections—we try to tell people in the best way we can to go up and vote. I think this is just another tool that would assist campaigners of all political stripes. They should be able to say to their constituent: look, it is a viable option, that, if you do not like any of the names that are there, you can go and you can put an X on the decline and decline the ballot.

I think that is important. I had Legislative Counsel draft a couple of amendments. One of them, Madam Speaker, was to take the logo off the ballot because I did not think it was appropriate, given that you already have the name of the party on it; and after doing some consulting, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) did move that amendment. I applaud the Premier, after consulting with Elections Manitoba, that that amendment was moved.

Well, Madam Speaker, that was the little step. I would suggest to you that the larger step is to put, if you like, on the ballot itself, decline a vote, and those amendments are there. I have the amendments. They are both in English and French, and what I would look to is the Premier or the Leader of the official opposition (Mr. Doer) to adopt the need to recognize that it is important to allow all individuals to express themselves, and I think that this is a venue in which would allow for more participation, overall more participation

in the democratic process, and would suggest that all members should be supportive of it. I do not believe for a moment that it takes anything away from the current candidates. I do not believe, as some have suggested, you should write down none of the above. Well, I think just a proper decline of ballot is appropriate. I think constituents or Manitobans would, in fact, take it seriously and it would be most interesting to see if, in fact, it does assist in getting more people participating in the process.

Madam Speaker, there is an obligation through the Elections Manitoba, and there are a number of things that were not accepted by the government in bringing in this legislation. One of the things that I think has always been unfair or not appropriate for Elections Manitoba is the way in which we appoint returning officers. I have had the opportunity to discuss issues, and this is one of those issues that I have had with the members from Elections Manitoba. I am not going to necessarily name the specific individuals, but, suffice to say, you have to look at the way in which returning officers are being selected. Quite often it is just a list of names that is provided, and the returning officer, the chief returning officer, has to accept those names.

What we should be doing at the very least is acknowledging that there are certain criteria that need to be met, that these individuals have certain abilities, that you just do not take a party person from the street and say, well, you would be a great returning officer. It has caused problems for Elections Manitoba. If the government was to at the very least establish whether it is job descriptions or some sort of criteria for being a returning officer and maybe look at even allowing it to be more of a permanent thing, Madam Speaker, I think that would be a positive.

I was quite involved in the last federal election at the organizational level. What really impressed me was with the way in which Elections Canada, for example, operates on some of its polling officers, where you have the incumbent actually make some of the appointments, and the opposition members, opposition candidates, if you like, opposition candidates to the incumbent that is, also get to make some of the appointments. I think that is something that is worthwhile in terms of us to explore.

In speaking to Bill 2, one of the unfortunate mishaps that I had, because I did want to also put some remarks on the record with respect to Bill 3, which concentrates more on the finances, I will put some words on the record because both of them are so tightly knit together, the whole way in which we finance campaigns to the way in which they are actually reported. Some of the discussions that I have had talk about the whole third-party advertising, and we have had lots of political discussion amongst political parties. We have had discussions or we have seen discussions even take place or court decisions taking place on third-party advertising.

I would suggest to you that something needs to happen in that whole area, that it is not appropriate to leave it so wide open. You know, in opposition, it is to my advantage to see that third-party expenditures, at least in part, because, generally speaking, it is not necessarily favourable toward the government. [interjection] The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) points out some of those experiences. But having said that, I do believe it takes away from the principles of trying to get controls over the way in which a political party might be able to finance a campaign, where we see outside organizations outside of the major political party paying huge dollars towards advertising campaigns, and it can be from formal, very formalized organizations to not as formal organizations.

\* (1750)

I will go back to the federal election, where there was an experience with respect to the gun lobbying groups. You have gun lobbying groups that are quite often American-based that have just phenomenal resources, to the types of resources even here in the province of Manitoba. So where you have local candidates at the local level having to live within certain financial constraints, there are outside potential third parties that can have a very dramatic and profound impact on a local campaign if, in fact, you have a third-party group wanting to have an impact to those third-party organizations.

For example, I would suggest, and I am going to say that it is being hypothetical, but I think the people can somewhat relate to it, if you have an outside group, for

example, that is prepared to invest substantial dollars in a particular riding, the candidate in that area, if, in fact, that candidate is being focused against, has very strong limitations in terms of the type of money he or she can actually spend in that local campaign.

So if you have opposition candidates, whether they are of the governing body or they are not of the governing body, having to compete against those third parties, I think that it is not fair, for the simple reason that you have unlimited resources then that could be used to campaign against that local candidate, while at the same time a very finite amount of dollars that candidate can actually spend. I know for myself, it is quite the challenge in terms of getting the monies required in order to even meet my limit.

So if I was one of those targeted individuals, whether it is in the next election or the one following, it can have an impact. I think that is something in which the government, or Elections Manitoba, more so, needs to look at, Madam Speaker.

**An Honourable Member:** In the way that the Liberals have been targeted.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Well, which is another point in itself that I probably should stay away from.

Madam Speaker, I do not know, I think it was Sid Green who talked about the way in which political parties are funded. I do not necessarily agree with some of the extremes. I think that public assistance through compensation, 50 percent return and so forth, is a positive thing. It assists other people in being able to participate in a democratic process. I, for one, could not have been successful had it not been for some of the compensation that was being provided for candidates to be able to run, because I just financially would never have been able to have afforded it.

Well, I think that there are still some changes in areas that could take place, and Madam Speaker, I would suggest to you that Elections Manitoba is not naive, that, in fact, that they are aware of the number of things that take place that are somewhat questionable. I have learned in my time that you do not throw rocks in a glasshouse type thing. So I want to be somewhat



careful with making any sort of allegations of things that maybe were not done aboveboard, but suffice to say that that whole area of the way in which financial claims are submitted, the way in which the public subsidize the political parties, does need to be revisited. I think that there are more benefits if you see to a certain degree more money coming back in the form of rebates with smaller spending limits. So there is no direct or additional cost per se to the taxpayer, but there is going to be a higher sense of accountability for the ways in which claims are ultimately processed.

Madam Speaker, I think that because this whole area of Elections Manitoba is nonpolitical, and I have a deep amount of respect for the work that the Elections Manitoba does, I would like to see more reforms, in particular in that financial area, come out from Elections Manitoba. That is the body that ultimately has to lead as we should in that area follow, because we would not necessarily want to be causing—at least I—a political interference.

If I was to conclude, I am sure all members are very much aware of the redistribution of boundaries. From what I understand, the proposed boundaries are going to be coming out at the end of the month, the beginning of July. I think the government has a responsibility to look at what the intent of the law was. The government

might want to take into consideration the need to coming back, let us say, for example, in the fall time in order to accommodate, because the last thing that I would want to see is if you have new boundaries that come forward and then there is an election that is based strictly on old boundaries when the government had the opportunity to base it on the new boundaries. Ultimately, the new boundaries will prevail and it does have an impact, the new boundaries on representation, whether or not elected officials want to acknowledge that or not.

Madam Speaker, with those few words, I will just take it that I have spoken on both Bill 2 and Bill 3. Thank you very much.

**Madam Speaker:** As previously agreed, this bill will remain standing in the name of the honourable Leader of the official opposition (Mr. Doer).

**An Honourable Member:** Six o'clock.

**Madam Speaker:** Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? [agreed]

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 15, 1998

## CONTENTS

<b>ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS</b>		Lathlin; Cummings	4452
<b>Presenting Petitions</b>		Man-Sask Short line Initiative	
Rail Line Abandonment		Wowchuk; Downey	4452
Wowchuk	4443	Helen Betty Osborne Murder Investigation	
<b>Reading and Receiving Petitions</b>		Robinson; Toews	4452
Rail Line Abandonment		<b>Members' Statements</b>	
Wowchuk	4443	Stephanie Friesen	
<b>Presenting Reports by Standing And Special Committees</b>		Render	4453
Committee of Supply		India School of Dance, Music and Theatre	
Laurendeau	4443	McGifford	4453
<b>Tabling of Reports</b>		Century Farms	
1997 Annual Report, Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Board		Helwer	4454
Gilleshammer	4443	Kids Fishing for a Cure	
<b>Oral Questions</b>		Dewar	4454
City of Winnipeg Amendment Act		Elementary Classroom Teacher Awards	
Doer; Reimer	4444	Faurschou	4455
Barrett; Reimer	4445	<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b>	
Lamoureux; Reimer	4449	<b>Committee of Supply</b> (Concurrent Sections)	
Misericordia General Hospital		Health	
Chomiak; Praznik	4447	Praznik	4456
Northern Communities		Ashton	4456
Robinson; Newman	4448	Enabling Appropriations	
Highway Maintenance		L. Evans	4461
Wowchuk; Downey	4450		4464
Fishing Industry		McCrae	4461
Lathlin; Cummings	4451		4464
Fisheries Committee		Other Appropriations	
		L. Evans	4463
			4465
		McCrae	4463
			4465

Legislative Assembly		Lamoureux	4488
Maloway	4467		
McCrae	4467	Bill 38, Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	
Agriculture		C. Evans	4488
Wowchuk	4468		
Enns	4468	Bill 39, Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2)	
<b>Debate on Second Readings</b>		Mackintosh	4490
Bill 8, Real Property Amendment Act		Bill 40, Domestic Violence and Stalking Prevention, Protection and Compensation and Consequential Amendments Act	
Maloway	4474	Mackintosh	4493
Bill 10, Mining Tax Amendment Act		Lamoureux	4495
Mihychuk	4475		
Lamoureux	4476	Bill 45, Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act	
Ashton	4476	Lamoureux	4496
Bill 28, Employment Standards Code and Consequential Amendments		Bill 54, Engineering and Geoscientific Professions and Consequential Amendments Act	
Reid	4477	Reid	4498
Lamoureux	4480		
Bill 32, Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act		Bill 55, Certified Applied Science Technologists Act	
C. Evans	4481	Reid	4500
Wowchuk	4483		
Lamoureux	4485	Bill 2, Elections Amendment Act	
Bill 33, Municipal Assessment Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act		Lamoureux	4502
C. Evans	4486		