



Fifth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

(Hansard)

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



Vol. XLIII No. 50 - 10 a.m., Friday, June 17, 1994

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, June 17, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

Manitoba Builder Bonds Series II

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement for the House.

On April 25 of this year, I announced that due to the enormous success of the initial offering of Manitoba Builder Bonds and the continued desire of Manitobans to invest in their province, the second issue of Manitoba Builder Bonds would go on sale May 24.

It gives me great pleasure to rise in the House today to announce that over 16,000 Manitobans have purchased in excess of \$300 million of Builder Bonds Series II.

The combination of HydroBonds and Builder Bonds has now generated in excess of \$230 million in interest for Manitobans. Proceeds from the sale will provide a local source of funds and go to work right here in Manitoba and will help the province to create new jobs in a variety of capital and provincial projects.

I would like to extend my thanks to the people of Manitoba who have shown pride and confidence in their province by investing in Manitoba Builder Bonds. Thank you.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I thank the Minister of Finance for that good-news statement. It is certainly good to hear that Manitobans are prepared to buy the Builder Bonds, and as the minister inferred, the interest payments on those bonds go to Manitobans and hopefully are retained within the province, as opposed to interest

payments paid to foreigners or people out of the province.

To that extent, the idea is good, and I am pleased that Manitobans have seen fit to invest in them. We do have concerns that there is not sufficient capital investment in this province. The forecast by Stats Canada of capital investment for this year is that there will be virtually no growth, and that is bad news. That should concern all of us.

There are other signs that our economy is not as active as it should be. We are not getting the growth that we should. Hopefully, these particular Builder Bonds and the revenue from them will assist in government financing. We certainly are pleased with those Manitobans who were prepared to buy those bonds. We are very satisfied, but we would like to see a little bit more action on the economic front. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have spent a lot of time in this House, as have members of my party, talking about the retention of capital within this province—our own investment dollars. Therefore, it does give me great pleasure to acknowledge and recognize that the HydroBond and now the Builder Bond program is obviously a very, very good idea. I am very pleased to see that it is successful.

My predecessor as Finance critic, Mr. Alcock, recognized that when these issues first came out, Mr. Speaker, and we continue to feel that way. I do, however, want to leave on the record that in new investment dollars in this province, there are approximately \$640 million invested in new investment dollars through pension funds, through RSP funds, and we are still retaining a very small portion of those over the long haul. Every year, we see that drain of capital. This is an important start. It should be seen just as that, however—a start. There is a need to continually be proactive and

creative in retaining those investment dollars for our own people.

I am interested in the Finance minister's comments that these funds will help the province to create new jobs. One hopes that will occur. It certainly has not occurred yet, but the retention of capital is a start. I think we are all looking forward now to any indication that those funds would be put to use by this government to, in fact, create jobs. It has not happened yet, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): I am pleased today to table the 1994-95 Capital Program for the Department of Health.

* (1005)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 26—An Act to amend An Act to Protect the Health of Non-Smokers (2)

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey), that leave be given to introduce Bill 26, An Act to amend An Act to Protect the Health of Non-Smokers (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la protection de la santé des non-fumeurs), and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have with us this morning from the Sir William Osler School 45 English Language students under the direction of Ms. Elaine Dale. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs).

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

* (1010)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Health Care System Disease Control

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier.

Daily in this House and over the last couple of years, we have been asking questions about the government's cutbacks in the Department of Health, and the government has repeatedly said that they are allegedly putting resources into the community for disease prevention and for early detection of disease.

Today, unfortunately, and yesterday, unfortunately, we learned through testimony at a public inquiry dealing with the blood supply that senior health consultants and former senior Assistant Deputy Ministers of Health have given testimony that early intervention programs have been gutted by this provincial government, preventative programs have been reduced by this provincial government and that we have been placed at risk by the reductions in services by the provincial government.

I would like to ask the Premier, why has he allowed the situation to deteriorate in this province of Manitoba in terms of overall health, and as the testimony suggests, why has he weakened our ability to fight and respond to communicable diseases in Manitoba at the earliest possible point?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, we see it as our duty to be as prepared as we can for whatever kinds of epidemic situations might present in the future, as governments have tried to do in the past. In spite of that, there have been medical problems that have developed in the past, although I can say to the honourable member the recent meningitis vaccination program I think by all accounts has been run very well in conjunction with the federal, provincial and aboriginal leadership in this province.

We certainly take seriously any comments made in this vein in front of a public inquiry. We, of course, await like everybody else the recommendations and outcomes that will flow from the Krever inquiry. I think in light of the

history of the HIV infection, there is nobody in this country who should claim to be ready as we would like to be ready.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will pay close attention to the comments that have been made and have a look at our prevention programs and our immunization and our disease control programs and monitor them carefully, as we have been doing all along.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the testimony goes on to say in terms of Manitoba labs—and we have asked the question about labs on four or five occasions. We have tabled the Hammond report. We have tabled the Bass report. We have talked about the Anderson consulting report.

The testimony goes on to say that spending cuts by the provincial government and provincial laboratories strip our provincial laboratories of basic tools of surveillance and testing that serve as a front-line defence against epidemic. We have raised this question in the Chamber before to the government. We have quoted the reports that have talked about the skimming that is going on in provincial labs in terms of the rural lab situation, or its creaming, I might say, specifically in the report, the Bass report.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time that we have been raising the question of labs and early defence and prevention, the government has cut positions. In this year's budget alone, they cut 11 positions dealing with the screening of population groups for various indicators of health disease, specifically cholesterol and HIV.

I would like to know, how can the government square its policy of massive cutbacks in our institutions with nurses being laid off and at the same time, cut back community preventative resources to deal in our provincial labs with detection of diseases?

* (1015)

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the honourable member that never before in the history of health delivery in Manitoba has there been so much consultation and work being done and networking and integrating of services than presently. I am afraid that what the Leader of the

Opposition and his colleagues keep recommending day after day is a further gutting of the health care system in Manitoba which we will not tolerate.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition has made it clear that he is happy to defend the health care policies of the Province of Ontario. He has said that. Each day that he raises questions, I attempt to engage him in debate on issues in Ontario, and he refuses to take part, yet he says he is proud and happy to do so. He is proud and happy to defend the closure of 52 hospitals in Saskatchewan, proud and happy to defend the closure of 5,000 hospital beds in Ontario, and then he and his colleague for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) have the nerve to stand in this House and be critical of the meaningful change that is going on in Manitoba to place the appropriate emphasis on prevention and promotion and community care.

You cannot come from all directions at once, Mr. Speaker, and be believed.

Mr. Doer: That is the most pathetic answer I have ever heard in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. You have—

An Honourable Member: It matched the quality of the question.

Mr. Doer: Well, if the Premier (Mr. Filmon) cared about the situation in health, he would be worried about former ADMs saying that we cannot fight disease anymore. If the Premier had the guts to stand up and answer what is going on in his Health department, you would not have reductions in staff in the labs dealing with AIDS detection.

I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for the use of—

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

AIDS Prevention Programs Government Strategy

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): This is a very serious situation, Mr. Speaker. You have a lab body that is saying they cannot handle the cuts anymore. Our defence is gone. You have people in community health who are experts saying that we have gutted the system so much that we cannot deal with the prevention of disease and epidemics at the first line. This is very, very serious.

Mr. Speaker, we have asked questions before about AIDS, the fact that AIDS is spreading, according to Health and Welfare Canada, and has the potential to spread at a rate equal to the rate of AIDS that was contracted in the AIDS community 10 years ago in our aboriginal population. It talks about the tremendous at-risk situation here in the province of Manitoba, including in many of our urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, Manitoba is one of only two provinces in Canada that does not have a formal AIDS strategy. We have also gutted all our preventative staff and now gutted our lab staff to deal with the situation.

I would like to ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon), will he instruct his Minister of Health to reinstate our resources to prevent disease, to prevent disease spread, to prevent epidemics and to develop an intelligent and forthright and honest and aggressive AIDS epidemic strategy prevention program in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): The honourable Leader of the Opposition should have a chat with his spokesperson for Health, Mr. Speaker, because during the Estimates process, we discussed at some length the development of epidemiology services in Manitoba and the department's intention to make that service more effective, so that we can have a better understanding than in past generations of the development of disease in Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I have said that we will look carefully at what Dr. MacDonald and others have had to say before the Krever inquiry, it ought not to come as any surprise to the honourable member that the reason for having inquiries is finding out those things that we need to find out in order to make improvements.

That is exactly what we have been embarked on in the last few years here in Manitoba, improving our health care system. I mean, you cannot defend Ontario and Saskatchewan on the one hand and then come along and suggest that we should be criticized here in Manitoba.

When you look at the levels of funding for health care services in Manitoba over the last

number of years, when you look at the percentage of health care spending in Manitoba as a percentage of total spending, which is the best measure of the commitment of any government, you will see that never before in the history of Manitoba has any government been more committed to a safe and effective health care system than the present government right here in Manitoba.

* (1020)

Laboratory and Imaging Services Layoffs

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, the minister refuses to answer the question. The minister completely misses the point. It had to come out at a federal inquiry what is wrong in the department, and still the minister does not acknowledge the difficulties that were raised by our Leader and the problems in the department. At least the minister could acknowledge the problem, but, no, he is keeping his head in the sand and refusing to acknowledge it.

My question to the minister is, why did you cut 11 staff from your Laboratory and Imaging Services department, which undercuts the ability of the department to screen for diseases like HIV?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): You see, Mr. Speaker, the difference between my approach and that of the honourable members opposite is that they will defend the approach in Ontario and the approach in Saskatchewan. I will acknowledge that in Manitoba, there is always room for improvement. That is the difference in approach.

I remember honourable members, when they were going around hacking and slashing here in Manitoba, defend, defend, defend or deny, deny, deny, and that is not the right approach either, Mr. Speaker.

Working together with health care professionals, with health care providers, with health care consumers, acknowledging where you are weak, building on where you are strong, that is what you should be doing in building a good health care system that will be sustainable for generations to

come, but I reject the approach that chokes the health care system to death being advocated by honourable members opposite.

AIDS Prevention Programs Government Strategy

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, when we asked the minister on May 19 why Manitoba was one of two provinces without an AIDS strategy, the minister would not answer the question, and he has refused to answer the question today.

Why, given what we know, given what has happened, given that we are supposed to be emphasizing prevention, why does this government not have an overall AIDS strategy and approach to this disease?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member raises the issue of an AIDS strategy. I have met with the AIDS Advisory Committee. That committee continues to do its work and to advise the government. We will pay heed to the AIDS Advisory Committee in the development of programs.

We have programs in operation now which are having an effect, and if the honourable member would care to look back on our discussions in the Estimates discussion, I can also bring forward facts and figures for the honourable member about the number of people who have been contacted, people we have worked with in this particular area, at a time when the honourable member can ask those questions, and I will make that detail available to him.

Mr. Chomiak: The members of the minister's own advisory committee are angry at some of the things he has done with respect to AIDS. Mr. Speaker, we will provide the minister with an example of an AIDS strategy from other provinces at some later date, so he can finally start to work on that process.

Public Health Services Government Support

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): My final supplementary: Will this government now enhance

the ability of public sector labs, public nurses and others involved in the public sector to carry out their functions adequately so things like Chagas disease and other things can be screened for and so that the health and protection of Manitobans can be foremost in the minds of this government, not simply cutbacks?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, again, you cannot come in here and suggest that our laboratory advisory committees are not appropriate and then come along and say you have got to do something about labs.

You cannot have it both ways, and, by the way, there is staff of private labs, people who day in and day out provide services in laboratory services who want to meet with me, because they are very upset with some of the things that the honourable member and his colleagues have been saying about the services provided by the good people who work in private and public labs.

Health Care System Privatization

Mr. Paul Edwards (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, last night, the chief of medical staff at Brandon General Hospital, a Dr. William Myers, made some very interesting comments, and I have a transcript of them because when I first heard about them, I was concerned about those statements. I want to very briefly ask the Minister of Health what he thinks of them.

The chief of medical staff, Dr. Myers, said private health care is inevitable. He went on to say that the sooner people accept that reality, the better off they would be, and he went on to say that it has become a very sacred issue for politicians, but they have found they cannot afford it, so they are contracting the service and still maintaining the front that they are providing the same level of care. It is simply not true.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very influential doctor in the Brandon community and indeed in the province. He has made those statements at a public meeting, the annual general meeting of the Brandon General Hospital.

Will the Minister of Health today put on the record if he disagrees with those comments, put it on the record publicly today, because a very influential man in this community has said specifically that we must, he believes, move to private health care?

* (1025)

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I was not at the meeting. I did not hear what Dr. Myers had to say. It may be that Dr. Myers has personal opinions. I am sure the honourable member has personal opinions, and other people have personal opinions.

What we are committed to here in Manitoba are the principles enshrined in the Canada Health Act. What we are committed to is the best—and I will quote Dr. Bill Myers from a conversation I had with him one day: We are going to have the best health care system we Canadians can afford to have. That is the way Dr. Myers put it when he was talking to me.

I cannot account for anything he might have said last night, but we are committed to the principles enshrined in the Canada Health Act and the best possible health care system we can provide, working with all manner of health care professionals. I am happy to work with Dr. Myers. I have had many conversations with Dr. Myers about some of his views.

I do not accept that private health care is inevitable, not as long as we have a will, as we do on this side of the House, to preserve our health care system. There are some on the other side of the House who would move to destroy our health system, Mr. Speaker, and I will not tolerate that.

Mr. Edwards: I appreciate the latter comments of the Minister of Health which are in direct contradiction to what Dr. Myers has said.

I would ask the Minister of Health to communicate those comments to Dr. Myers who, agreed, has a right to private opinions, but he is a very public man. He stated it in a public venue, the annual general meeting, and he does have a significant amount of respect in the medical community, Mr. Speaker.

He went on to say that if you believe that, that is, that you can avoid a two-tier system, you are very gullible, and I do not think people are. He argued a two-tier system would allow people to obtain services that medicare has had to ration or cut.

Will the Minister of Health—obviously knowing Dr. Myers very well—speak to him and specifically indicate to him that this type of theory, that we have to move to a two-tier system, is simply not on in this province and that he should refrain from comments such as that in public venues when they are so at odds with—when he is the chief of medical staff at a hospital, and he is speaking to the annual general meeting?

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is right about Dr. Myers. He is an extremely well respected practitioner in Manitoba, and he certainly enjoys my respect. There is no question about that, and his services in the Westman area are valued very highly by many, many people in that area.

I might not agree with everything Dr. Myers says, but I sure do not agree with stifling him and gagging him so that he cannot speak. I always thought, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things about liberalism was that people were entitled to express their opinions, and now the honourable member wants me to stick a gag on Dr. Myers. Well, no, I will not be doing that, I can tell you that.

Mr. Edwards: This government has placed more gag orders on the thousands of employees they have in government than any other government in the history of the province.

The record will reflect that I certainly did not ask the minister to impose a gag order. What I am asking this minister to do is to publicly express his rejection of the theory that we must move to a two-tier private health care system, and he should contact Dr. Myers in his very influential position with the Brandon General Hospital and make that view known publicly in Brandon and around this province today, Mr. Speaker.

Point of Order

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether this question, in fact, is in

order. The individual whom the Liberal Leader is talking about is a private citizen. I am not sure that it is within the government's purview to control what someone thinks or says in the province of Manitoba. Is that in order? Is it in within the area of the government's competence?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order.

Mr. McCrae: Well, Mr. Speaker, to use an expression often used by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), the Leader of the Liberal Party seems to be suggesting that I take Dr. Myers to the woodshed.

Point of Order

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, we have had enough of the use of that phrase in this House to last in perpetuity. You have it within your power to make that expression unparliamentary, and I would ask you to do so.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. On the point of order raised by the honourable member for River Heights, it is indeed unfortunate that the word as clearly enunciated by the Minister of Health, referenced by the honourable member for River Heights, does not show up in Beauchesne's under unparliamentary language.

But, again, I would remind all honourable members to pick and choose your words very carefully.

Mr. McCrae: In any event, Mr. Speaker, when I said what I said, the Leader of the Liberal Party said: Yes, I do suggest to take Dr. Myers to the woodshed.

Point of Order

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have asked this minister to call Dr. Myers and tell him that he is wrong that we must move to a two-tier—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order. That is

clearly a dispute over the facts. There is no point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the honourable Minister of Health, to finish with his response.

* (1030)

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member may know Dr. Myers, but if I were to do as the honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is suggesting I do, use my muscle as a Minister of Health to go and tell Dr. Myers what he should or should not be saying in this free country of ours, I can tell you, Dr. Myers would waste no time dispatching me on the point, and I would respect him for it if I ever tried to do such a thing.

Dr. Myers is entitled to his opinion. I disagree with the opinion as expressed by the Leader of the Liberal Party today. I do not know how much more public I can be, Mr. Speaker, than to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Community-Based Policing Government Strategy

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, this week, Mr. Chris Braiden, the former superintendent of the Edmonton Police Service and the acknowledged expert on community-based policing in North America was in the city to advise the Winnipeg Police Services. Mr. Braiden makes the point that policing is off the rails here and that we must get officers out of their cars and into the community and working with neighbourhoods.

My question for the Minister of Justice is, would she explain why her department does not have a single program in place to ensure that Manitoba police forces can be transformed to community-based policing?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, as the member knows and this government has demonstrated, we have a very strong commitment to community consultation, to working with communities. The member, I am sure, knows that the RCMP has a system in place in which they do work with communities, where communities have

the opportunity to determine what kind of services they would like to have, what would best serve their community.

I meet both with the chief of the Winnipeg Police and also the head of the RCMP and make sure that I am aware of issues of concern. However, the departments themselves have to look at an internal management strategy and a direction that they wish to go in and how they will actually achieve it.

Mr. Mackintosh: Would the Minister of Justice explain how a move to community-based policing can be listed in her Detailed Estimates as an objective of her department when there is no action plan, there is no program in place, either taken or planned?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, the member obviously paid no attention in the course of Estimates. I wonder where he was in the course of Estimates in terms of his thinking, because he did not hear any of the discussion when we discussed the Law Enforcement line, when we discussed the RCMP's work with the community, with the community groups that they report to and that they continually work with. It is through those groups—and there were examples raised in the process of Estimates—that citizens had the opportunity to speak about the type of policing they want.

So that certainly is in place. The member obviously just missed it, like he misses a lot of other things.

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, I resent those personal remarks, and I think we should talk about the issues.

I reviewed Hansard this morning and the Estimates and, given that the minister said that all she was doing for community-based policing was encouraging the RCMP to work with community advisory groups, I ask the minister, will she assure Winnipeggers that she will now meet with the chief of the Winnipeg Police Services and help him and help the department so we can achieve community-based policing in Winnipeg, we can get officers continuously visibly deployed in communities?

Mrs. Vodrey: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the member made reference to the earlier discussion. It seems that one question says it did not happen; another question says it did. So, in fact, we did discuss community-based policing. We did discuss the RCMP's role in this area in terms of the City of Winnipeg Police. As the member knows, they also report very directly to the Winnipeg City Council and that they are, in fact, employees of the City of Winnipeg.

I have the opportunity to meet with them to discuss issues of importance, but this is also an area of their own internal management, and they have to work at it also with their own employers.

Blood Transfusion Recipients Communication Policy

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, today we learn at the Krever inquiry that Dr. John Guilfoyle indicated he attempted to contact all individuals who had received blood transfusions in Manitoba between 1985 and the present.

Can the minister advise the House what the departmental strategy has been and is with respect to notifying recipients of blood transfusions between '85 and the present?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I am just as uncomfortable as before in discussing matters that are presently before a commission of inquiry. The honourable member asks questions that flow from testimony being given before a commission of inquiry. I recall many times during the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry, the Hughes review, questions arising as a result of testimony given before those inquiries, and I tried very hard to stay away from getting involved in something that is presently before a commission of inquiry.

Needless to say, I think the previous questions asked by the honourable member, are answered in a general way, as I have tried to answer them, to assure the honourable member and everyone else that as these allegations get made in front of a commission of inquiry, we certainly do look into them as they come up, but we try not to engage in

a whole lot of comment about them, as they are properly before Mr. Justice Krever.

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, these are the minister's own officials, and these are health policies that apply today.

My question again to the minister is, what steps has the department taken to notify individuals who have received blood transfusions prior to 1985?

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Speaker, I will get the detail for the honourable member and discuss it with the honourable member outside the realm of the Chamber, as these matters are presently before the Krever inquiry.

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Speaker, maybe also, can the minister explain why Dr. John Guilfoyle who testified today was stonewalled by the department last year when he attempted to notify individuals about blood transfusions, why the department stonewalled his attempt to notify the public?

Mr. McCrae: As I said, Mr. Speaker, these questions are the subject of discussion before the Krever inquiry. I do not mind having a private conversation with the honourable member about this, but I do not want to say anything that might jeopardize the work of the Krever inquiry. That would be the inappropriate thing to do, and I am a little bit surprised that the honourable member, with his particular training, would raise the matter in the way he has today.

* (1040)

Training/Employment Creation Federal Discussions

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Newfoundland and the federal government announced a strategic initiative in education and job creation—\$4.4 million to assist students to attend universities and colleges and \$3 million for jobs for recent graduates.

The needs in Newfoundland are obvious, but in Manitoba, our youth unemployment rates have at times climbed to over 25 percent, and in northern Manitoba, the unemployment rates are extremely high.

I want to ask the Minister of Education and Training, what specific proposals have been made

by the government of Manitoba to the federal government for post-secondary education and training for young Manitobans?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, firstly, I want to correct part of the record when the member talks about youth unemployment rates. I believe that our youth unemployment rate in Manitoba for the last census is around 16.5 percent, one of the best in the country and dropping significantly from where it was several months ago. So Manitoba virtually leads the land with respect to the low ranking of the unemployment rate with respect to the youth category.

We continue to work closely with the federal government. Just yesterday, I was involved in a signing with the federal government with respect to the health care products industry and training associated with, again, that industry. We continue to try to work together to find those areas, Mr. Speaker, where indeed there will be jobs upon further training opportunities, and we continue to contribute significant amounts of money under our budgetary responsibility.

Unemployment Insurance Commission Training Freeze

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, has the minister then, since he has been in conversation with the federal government, yet prepared a response to the question I put to him at the beginning of the week, asking about the impact of the de facto freeze in unemployment insurance training monies in Manitoba, what the impact of that is on the community college enrollments for this fall, and what the impact of that is on the thousands of unemployed Manitobans who cannot access any training funds from the unemployment insurance funds?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, the member is well aware, through the social safety net reform, that this is a broader issue. The member, if she was reading the paper at all, would know that my colleague the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) was meeting with other ministers across the country with respect to the whole reform

process, and obviously some dimension of the time was directed to that point.

Specific to her question, we are still no further ahead with an understanding as to how the federal government is going to revamp this whole program.

Labour Force Strategic Plan Development

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Will this minister make the commitment that he has refused to make for every single year that this government has been in office, and that is, to prepare a labour force strategic plan for Manitoba which will inform the public discussion, which will enable Manitobans to understand what opportunities can be made available to them and which will give some educational direction which is absolutely lacking in this government in its discussions with the federal government?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I categorically reject the comment and the assertion made by the member for Wolseley. There is not a lack of direction as presented by this government.

As I indicated to the member over and over and over again in Estimates review, the thrust is contained within the Framework for Economic Growth. Those are the strategic areas of growth. We are trying to make our educational institutions understand that in greater measure, and with respect to setting forth a labour market development board, we have tried to do that, but that has not been as easy. As a matter of fact, there has not been a province over the course of the last number of months that has been able to, itself, come around.

So this whole process of trying to marry supply with demand within the labour market development area is certainly understood by this government, and I dare say with respect to the approach that we put forward through the Framework for Economic Growth, we have gone further than any other province in this country.

Income Security Program Pending Bodily Injury Claims

Ms. Norma McCormick (Osborne): My question is to the Minister of Family Services.

This week, I received a letter received by an income security recipient who was injured as a passenger in a motor vehicle accident. On May 30, she received a letter from Winnipeg South Income Security office advising her that she was to provide detail on a pending bodily injury claim and that future benefits would be on hold until this information was provided.

Is it consistent with department policy to interrupt this family's income awaiting the adjudication of a pending bodily injury claim?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Family Services): I will take the detail of that question as notice and provide information back to my honourable friend, but I would hope that if there are specific issues and there are people in Manitoba who are suffering financially as a result of some decision that has been made, that this would be brought to my attention personally at the very earliest opportunity, so I could look into and investigate that circumstance and ensure that Manitobans are being treated with compassion and with fairness, Mr. Speaker.

Communication Policy

Ms. Norma McCormick (Osborne): My supplementary is to the same minister. I am going to table this terse, five-line form letter which shows no sympathy or understanding for this mother's situation. This was the first communication from the Income Security office. It simply tells her she has no immediate income.

What can be done to improve the way in which our bureaucracies and those who represent them communicate with Manitobans and ensure that at least there is some level of humanity and compassion?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Family Services): Again, I will say that if there is a Manitoban who is suffering financially as a result of any decision that has been made in the department, I would be very appreciative of that

information being brought to my attention at the very earliest convenience, so that I could look into the matter and try to resolve the problem.

I will take the specifics of the individual case as notice and ask my department for some detail.

Ms. McCormick: My final question, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister work with Winnipeg South Income Security office to improve the tone of the communication from Income Security, so that it shows greater respect for the program's clients?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Speaker, I have always said, and I think the message that has gone out from me into the department is that we are there to serve the clients in the best and most respectful manner possible.

I will take the letter that has been tabled back to the department and ask for some details around the circumstances.

Economic Growth Provincial Comparisons

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance.

The current economic indicators that we have from Statistics Canada show that Manitoba is performing below the national average in 10 out of 13 economic indicators—10 out of 13. Building permits have declined year after year for the past four years, and now this year, Mr. Speaker, there has been a decline in building permits of 21.6 percent. That is the first few months of this year. Not only that, we are rating 10 out of 10 in terms of what is happening in building permits.

My question to the Minister of Finance is, why is Manitoba's economy performing so poorly?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, obviously, I disagree entirely with the preamble of the member for Brandon East. I would be more than pleased at any point in time to sit down, when we have ample time, to debate the economic indicators in Manitoba to point to how well Manitoba is doing in a relative sense.

The number of housing starts we have this year—we are certainly leading the nation in terms of housing starts in our province. In terms of investments in Manitoba over the last five years, we have been in the top half of Canada in three out of those five years. Our job creation performance last year was the third best in all of Canada. Since May of last year, Mr. Speaker, there are 16,000 more full-time jobs in Manitoba today than there were back in May of last year.

So there are many very positive economic indicators in our province, and I would gladly discuss them at length with the member for Brandon East.

Youth Unemployment Rate Provincial Comparisons

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister specifically, why has the youth unemployment rate jumped so drastically in the first five months of this year?

Last year, the first five months, the youth unemployment rate was 14.9 percent. This year, it is 18.5 percent. As a matter of fact, the Canadian average for youth in this period of time has actually declined a bit, and yet we have jumped up about three or four points. Why?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, traditionally, our youth unemployment rate has been amongst the best of all provinces in Canada. There are a series of initiatives that we have done to enhance employment opportunities for youth, initiatives like the Green Team proposal, not only in rural Manitoba, but now reproduced here in Winnipeg which will employ hundreds of young people in the city of Winnipeg, many initiatives in terms of dealing with youth unemployment.

But one of the single most important things we can do for the youth of Manitoba is to create the right positive economic climate by holding taxes down, by reducing taxes to create long-term economic growth in Manitoba, and that is exactly what we are doing. That is the best thing we can do for the youth in this province.

* (1050)

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Finance would read the statistics because last year, we were far better off than the national youth unemployment rate. This year, we are about the same as the Canadian average; in fact—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Question, please.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, my last question: How does the minister expect any significant economic growth if we do not have an increase in total capital investment which Statistics Canada is forecasting—no increase—and I note construction levels have dropped in the past three years. As I said, building permits are down 21.6 percent this year. He talks about housing starts. We are only a fraction of what we were five years ago. Why have we become a no-growth province?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, as usual, the member for Brandon East is very selective, and he is pointing to 1994 where capital investment is expected to be flat in Manitoba.

If you look over the last five years in Manitoba, we have led the nation in three of those five years. Last year, 1993, the highest capital investment growth in all of Canada in manufacturing investment was right here in the province of Manitoba.

So, again, he did not raise capital investment last year. He did not raise capital investment the year before. He raises it now when it is flat, but the figures he is quoting from do not include the infrastructure program that we were one of the first provinces in all of Canada to get off the mark on, and those numbers do not include the \$24 million that we are investing directly in the infrastructure program here in Manitoba. So I suggest that that number will be higher than zero growth in 1994.

Mr. Speaker: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

Speaker's Ruling

Matter of Privilege—Minister's Comments

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have a ruling for the House. I am ruling on the matter of privilege raised

by the honourable member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) on June 15.

In raising the matter, the member alleged that in the Committee of Supply on Monday, June 13, the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) made comments to her, including the phrases, and I quote, "you need a slap" and also quote "you need to go to the woodshed." This is a serious allegation which has affected the House and has generated a great deal of media attention.

As I ruled on a somewhat related incident on June 2, 1989, because the matter arose in a committee, the correct procedure for the member would have been to raise her concerns in the Committee of Supply. My ruling was based on Beuchesne Citation 107, which reads that "breaches of privilege in committee may be dealt with only by the House itself on report from the committee." Also, Beuchesne Citation 760.(3) clearly states that the Speaker cannot exercise procedural control over committees.

Therefore, I am ruling that this matter is out of order as a matter of privilege. The honourable member may, however, wish to raise the matter in the Committee of Supply and the committee could decide whether or not to report it to the House.

NONPOLITICAL STATEMENT

Winnipeg General Strike

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in the early hours of June 17, 1919, under the cover of darkness, 10 men were arrested for their involvement in the Winnipeg General Strike. The stage had been set shortly before when, with undue and very unusual haste, the federal government amended the Immigration Act. In less than one hour, an amendment was rushed through three readings, Senate approval and Royal Assent.

The amendment permitted the deportation, as an undesirable, any immigrant, British or foreign born, regardless of the length of time he or she had lived in Canada, by the Immigration department and without a trial by jury.

Another amendment to the Criminal Code permitted a person to be arrested on a suspicion and guilty until he or she could establish his or her innocence, a complete reversal of British tradition.

Those arrested included R.B. Russell, John Queen, William Ivens, George Armstrong, A.A. Heaps, R.E. Bray and four so-called aliens who had nothing to do with the strike leadership. The purpose of the arrest was to settle the strike in favour of the employers or crush it by force, but being arrested had a profound effect on the individuals concerned, on their future, the course of politics in Manitoba and on organized labour.

As J.S. Woodsworth, who was arrested on June 23, said, when the Meighen government arrested me, it nominated me to Ottawa.

In the next provincial election in 1920, Fred Dixon, George Armstrong, John Queen and William Ivens were elected to the Manitoba Legislature, three of whom were still in jail. These Labour Party representatives were four out of a possible 10 MLAs in Winnipeg and received 42.5 percent of the votes cast.

What began as a strike for collective bargaining, better wages and safer working conditions was propelled into a determination by the working class to support its own representatives who could give voice at Winnipeg City Council, this Legislature, and the federal Parliament for the rights of all working people.

Member's Statement

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, may I make a statement to the House, with leave?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? [agreed]

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, on occasions, statements have been made by honourable members in this House to which objection has been raised. These issues have been resolved by a ruling of the Chair, but in most cases by a simple clarification or withdrawal and an apology where appropriate.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let us get some clarification here. I asked for leave for the honourable minister to make a nonpolitical statement.

Mr. Orchard: I just said a statement.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I understand that now. Are we going to grant the honourable minister leave? Apparently he wants to make a statement to the House. [agreed]

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, I will commence from the beginning.

Mr. Speaker: Please.

Mr. Orchard: On occasions, statements have been made by honourable members in this House to which objections have been raised. These issues have been resolved by a ruling of the Chair, but in most cases by a simple clarification or withdrawal and an apology where appropriate.

I have withdrawn statements that I have made both inside and outside the House and made specific apologies to any individual personally offended.

The member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) raised a matter of privilege, which is her right, alleging statements were made by me in committee which the honourable member found offensive.

I have acknowledged what I said to the member, and my statement had no connotation other than that intended by the author of that statement, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Doer), who has often used the phrase, taken to the woodshed.

Now, if that often-used phrase has offended the member for Radisson, then I apologize to her for any offence taken, since no offence was meant.

The member for Radisson further alleged that I said, quote, unquote, she needed a slap, which I did not say. If such language was used as alleged, the matter should have been raised immediately, yet was not. In fact, the matter was not raised the next day but rather the following day, Wednesday.

The MLA for Radisson made her accusations with a full knowledge that neither Hansard nor the tape had any such statements recorded. I suggest the member for Radisson raised the matter of

privilege with the expectation that Mr. Speaker's ruling would not sustain her motion since that was the advice given to her at her caucus meeting on Tuesday.

I further suggest that the member for Radisson made the allegations with the full knowledge of how it would be used by the media. In that regard, I suggest the member abused her privilege of the House and indeed mine.

For many years women have served this House with distinction, including the former member for your constituency, who also was the Speaker of this House. There are more women elected today because their predecessors have earned through achievement the respect of the people of Manitoba. They gained that respect through their performance and their strength of belief, which proved them to be equals to all honourable members. They did not achieve that respect on the sole basis of gender, Sir. Thank you.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, when we gave leave for the member to make a statement, we did not anticipate that it would be in many ways a continuation of argument on a matter of privilege that was raised.

Your ruling, Mr. Speaker, indicated that the matter should be raised in the committee, but I want to express concern, that I believe that many of the comments made by the minister are out of order, because it is reviving a matter on which you made a ruling in terms of it being raised in this House, in terms of procedure, which may still be raised in the committee.

Quite frankly, I am disappointed that after giving the leave for what we thought might be a statement of clarification, that we are once again engaging in debate on a matter of privilege, and I would therefore indicate that we feel it very unfortunate the minister used the leave that we granted to the minister—it was a common courtesy—to again raise the matter, Mr. Speaker, which you have dealt with in the procedural matter, which may still be before this House.

So we want to place that clearly on the record.

* (1100)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to rule on whether or not the honourable member did have a point of order, and I am having great difficulty at this time because, as the member for Thompson clearly indicates, and I will use his terminology, an abuse of—the member has granted the right or the privilege to the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard) to make a statement to the House which, sir, does not breach any of our rules in our rule book.

Therefore, the honourable member, I guess, does not have a point of order, because the minister did not breach any of the rules, but I do note that the comments made by the honourable minister are such that—I caution all members, because it is a privilege granted by the House, and I am sure the minister is quite aware of that. We had gone through a scenario here years back where a particular member had been denied leave for many, many days.

So I just caution all honourable members when you ask for leave to make a statement, the statement that you make is a privilege granted by this House. Therefore, I guess, on the point of order raised by the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), he does not have a point of order.

Point of Order

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): I really want to raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, to ask that you explore the options with respect to the minister imputing motives with respect to the matter of privilege that I raised. I want to respect your ruling. I did not prejudge your ruling, and I think that the ruling indicates that I still have the option of going to the Committee of Supply, an option that I will consider. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the honourable member for Radisson, I will take this opportunity to take this matter under advisement. I will peruse Hansard as to exactly what was said by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard), and I will come back to the House with a ruling on that matter.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House Business

Hon. Jim Ernst (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, House leaders have had a number of discussions with respect to certain adjustments to our schedule for next week.

First of all, I would like to announce that the Public Accounts committee will sit on Monday, June 20, at 10 a.m., to continue consideration of the report of the Provincial Auditor and related documents.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the government House leader for that information.

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, there is general agreement, and I wonder if you would seek unanimous consent to set aside the regular business of the House on Monday, June 20, in the afternoon in order to consider Motions of Condolence.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House to allow the Chamber to—I will use the terminology—debate condolence motions Monday afternoon? Is there agreement that we will do condolences Monday afternoon? [agreed]

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, then would you also seek unanimous consent of the House to set aside in the Chamber the Estimates of the Department of Justice for consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Highways and Transportation?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to set aside the Department of Justice and bring forward the Department of Highways and Transportation? [agreed]

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, I also advise that the Committee of Supply will sit in two sections, if there is unanimous consent to have Committee of Supply sit in two sections on Thursday morning, June 23, at 9 a.m. until 12 noon, to consider matters of Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to sit on June 23 two sections of the Committee of Supply from 9 a.m. till 12? [agreed]

Mr. Ernst: With respect to Monday evening and the sitting of the Committee of Supply in the Chamber, it is anticipated that, in the Chamber,

should the Department of Highways Estimates be concluded either before or after ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker, that we would then resume the Estimates of the Department of Justice either before or after ten o'clock.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, in the order of Estimates consideration in the Committee Room, as agreed to earlier, is first the Status of Women and then Natural Resources. Should the Status of Women Estimates conclude either before or after 10 p.m., we would then start the Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave now, whether the Department of Highways and Transportation ends here in the Chamber either prior to 10 or after 10, to continue on discussion on the Department of Justice? We will clarify that one first. [agreed]

In Room 255 in committee, I understand we will be doing the Status of Women and if that department would conclude either prior to 10 or after 10 that we would resume with the Department of Natural Resources. [agreed]

Now we will get back to Orders of the Day.

Mr. Ernst: In that case, Mr. Speaker, would you call Debate on Second Readings in the order that they are listed in the Order Paper.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 3—The Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae), Bill 3, The Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Fondation de traitement du cancer et de recherche en cancérologie).

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, we have perused this bill, and we are prepared to pass it through to committee.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second—

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 4—The Energy and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Orchard), Bill 4, The Energy and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur l'énergie et apportant des modifications corrélatives, standing in the name of the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave that this matter remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 5—The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay), Bill 5, The Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route et apportant des modifications corrélatives, standing in the name of the honourable member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

* (1110)

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave? [agreed]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, it is actually with pleasure that I could stand here today and speak on Bill 5. Bill 5, we would argue, is a bill that is probably long overdue.

There are a number of changes that we have been wanting to see brought to MPIC over the last number of years, and this particular bill does address one of those changes.

That, of course, is something which a former colleague of mine, current City Councillor John Angus, as I can recall, sitting at our caucus table talking about the need to have those time payments so that individuals would not necessarily have to pay at one time in the year, thereby taking so much out of the disposal income of the citizenry at one point in time of the year, which would have a very negative impact on all the different other sectors that are out there. So I recall quite clearly some of the arguments that were being made forward from

our then-critic Mr. Angus talking about why we would benefit consumer-wise, how the different industries, in particular the retail industry, would be able to benefit.

I know, Mr. Speaker, working somewhat in the retail sector a number of years back that when Autopac came around what would happen is we knew that was likely going to be the month in which we would do inventory, or plan on taking some inventory, because there is a noticeable decrease in consumer spending at the different retail sectors.

This is the primary reason why the Liberal Party, at that time and since then, has continuously fought to try to get the government to acknowledge the need to have insurance renewal periods, something as I say that the caucus has been demanding for years, and we are quite pleased. We know that even I believe Autopac or MPIC in itself has been requesting a change of this nature. So it is a very positive thing.

I also understand that there are some other changes to the legislation that allows for a transfer of ownership document which would be provided for potential purchasers of vehicles, and this will better the assurance of the credibility of the seller and the accuracy of the odometer.

Again, I have some first-hand experiences in terms of the issue of the rigging of odometers, not in a negative sense, of course, my first-hand experience. I also had worked in an occupation in which it was brought to our attention on numerous occasions in terms of some of the problems of those unethical sales people or backyard garage men. People were actually changing back the odometer in hopes that by doing this you are better able to get a price that is maybe inflated over what the car actually is worth because, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the car has a lot more mileage on it than the odometer was showing.

So anything that moves in the direction of trying to protect the consumer, once again, in an area that comes up time in and time and time again, because this is not something in which you can just say, well, consumer beware. Then it is the responsibility of the consumer to watch out for

because, because, quite frankly, the average consumer does not have the expertise to be able to tell if in fact an odometer has been tampered with or changed, as some cases in the past you have seen a straight transfer from one vehicle to the next vehicle. Just a part replacement, but the impact of that part replacement would enhance the value of that vehicle by showing a reduction of thousands of miles when it is not appropriate.

For the average consumer, they would never know this. You do not go behind the dashboard to see if an odometer has been tampered with. In some cases, when they have the odometers rolled back, you just cannot tell.

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

If there is a better way in which vehicles of all makes can be tracked or better certification being provided to ensure that the tampering of odometers is, wherever possible, limited to a relatively small number of incidents, that would be a positive thing. We were quite glad to see that.

Madam Deputy Speaker, my intentions were not to speak at length on this bill. I am not the critic. I believe the member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) was also wanting to put some words on it, but I did want to comment specifically on this bill primarily because it is a bill, which, I believe personally, is something that is long overdue.

I do even believe that the government in the past has talked about introducing this particular bill, or a bill of this nature. Having heard the many different arguments as to why a bill of this nature is warranted, I do not have any problem in terms of supporting the principle of the bill. As for the actual details, I have not read the bill from cover to cover, I must admit; but I do believe that the principle of it is something that I personally can support. Thank you for the opportunity to be able to put those few words on the record.

Madam Deputy Speaker: As previously agreed, this matter remains standing in the name of the honourable member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar).

Bill 7—The Crown Lands Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 7 (The Crown Lands Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les terres domaniales), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Driedger), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 8—The Fisheries Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 8 (The Fisheries Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la pêche), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Driedger), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 10—The Wildlife Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 10 (The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Driedger), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 12—The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 12 (The Provincial Auditor's Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le vérificateur provincial), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ernst), standing in the name of the honourable member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans).

Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 13—The Condominium Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 13 (The Condominium Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les condominiums), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ernst), standing in the name of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 14—The Real Estate Brokers Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 14 (The Real Estate Brokers Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les courtiers en immeubles), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ernst), standing in the name of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 15—The Law Society Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 15 (The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Loi Société du Barreau), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey), standing in the name of the honourable member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 16—The Provincial Court Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 16 (The Provincial Court Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey),

standing in the name of honourable member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 17—The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 17 (The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg et apportant des modifications corrélatives), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), standing in the name of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 18—The Insurance Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 18 (The Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les assurances), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ernst), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? [agreed]

* (1120)

Bill 19—The Mental Health Amendment Act

Madam Deputy Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 19 (The Mental Health Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la santé mentale), on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? Leave?

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill 19, The Mental Health Amendment Act, and I can say that I have read this entire bill. It is sort of typical of the legislation on the Order Paper for this session. It is two pages.

I think everyone here acknowledges that all of the bills in this session, or almost all of them, are housekeeping bills, they are minor amendments. That is the main reason why we are going to have a short session this year.

We know that the government got its major piece of legislation and its controversial piece of legislation through in the last session. This session, for various reasons, the government wants to keep controversial things off the Order Paper, and they have done a very good job of that. They have also kept the number of bills down to a minimum. I am sure that took some doing in their caucus, but if that was their agenda, they seem to have succeeded.

This bill has two main parts to it. The first is to provide for a second opinion on a review board on someone who has been determined incompetent. I think this is a reasonable amendment. I think all of us are entitled to a second opinion. Certainly, when we go to a doctor, we frequently want to have a second opinion and, because of medicare, we are able to go to another doctor and get a second opinion—

An Honourable Member: Right. When I go to a minister, I get a second opinion.

Mr. Martindale: As the honourable Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) says, if you go to a minister—I think he meant a clergyperson—and you do not like what you hear, you can go to another clergyperson and get a second opinion. This reminds me—

An Honourable Member: It is that final opinion I am worried about.

Mr. Martindale: Well, we are getting into some interesting theological debate here now. I would like to spend 40 minutes discussing theology. An honourable member just said, it is the final opinion that is the problem. I think he is referring to the final judgment, and all of us should be worried

about that opinion. Yes, I agree. I do not often agree with this government, but I agree with that statement.

Getting back to Bill 19, I think that just as all of us agree that it is a reasonable thing that we have access to a second opinion with a medical doctor, I think it is reasonable that psychiatric patients should be able to have access to a second psychiatric opinion. I do not think that is an abuse of medicare. I think where the abuse comes in is people that visit 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 different medical doctors in a year, and I know that the Manitoba Medical Association and the Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae) are working on that problem.

In fact, yesterday the government put out a press release on the Pharmacare Smart Card, which is going to cut down on abuse of individuals going to numerous doctors to get double prescriptions or even triple or quadruple prescriptions and have all of them filled. Because of the wonders of computer technology, this problem should be completely eliminated.

In fact, it is really quite impressive when you read the government's information about the amount of money that this will save. I am just going by memory here, but I believe the figure was something like \$50 million in the first five years, and that is a considerable saving to the taxpayers of Manitoba and to the public purse. It is because of this computerized system whereby, when people fill their prescriptions, the pharmacist can immediately check and see if people have got another prescription at another pharmacy.

The second area that it will save money is that the pharmacist will be able to check on whether this prescription will be in conflict with or have side effects, harmful side effects, because two or more medications are being used. The government also has projections on how many millions of dollars they can save by this, and we commend the government for this. This is something I think that all three parties were in agreement, that we should go to this system.

Of course, the biggest benefit is that seniors and other low-income people will not have to apply for their rebate and wait until they get the rebate

cheque in the mail. They will be immediately paying their deductible and then the amount over that, I think, in Manitoba 40 percent of the cost, is reimbursed and so people will not have to wait for that reimbursement. It is a big improvement. It is a good system and I think all three parties had been urging the government and the government I think agreed—obviously, they agreed. They changed the system to allow for this new Pharmacare Smart Card.

So the first part of this bill providing for a second opinion on a review board seems to be a reasonable change to The Mental Health Act.

The second part provides for confidentiality under the act, and I think all of us would agree that confidentiality is very important. I had a recent experience whereby someone in the community who worked at an institution funded by the Department of Family Services was discussing over coffee the names of clients. I was very upset by this. I assumed that this employee was violating their oath of confidentiality and so I phoned the executive director of this organization and, basically, put in a complaint.

The executive director treated this violation of confidentiality extremely seriously. In fact, the individual was called into the office and reprimanded and reminded that he or she could lose their job for violating this policy. In retrospect, I probably should have handled it a little differently. I should have confronted the individual and pointed out that they were violating this confidentiality policy, because now the individual is very mad at me and so is the spouse. They live in my constituency, and I probably lost two votes. If they tell all their friends—however, I would be very surprised if the individual would tell anybody the details of what happened, because I think anyone in our society would know that the individual was wrong, that they were violating confidentiality.

I guess we learn from our mistakes. I think I learned from the way I handled it. I could have handled it differently. But I think the employee learned that it was a serious breach of

confidentiality, and I am quite sure that it will not happen again.

I find that being a United Church minister is actually quite helpful when it comes to confidentiality as a member of the Legislature because, from time to time, I talk to civil servants and I talk to people in the community and frequently they share information with me.

They say, you know, please protect me as an individual. I do not want to be fired by the government for talking to a member of the opposition. I assure them that I am trained, as a clergyperson, to keep confidences, and I think people find that reassuring. People share information with me on an almost daily basis, and that is often the basis on which I bring questions to the House or bring up questions in Estimates.

So it is very helpful to be in an occupation where people have the degree of trust in me as an individual. As one of the government ministers points out, there are two sides to every story. That is very true. That is one of the things that you learn as a critic in your first term. So more and more often now I phone the director of a department, and Family Services is a big department, or I phone a deputy minister or assistant deputy minister and get the other side of the story.

Frequently the two sides of the story are like night and day or black and white. Even my constituents, when they phone me, they tell me half the story. They do not tell me the whole story. So I phone the department, and I get the other half of the story.

I am one of those individuals who prefers to do their research before I bring questions to Question Period and ask questions in Estimates.

An Honourable Member: And I suppose you are asking a lot less questions this term than the last two.

* (1130)

Mr. Martindale: The member remarks that I am asking fewer questions, but that is not the reason. The reason is that there have not been nearly as many cutbacks in the Department of Family Services.

Last session the government gave me all kinds of questions as a result of their budgetary decisions. This year there have been relatively few decisions regarding cutbacks in funding in the Department of Family Services. So of course that means fewer questions. Not that there are not any. I mean, I have raised questions about the \$300,000 taken out of the Child Day Care budget and the decrease in foster family rates, and the decrease in relatives rates, and there will be more questions. I have two or three that will get asked in the next week.

An Honourable Member: All of which have nothing to do with The Mental Health Act.

Mr. Martindale: One of your colleagues got me sidetracked, Mr. Minister.

Speaking of Bill 19, The Mental Health Amendment Act, I have found it very helpful to have a friend who has had some mental health problems. I have great admiration for this individual and for her honesty and her courage. This individual admits that she has a problem and that she has received some counselling and, in spite of this, has overcome many obstacles. Currently she is working on a university degree.

One of the things that she did quite successfully was, she appealed a social assistance decision. She went to the appeal board and she won. Not very many people win on a social assistance appeal.

I asked the minister questions about this in Estimates this year, and I believe it is around 15 percent of all appellants win on appeal. I also asked how many appellants represented by a lawyer win. I am just going by memory here so I could be wrong, but I think fewer people win on appeal with a lawyer than without a lawyer, which is rather interesting. I usually advise people to get a lawyer although you do not need one.

This individual prepared her own case with a little advice from me and went and argued and won. I think that one of the reasons that she won was the subtle sort of bias of the appeal committee members. These are individuals who are chosen from the community. They are government or political appointments.

I think they were rather surprised when this individual showed up and did not fit the typical stereotype of an individual on social assistance. She was a university student. She was white. She was well educated. She was articulate. She prepared her case well. She spoke well and clearly, and I think that was probably the key reason why she won. I was not there, so I am not sure of all the dynamics. I do not remember the particulars of the appeal.

It is possible that she had a good case before she even went, but that was the feeling that she got, that she got a lot more respect because she was an educated person. I just wish that happened more often, because many, many of my constituents phone me with social assistance problems and, particularly where they have been cut off or there seems to be some glaring omission, I always encourage them to appeal the decision of the Income Security staff.

Getting back to my friend with mental health problems, I think that she does some very good things. She talks about herself and her problems, and that is helpful, because in the past we have tended to put mental health patients in the closet, so to speak. There has been a very negative social stigma to people with mental health problems and that has not been helpful. I think it is more helpful when we as individuals and we as a society acknowledge that many people in our society have mental health problems and we talk about it openly and we accept these individuals.

In fact, I think acknowledging the problem is probably key to the acceptance in society and in our families and in our community, of these people. Once we can get rid of the social stigma and we can accept these people, then I think the next step is understanding, and when we have more understanding, we are more likely to be part of the solution rather than part of the problem. I think we as individuals and as a society are part of the solution. We cannot just rely on mental health professionals and on psychiatrists to solve an individual's problems. I think it involves all of us.

This individual is like many other people. She reaches out for support and friendship and she does

it by telephone, which I think is probably a little less threatening and easier than meeting friends and supporters on a face-to-face basis. I have a number of individuals who phone me from time to time, and I think I am part of their support network. I listen patiently. There is not a lot that I can do other than listen, but I think that is helpful. I think that keeps these individuals on a steady course.

There is a good program in the Department of Mental Health, and I have talked to the director of this program several times. In fact, I have tried to recruit individuals for this program, because it is called the Proctor Program. What the department of mental health is doing is recruiting individuals in the community who are called proctors. They are assigned to an individual with mental health problems, someone who is living in the community. The proctor is paid for the time that they spend with the individual.

The idea is that instead of using only professionals to help individuals with mental health problems that nonprofessionals who are friends, who are both a proctor and a friend, can be helpful. The director of the program says that it is very successful. I met her at a banquet a week ago and I said when an individual has a proctor who is also a friend, does it keep them out of expensive psychiatric care? Does it help in keeping them out of being hospitalized or out of being institutionalized? The director of the program said, yes, it is successful. It does mean that there are fewer admissions.

This is a program that is expanding. They are recruiting more proctors, and I think that is a good thing. It means that individuals can continue to live in the community. They can try to get their lives back in order. They can go to school. They can find a job and establish some stability in their lives. The alternative is a much poorer alternative. I think all of us would agree that we need psychiatric facilities in hospitals and psychiatric beds in the community and psychiatric institutions that when they are needed, it is helpful, they must be there.

If we can keep people out of those institutions and psychiatric beds, I think there are many, many advantages. I think it is better for the individuals

and it is, of course, less costly to government because there is a huge cost to staffing facilities, three shifts a day and hiring psychiatric nurses and hiring psychiatrists, because all of these professionals are very well paid. Not to say that the proctors do not have to have standards and some training, my understanding is that the proctors must have a university degree and/or experience in the social services sector. So these individuals are screened and are chosen carefully.

Another reason for wanting to commend the Proctor Program is that in Manitoba and probably across Canada and the United States, we have seen a very large shift in probably the last 25 years whereby psychiatric patients in hospitals have been deinstitutionalized and returned to the community. While it is good to see the number of people being reduced in psychiatric institutions and facilities, there have been problems because while governments said we are going to put more resources into the community, we are going to follow these individuals and provide support in the community, that has not always happened. So there is considerable evidence that one of the results is that many of these people end up on the streets. Amongst the numbers of the homeless in our society, the problem of homelessness is a very big problem, even in Canada, and particularly in our major cities. I am not sure of the extent of the problem in Winnipeg, but I think the last figure I heard was something like 150,000 homeless people in Canada. If that is true, that is a huge figure. Sounds a little high to me, but if it is true, it is a very, very large figure.

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

* (1140)

When people have both psychiatric problems and they are homeless, there are many, many problems for those individuals and for our society. It is very difficult if an individual is homeless and they are on medication for them to take the medication regularly. If they do not take the medication regularly, then that causes problems for these individuals. It is very hard to have any sense of stability or any kind of hope if one is

homeless. This is a problem that we as a society should be doing a lot more about.

Unfortunately, we have two views or two models in our society of what to do about the homeless. One model is to warehouse these individuals. Basically that is the model of the Salvation Army and other organizations that put up shelters, frequently subsidized by provincial and federal governments. Individuals can stay for one or two or three days, whatever the policy is, and then they are out on the street. They have to spend time out of the facility before they get back in again. It does not do anything for the problem of homelessness. It only provides a roof over their head and a temporary shelter.

But there is another model. I have been involved with people supporting the alternative model, who are part of an organization called the Urban Core Support Network. They have been working with psychiatric patients and others who are homeless on the model of building permanent housing for homeless people.

There are many success stories in this regard. For example, the Fred Victor Mission funded by the United Church in downtown Toronto, which for many years was based on the warehouse or shelter model, was transformed into permanent housing. The success stories here are quite interesting and wonderful to hear.

Basically it is based on an empowerment model whereby the homeless people themselves are involved right from the beginning in planning and designing the permanent housing and then occupying it. Some of them have also gained employment in terms of being managers or security guards or maintenance staff.

I have heard some of these stories. One of the more interesting ones told by Reverend Paul Webb is about an individual who was a client at Fred Victor Mission, a homeless person, had lived there for a long time. No one had ever heard this individual speak. Then they started having meetings with the homeless people to plan their permanent shelter. This individual started to speak at meetings and started to speak more and more. He came out of his shell. Once it was built, he

became the person who ran the laundry facility. That is one small example of the transformation that occurred in an individual.

In Toronto there are two or three organizations that have built permanent housing for the homeless. In Vancouver there is Seven Sisters Housing Co-op which houses people who used to live in hotels and rooming houses, I believe, on the downtown east side.

One of the examples that was used whenever I went to these meetings of the Urban Core Support Network in Toronto was Jack's Place on Main Street in Winnipeg. People were constantly saying, well, CMHC funded Jack's Place in Winnipeg; why do they not fund similar places in other cities?

My understanding is that Jack's Place, when it opened, was made available for people who were living in hotels and rooming houses on Main Street in Winnipeg. I have toured the facility, and it seems to work well. The problem is that the rooms are very small because it was a small hotel that was converted to Jack's Place. So consequently they have had a problem with vacancies.

But it is interesting, Mr. Acting Speaker, to look at the attitude of the people who work in these organizations. For example, there was an incident involving an individual who took a hostage at the Salvation Army, I believe at the Booth Centre, within the past week. I have been to the Booth Centre, and I know that when you go into the lobby, the staff person is behind plexiglass, or whatever it is, and they press a button to open the door. There is a lot of security there already. Some of it is understandable, because you have to protect your staff, and I guess this incident showed that.

At Jack's Place—I have met the manager at Jack's Place. She used to come occasionally to the North Winnipeg Co-operative Community Council for Seniors. She works in an office on the main floor at the front of Jack's Place, you know, 10 feet from the sidewalk on Main Street, and works all day with her door unlocked. So people said, well, what happens if there is a fight? She said, well, occasionally a fight breaks out, and I just go out and lock the door.

Now I see they have got wrought iron gates. I guess that they close at night, in front of the facility, but I think the attitude is quite significant, that people who work with the poor, who are empathetic, are not afraid of them. Maybe they are willing to take more risks. I do not know.

That was our attitude when I was at the North End Community Ministry. We did have a security policy for the staff, but when there were two or more staff there, the door was always open. We made it a place that was hospitable even for people that were inebriated or high on sniff. We took certain precautions, but they were always welcome.

One of these individuals is one of my constituents now and lives in the north end. Just the other day, he was walking down our back lane. He does this every day. He opens the garbage containers and takes out plastic bags, and he goes to a store on Salter Street and buys sniff products. I happened to be talking to one of my neighbours, and I said hello to him. This individual has a great sense of humour. He went back to the garbage bin and opened the lid and looked in, and was looking for me in the garbage bin. She said, do you know him? Because I called him by name. I said, yes, I have known him for about 10 years. He is a sniffer and this is what he is doing and this is where he is going. I have never been afraid of this individual. So I think attitude is very important.

I digress from Bill 19. I do have many articles here on homelessness, and I thank the staff of the Legislative Library for digging up many, many articles on mental health problems. Unfortunately, I did not have time to read them before I gave my speech, so I am not going to be able to use many of these, but the librarian's time was not entirely wasted, because I will put this in our file for other speakers on this bill.

Since I did not have time to read all these very interesting articles on mental health care and mental health reform and the area that particularly interests me, and that is the problem of mental health patients and former mental health patients who are homeless, I think with those remarks I will conclude now, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): As previously agreed, this matter will remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Committee Changes

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be amended as follows: the member for Sturgeon Creek (Mr. McAlpine) for the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey); the member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer) for the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 20—The Municipal Amendment Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), Bill 20 (The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités), standing in the name of the honourable member for Interlake (Mr. Clif Evans).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Is there leave that this matter remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 21—The Manitoba Medical Association Dues Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. McCrae), Bill 21 (The Manitoba Medical Association Dues Act; Loi sur la cotisation de l'Association médicale du Manitoba), standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Is there leave that this matter remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 23—The Manitoba Historical Society Property Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of

Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ernst), Bill 23 (The Manitoba Historical Society Property Act; Loi sur les biens de la Société historique du Manitoba), standing in the name of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Is there leave that this matter remain standing? [agreed]

Bill 24—The Waste Reduction and Prevention Amendment Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of

Environment (Mr. Cummings), Bill 24 (The Waste Reduction and Prevention Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réduction du volume et de la production des déchets), standing in the name of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Is there leave that this matter remain standing? [agreed]

Is it the will of the House to call it 12:30? The hour now being 12:30 p.m., this House now stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Monday, June 20.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, June 17, 1994

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports		Unemployment Insurance Commission Friesen; Manness	3699
Manitoba Builder Bonds Series II		Labour Force Strategic Plan Friesen; Manness	3700
Stefanson	3691	Income Security Program McCormick; Mitchelson	3700
L. Evans	3691	Economic Growth L. Evans; Stefanson	3701
Edwards	3691	Youth Unemployment Rate L. Evans; Stefanson	3701
Capital Program, Health McCrae	3692	Speaker's Ruling	
Introduction of Bills		Matter of Privilege—Minister's Comments Rocan	3702
Bill 26, Act to amend An Act to Protect the Health of Non-Smokers (2) McCrae	3692	Nonpolitical Statement	
Oral Questions		Winnipeg General Strike Martindale	3702
Health Care System Doer; McCrae	3692	Member's Statement	
AIDS Prevention Program Doer; McCrae	3693	Matter of Privilege—Minister's Comments Orchard	3703
Laboratory and Imaging Services Chomiak; McCrae	3694		
AIDS Prevention Programs Chomiak; McCrae	3695		
Public Health Services Chomiak; McCrae	3695		
Health Care System Edwards; McCrae	3695		
Community-Based Policing Mackintosh; Vodrey	3697		
Blood Transfusion Recipients Chomiak; McCrae	3698		
Training/Employment Creation Friesen; Manness	3699		
		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
		Debate on Second Readings	
		Bill 3, Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation Amendment Act Ashton	3705
		Bill 5, Highway Traffic Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act Lamoureux	3706
		Bill 19, Mental Health Amendment Act Martindale	3709