



**Fourth Session - Thirty-Sixth Legislature**

**of the**

**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report  
(Hansard)**

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



**Vol. XLVIII No. 71B - 1:30 p.m., Thursday, June 25, 1998**

ISSN 0542-5492

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

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

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 25, 1998

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

## PRESENTING PETITIONS

## Mining Reserve Fund

**Mr. Gerard Jennissen (Flin Flon):** I beg to present the petition of E. Fox, D. Scott, B. Fox and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba may be pleased to request the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Newman) to consider transferring the account of the Mining Reserve Fund to a banking service in Lynn Lake should such a facility meet provincial standards.

## Community VLT Plebiscites

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** I beg to present the petition of T. Bode, A. Peeling, D. Finnigan and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to consider permitting communities to hold plebiscites on VLTs, reducing gambling advertising and increasing funding for treatment of problem gamblers.

## READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

## Community VLT Plebiscites

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

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Madam Speaker:** Dispense.

*THAT in 10 years the current government has increased gambling revenues from \$55 million to more than \$220 million annually; and*

*THAT the introduction and the proliferation of video lottery terminals in virtually every licensed premises across the province has resulted in Manitoba having nearly 5,000 VLTs, the most per capita in the country; and*

*THAT gambling is now the Manitoba government's third largest revenue source behind only income tax and sales tax; and*

*THAT the provincial government doubled lottery advertising in 1996; and*

*THAT the Manitoba government has become more dependent upon gambling revenues than any other province; and*

*THAT the number of the tragedies involving people who have lost their savings homes and in some cases their lives following gambling addiction continues to grow; and*

*THAT the provincial government spends less than 1 percent of its VLT profits on gambling treatment programs; and*

*THAT the Manitoba Lottery Policy Review Working Group, amongst many others have requested that communities be allowed to hold plebiscites on banning VLTs as is allowed in Alberta and Saskatchewan.*

*WHEREFORE YOUR PETITIONERS HUMBLYPRAY THAT the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to consider permitting communities to hold plebiscites on VLTs; reducing gambling advertising and increasing funding for treatment of problem gamblers.*

**Madam Speaker:** I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), and it complies with the rules and practices of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read? No. Dispense.

*THAT in 10 years the current government has increased gambling revenues from \$55 million to more than \$220 million annually; and*

*THAT the introduction and the proliferation of video lottery terminals in virtually every licensed premises across the province has resulted in Manitoba having nearly 5,000 VLTs, the most per capita in the country; and*

*THAT gambling is now the Manitoba government's third largest revenue source behind only income tax and sales tax; and*

*THAT the provincial government doubled lottery advertising in 1996; and*

*THAT the Manitoba government has become more dependent upon gambling revenues than any other province; and*

*THAT the number of the tragedies involving people who have lost their savings homes and in some cases their lives following gambling addiction continues to grow; and*

*THAT the provincial government spends less than 1 percent of its VLT profits on gambling treatment programs; and*

*THAT the Manitoba Lottery Policy Review Working Group, amongst many others have requested that communities be allowed to hold plebiscites on banning VLTs as is allowed in Alberta and Saskatchewan.*

*WHEREFORE YOUR PETITIONERS HUMBLYPRAY THAT the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to consider permitting communities to hold plebiscites on VLTs; reducing gambling advertising and increasing funding for treatment of problem gamblers.*

#### **Independent Judicial Review Committee**

**Madam Speaker:** I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), and it complies with the rules and practices of the House. It is the will of the House to have the petition read?

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Madam Speaker:** Dispense.

*THAT an independent judiciary does not justify a total lack of public accountability; and*

*THAT the lack of public confidence and the level of frustration in our judicial system continues to grow.*

*WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba may be pleased to*

*advise the minister of the need to consider establishing an independent judicial review committee to report to the Legislature on ways in which our judicial system may better serve the public of Manitoba.*

Petition

### **PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

#### **Standing Committee on Law Amendments Seventh Report**

**Mr. Jack Penner (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments):** I would like to present the Seventh Report of the Committee on Law Amendments.

**An Honourable Member:** Dispense.

**Madam Speaker:** Dispense.

*Your committee met on Wednesday, June 24, 1998, at 3 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.*

*Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:*

*Bill 51—The Cooperatives and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur les coopératives et modifications corrélatives*

*Rudy Comeault, Manitoba Co-operative Council  
Michael Sinclair, Manitoba Pool Elevators  
Anders Bruun, Manitoba Pool Elevators*

*Your committee has considered:*

*Bill 51—The Cooperatives and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur les coopératives et modifications corrélatives*

*and has agreed to report the same with the following amendments:*

**MOTION:**

*THAT section 88 be struck out and the following substituted:*

**Application of The Securities Act****88(1) The Securities Act**

(a) applies to the sale or issue by a cooperative of securities of the cooperative where the securities may be issued or sold to the public; and

(b) does not apply to the sale or issue by a cooperative of

(i) membership shares of the cooperative, or

(ii) securities of the cooperative where the sale or issue of the securities is restricted to members of the cooperative and where only members of the cooperative are eligible to own the securities.

**Application of sections 89 to 91****88(2) Sections 89 to 91**

(a) apply to the sale or issue by a cooperative of

(i) membership shares of the cooperative, or

(ii) securities of the cooperative where The Securities Act does not apply to the issue or sale; and

(b) do not apply to the sale or issue of securities by a cooperative where The Securities Act applies to the issue or sale.; and

**MOTION:**

THAT section 304 be amended by renumbering it as subsection 304(1) and adding the following as subsection 304(2):

**Amalgamation with a body corporate**

**304(2)** A cooperative may enter into an amalgamation agreement with a body corporate for the purpose of amalgamating with that body corporate and

(a) continuing as one cooperative under this Act, if the resulting amalgamated cooperative would meet the requirements for a cooperative to be incorporated under this Act;

(b) continuing as a body corporate under another Act of the Legislature of Manitoba; or

(c) continuing as a body corporate under the laws of another jurisdiction;

if the body corporate is authorized to enter into the agreement by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the body corporate is incorporated.; and

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 305(1) be amended in the part preceding clause (a) by adding "under subsection 304(1)" after "amalgamate".; and

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 305(2) be amended by adding "under subsection 304(1)" after "two or more cooperatives".; and

**MOTION:**

THAT the following be added after subsection 306(6):

**Amalgamations under clause 304(2)(a)**

**306(7)** Section 305 and subsections (1) to (6) of this section apply, with necessary modifications, to the amalgamation of a cooperative and a body corporate for the purpose of continuing as one cooperative under this Act, as provided for in clause 304(2)(a), and, in this regard, a reference to "cooperative" in section 305 includes the body corporate.

**Further requirements**

**306(8)** An amalgamation agreement referred to in clause 304(2)(a) shall contain any information required by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the amalgamating body corporate is incorporated and shall be approved by the members of the amalgamating body corporate in accordance with the requirements of those laws.

**Amalgamations under clause 304(2)(b) or (c)**

**306(9)** Subject to subsection (10), clauses 305(1)(b) to (g), subsection 305(2) and subsections (1) to (6) of this section apply, with necessary modifications, to the amalgamation of a cooperative and a body corporate for the purpose of continuing as a body corporate under another Act of the Legislature of Manitoba, as provided for in clause 304(2)(b), or under the laws of

another jurisdiction, as provided for in clause 304(2)(c), and, in this regard, a reference to "cooperative" in section 305 includes the body corporate.

**Further requirements**

**306(10)** An amalgamation agreement referred to in clause 304(2)(b) or (c)

(a) shall contain any information required by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the amalgamating body corporate is incorporated and shall be approved by the members of the amalgamating body corporate in accordance with the requirements of those laws; and

(b) shall contain any information required by the Act under which the amalgamating cooperative and body corporate propose to continue.; and

**MOTION:**

THAT the following be added after subsection 317(1):

**Continuance and amalgamation**

**317(1.1)** If authorized by the members and shareholders of a cooperative in accordance with this section, and if made pursuant to an amalgamation agreement referred to in clause 304(2)(b) or (c) that is approved in accordance with section 306, an application for continuance under subsection (1) may include an application to the official or public body referred to in that subsection for a certificate of amalgamation.; and

**MOTION:**

THAT subsection 320(1) be amended

(a) in clause (c), by adding "clause 304(2)(c) or" before "section 307";

(b) in clause (e), by striking out "or 317" and substituting "or subsection 317(1)";

(c) by striking out "or" at the end of clause (e);

(d) by adding "or" at the end of clause (f); and

(e) by adding the following after clause (f):

(g) amalgamate with a body corporate under clause 304(2)(c) and apply for continuance under subsection 317(1.1).; and

**MOTION:**

THAT the following is added after section 397:

R.S.M. 1987, c. C223 amended

**397.1(1)** The Cooperatives Act, R.S.M. 1987, c. C223, is amended by this section.

**397.1(2)** Section 137 is amended by renumbering it as subsection 137(1) and adding the following as subsection 137(2):

**Amalgamation with a body corporate**

**137(2)** A cooperative may enter into an amalgamation agreement with a body corporate for the purpose of amalgamating with that body corporate and

(a) continuing as one cooperative under this Act;

(b) continuing as a body corporate under another Act of the Legislature of Manitoba; or

(c) continuing as a body corporate under the laws of another jurisdiction;

if the body corporate is authorized to enter into the agreement by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the body corporate is incorporated.

**397.1(3)** Subsection 138(1) is amended in the part preceding clause (a) by adding "under subsection 137(1)" after "amalgamate".

**397.1(4)** Subsection 138(2) is amended by adding ", in an amalgamation of cooperatives under subsection 137(1)," after "Where".

**397.1(5)** The following is added after subsection 139(5):

**Amalgamations under clause 137(2)(a)**

**139(6)** Section 138 and subsections (1) to (5) of this section apply, with necessary modifications, to the amalgamation of a cooperative and a body corporate for the purpose of continuing as one cooperative under this Act, as provided for in clause 137(2)(a), and, in

this regard, a reference to "cooperative" in section 138 includes the body corporate.

#### **Further requirements**

**139(7)** An amalgamation agreement referred to in clause 137(2)(a) shall contain any information required by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the amalgamating body corporate is incorporated and shall be approved by the members of the amalgamating body corporate in accordance with the requirements of those laws.

#### **Amalgamations under clause 137(2)(b) or (c)**

**139(8)** Subject to subsection (9), clauses 138(1)(b) to (g), subsection 138(2) and subsections (1) to (5) of this section apply, with necessary modifications, to the amalgamation of a cooperative and a body corporate for the purpose of continuing as a body corporate under another Act of the Legislature of Manitoba, as provided for in clause 137(2)(b), or the laws of another jurisdiction, as provided for in clause 137(2)(c), and, in this regard, a reference to "cooperative" in section 138 includes the body corporate.

#### **Further requirements**

**139(9)** An amalgamation agreement referred to in clause 137(2)(b) or (c)

(a) shall contain any information required by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the amalgamating body corporate is incorporated and shall be approved by the members of the amalgamating body corporate in accordance with the requirements of those laws; and

(b) shall contain any information required by the Act under which the amalgamating cooperative and body corporate propose to continue.

397.1(6) The following is added after subsection 147(1):

#### **Continuance and amalgamation**

**147(1.1)** If authorized by the members and shareholders of a cooperative in accordance with this section, and if made pursuant to an amalgamation agreement referred to in clause 137(2)(b) or (c) that is approved in accordance with section 139, an application for continuance under subsection (1) may include an application to the official body referred to in that subsection for a certificate of amalgamation.

397.1(7) Subsection 149(1) is amended

(a) in clause (b), by adding "other than under clause 137(2)(c)" after "cooperative";

(b) in clause (d), by striking out "section 147" and substituting "subsection 147(1)";

(c) by adding "or" at the end of clause (f); and

(d) by adding the following after clause (f):

(g) amalgamate with a body corporate under clause 137(2)(c) and apply for continuance under subsection 147(1.1).; and

#### **MOTION:**

THAT section 400 be struck out and the following substituted:

C.C.S.M. c. S50 amended

**400** Clause 19(2)(g) of *The Securities Act* is repealed and the following is substituted:

(g) securities

(i) to which sections 89 to 91 of *The Cooperatives Act* apply, or

(ii) that are memberships or shares issued by a cooperative entity, as defined in section 1 of *The Cooperatives Act*, for the purpose of qualifying a person or company as a member of the cooperative entity; and

#### **MOTION:**

THAT section 403 be struck out and the following substituted:

#### **Coming into force**

**403(1)** This Act, except section 397.1, comes into force on a day fixed by proclamation.

**403(2)** Section 397.1 comes into force on the day this Act receives royal assent.

**Mr. Penner:** I move, seconded by the honourable member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Tweed), that the report of the committee be now received.

#### **Motion agreed to.**

\* (1335)

### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

#### **Commission of Inquiry**

**Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Madam Speaker, I am wondering whether I might have leave of the House to make a motion establishing a commission of inquiry pursuant to *The Manitoba Evidence Act*.

**Madam Speaker:** Does the honourable Minister of Justice have leave? [agreed]

### Point of Order

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, just for clarification, that would be a debatable motion, I take it. If it is a debatable motion, I think that there would definitely be leave for it.

**Madam Speaker:** On the point of order raised by the honourable member for Inkster, it is a debatable motion.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Toews:** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), that this Assembly, for the purposes of subsection 83(3) of The Manitoba Evidence Act, assent to the issue of a commission to the Chief Electoral Officer under clauses 83(1)(d) and (f) of The Manitoba Evidence Act to inquire into and report on the alleged infractions of The Elections Act and The Elections Finances Act occurring during the period prior to and during the 1995 Manitoba general election in the electoral divisions of Dauphin, Interlake and Swan River, as set out in the attached proposed Order-in-Council. I have three copies.

### Motion presented.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Madam Speaker, I will not necessarily debate the motion right now, but I did want to see if I could have leave to pose a question to the minister just to give further detail, if we are asking Elections Manitoba through this motion to strike the inquiry or is it the government that is striking the inquiry. That would be the question if in fact there would be leave to allow that to occur.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there leave to permit the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. Toews) to provide clarification to the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux)? [agreed]

**Mr. Toews:** Madam Speaker, the proposal is to follow the requirements of Section 83 of the act which sets out a particular authority to a commissioner and in this matter the proposed draft in fact, if I could refer to that

proposed draft, is that the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Richard D. Balasko, be appointed as commissioner to inquire into and report on the alleged infractions. I trust that that answers the member's question.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** I move, seconded by the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that debate be adjourned.

### Motion agreed to.

## TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), I am pleased to table the 1997 Annual Report of the Manitoba Municipal Employees Benefits Board.

### Introduction of Guests

**Madam Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have this afternoon seven Grade 8 students from Ecole Viscount Alexander under the direction of Mr. Pat Bennett. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey).

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

\* (1340)

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Commission of Inquiry Judicial Commissioner

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, we are pleased that the government has moved forward with a commission of inquiry. We are pleased that the process is public, and we are pleased under The Evidence Act that people will give testimony under oath.

But when the Hughes Inquiry was called to deal with the Pollock affair dealing with allegations in the justice system, the government said, and I quote—and I am going from memory here: that it is important to get



somebody outside, somebody credible outside of the existing allegations to have and head the commission of inquiry. We think the logic of an election and allegations that are serious dealing with an election are of comparable, if not greater, but certainly at comparable authorities and ethics to deal and compel this Legislature, where the motion will be dealt with, to have a person outside of the initial investigation.

We certainly respect Mr. Balasko; he is head of Elections Manitoba, but a judicial inquiry or a judge experienced in this nature that is outside of the process is surely the next step that this Legislature has to take. So I would like to ask the Premier: why did he use one set of investigative authorities with Mr. Hughes with the Pollock affair, and why is he now using Elections Manitoba to, in essence, reinvestigate with more powers some of the matters that they have already concluded there were no allegations to be substantiated?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, the allegations that are being investigated are not ones against Elections Manitoba. They are allegations by people about the conduct of certain people in the last election campaign. Elections Manitoba is the independent body that has the integrity and the authority to deal with all complaints and all issues that are raised regarding the conduct of elections and election finances in our province.

They are the people who have the most familiarity with the act. They are the people who have the most knowledge about all of the nuances of elections and the manner in which they are to be conducted and the integrity with which they are supposed to be conducted. They are the people who have the greatest body of information and the greatest capability of conducting a thorough investigation.

It is not they who are being investigated or they who have been alleged in any way to have done anything wrong. It is, indeed, individuals against whom the allegations have been made, and that is the reason why I believe they are best positioned to do this investigation, to do this examination.

**Mr. Doer:** Madam Speaker, the Premier should refer back to the former Minister of Justice's press release

dealing with the allegations in the justice system. The courts were independent, the judges were independent, but the government and the Minister of Justice of the day did not appoint a judge here in Manitoba on issues of justice that were dealt with in the allegations against Mr. Harvey Pollock, because the issues dealt with independent Crowns, independent judges, the authority of the police, the laying of charges, the Minister of Justice, the Deputy Minister of Justice, the director of Prosecutions, and because they had already been dealt with in the court, the government appointed somebody external and credible to the first investigation to do the inquiry.

I would like to ask the Premier: why is not the integrity of an election, the very serious allegations arising out of these elections, why is that not worthy of the same outside, independent, credible review with an experienced judge, rather than a group of people who have already dealt with this issue once?

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, among other things, the assertions and the comments made by members opposite throughout the week have been to the effect that Elections Manitoba did not have the tools at the time to do the job that members opposite wanted. This commission of inquiry gives them the tools that the member opposite said were lacking. The allegation, of course, also was that there was a time limitation. This corrects that. There is no time limitation. It is the specific mandate to go all the way back into the 1995 election campaign and deal with it. Those are the issues that we are dealing with.

If the member opposite is saying that Elections Manitoba does not have the integrity or the independence to deal with this, then that is an issue that obviously the members opposite are going to have to deal with, but this is an entirely different circumstance to the one that the member is attempting to compare to. It is apples and oranges. In this particular case, we are looking for the people who can do the most thorough and the most credible job of investigation under the two acts that are relevant to it, and in our judgment, there is no one who has a greater capability of that than the Chief Electoral Officer.

**Mr. Doer:** Justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done. You have a body of people who are nonpartisan whom we respect, who have already dealt and dismissed allegations that are very serious. There have been very serious new allegations, not made only by members here but members of the public, Mr. Sutherland, \$4,913, today \$3 a vote. I do not know whether Elections Manitoba investigated these matters before. We do not know. What I do know is they did deal with all the matters that they had before them at the time and they dismissed them.

I think it is important to have the powers which we support, and we congratulate the government for moving forward with The Evidence Act and the powers of an inquiry, but from Monday on we have always asked for an outside credible person who is independent of the first investigation, independent of the first investigation to conduct an investigation on the new and very serious allegations.

Why can we not have the same review of the integrity of the electoral system and the credible outside review as we had in 1991 with the credibility of the justice system?

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, I think the member opposite makes my point. He has said over and over again that these are new allegations, and that is obviously why the Chief Electoral Officer is in a position now to deal with those new allegations because they have been made public and they were not made previously, and therefore he could not have investigated them previously.

Number 2, the members opposite said that he needed new and expanded tools, obviously the power to subpoena witnesses and to compel evidence under oath. Those have now been given to him, as members opposite called for all week, and, therefore, this is the appropriate vehicle and the most experienced and I would argue the most credible person to do the job.

#### **Commission of Inquiry Investigation—Cubby Barrett**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Madam Speaker, we have seen increasingly, as this week has come about, the full story is only just beginning to become apparent of what happened in 1995. While we certainly

welcome any inquiry, we want to make sure it is going to deal with the depth of the kind of activity, the corrupt activity, the kinds of actions we have seen now even today confirmed in the public conducted by senior officials, senior members of the Conservative Party in the last election.

I would like to ask the Premier whether this inquiry, for example, will look at the most recent allegation that Cubby Barrett, member of the PC Manitoba Fund, a key fundraiser, offered \$3 a vote to Mr. Sutherland for every vote he obtained as a Native Voice candidate, a campaign, by the way, that was also financed by Mr. Barrett, amongst others.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** That will totally be within the scope of this inquiry, Madam Speaker, and they will have the authority to do just that thing.

**Mr. Ashton:** Well, we now also have sort of confirmed by Mr. Barrett himself the fact that he passed money to Mr. Sutherland. I am wondering—

**Madam Speaker:** Question.

**Mr. Ashton:** —and I would ask the question to the Premier, whether this inquiry will look at whether indeed, as appears to be the case, Mr. Barrett, once again a senior Conservative fundraiser, passed the money to Mr. Sutherland to run this fraudulent campaign that was an attempt to split the vote in the Interlake constituency. Will that inquiry look at Mr. Barrett's role in passing money?

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, those allegations are absolutely within the scope of the commissioner to make that investigation and report.

\* (1350)

**Mr. Ashton:** I am wondering whether this inquiry will also consider whether there is any connection between Mr. Barrett's receiving a liquor licence in Cross Lake after the election, after having been involved with a plot to subvert the electoral process that involved allegedly people including Taras Sokolyk, the Premier's right-hand person and campaign manager. Will it look at the fact of whether Mr. Barrett received any political favours for his political favour to the Conservative Party in this last election?

**Mr. Filmon:** If any of those allegations are demonstrated to have a relevance to this particular investigation, it is certainly, as far as I am concerned, within the scope of the commissioner to investigate.

**Commission of Inquiry  
Judicial Commissioner**

**Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood):** Madam Speaker, I have been made aware of a witness who has sworn an affidavit placing Taras Sokolyk, Allan Aitken and Val Hueging at a meeting at PC election headquarters early in the election campaign, planning to recruit, run and support aboriginal candidates in the 1995 election. I have seen that affidavit. I believe it to be true.

Given that this witness, like Darryl Sutherland and Kim Sigurdson, has expressed concern, serious concern about personal safety and wants a full, open judicial inquiry, will the Premier now order that inquiry to be headed by a judge, an experienced person in law?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, I would hope that the member opposite would share all of that information with the commissioner. I know that, if there are issues of safety involved, he would certainly be sensitive to all of those matters and would handle this with the utmost credibility and the utmost discretion, as I believe he always has.

**Mr. Sale:** Madam Speaker, will the Premier not agree that the allegations made to date, including the ones that I have just referred to, involve matters of complex criminal law and involve matters of the elections acts but require the experience of someone who understands corruption, understands fraud, understands the Criminal Code and is familiar with how justice can be obstructed and how that can be pursued in the courts? We need a judge to head this inquiry.

**Mr. Filmon:** Of course the member should know that the commissioner would do as any commissioner with any background would do, and that is to avail himself of any legal expertise required in the matter to ensure that all the relevant issues with respect to Criminal Code or any other infractions will be dealt with.

**Mr. Sale:** Will the Premier not understand that the public of Manitoba and the people involved in this

case, vulnerable people, want a very broad scope for this inquiry that can include issues which may not at first blush seem to be specifically related to the election itself but may be related to planning to corrupt the election, may be related to rewards given pursuant to the election? Will they not understand that requires a broad scope and expertise which is not necessarily resident in Elections Manitoba?

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, I am sure that the Chief Electoral Officer, whose very existence depends upon his preserving the integrity of the electoral system in Manitoba and the credibility that he must maintain as well as the independence and the integrity that he portrays to the public, would be aware of any and all of those innuendos.

I trust that the Chief Electoral Officer would be as concerned with, if not more concerned than the member for Crescentwood, all those issues.

**Elections Manitoba  
Workload**

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Madam Speaker, the Premier, in an answer to an earlier question today, said that he felt confident that Elections Manitoba or the Chief Electoral Officer, who has now been given the role of commissioner in this investigation, could do a thorough job.

I would like to ask the Premier how he believes that the Chief Electoral Officer in this time frame between now and September 30 is able to do a thorough job while at the same time he is required under legislation to prepare and produce and make public a preliminary map for the new electoral boundaries; to take into account all of the presentations that have been made up to this date in preparing and producing that map; holding public hearings, which he has said he is going to do by the middle of September throughout the province dealing with the boundary map; and making a report to the government on the electoral boundaries, all the while preparing for a possible election under the new Bill 2 which undoubtedly will be passed before the end of this session.

Madam Speaker, how does he expect Elections Manitoba—

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The question has been put.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** The member opposite may know that the office of the Chief Electoral Officer has been considerably increased in staff in recent years and that he also has within his budget, within his capability, the ability to hire investigative personnel as well as legal personnel and any and all staff that he requires for this.

The member opposite should be aware that we would not be making this assignment to the Chief Electoral Officer if it were not our understanding from his office that they have the capability and the resources to do the job.

\* (1355)

**Ms. Barrett:** With absolutely no impugning of anything but the highest regard for the office of the Chief Electoral Officer and the person who holds that office, I would like to ask the Premier how he thinks that the Chief Electoral Officer whose additional people were hired to prepare for the new boundaries, the new maps and the implications of Bill 2 which will come into effect within 90 days of Royal Assent, which we expect to be within the next few days or weeks—he does not have the people to do this, and he should not be asked to be responsible for two hugely important things at the same time.

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, I can tell the member opposite that the government would not be asking the Chief Electoral Officer to do this if he were not of the view that he had the resources and he had all of the support to get the job done within the parameters. The matter has been canvassed with him, and we have been assured that he feels that the office and he have the capability of doing this assignment.

**Madam Speaker:** The honourable member for Wellington, with a final supplementary.

**Ms. Barrett:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Given that the Order-in-Council gives the—

**Madam Speaker:** Would the honourable member please pose her question.

**Ms. Barrett:** Given that the Order-in-Council—it is a phrase of the question. Given that the Order-in-Council allows the Chief Electoral Officer in his role as commissioner to expand the parameters of this investigation to wherever he feels it needs to go, how can the Chief Electoral Officer know if he has enough resources to do this by September 30 when he still has to deal with the Boundaries Commission and The Elections Act changes within 90 days of coming into effect? How can he know that?

**Mr. Filmon:** I find it preposterous, Madam Speaker, that the member for Wellington suggests that the Chief Electoral Officer does not know his job and does not know how to conduct these inquiries or investigations, does not have any idea of how much resources it will take and so on. I would suggest that he knows much more than the member for Wellington about his capabilities and the capabilities of his staff and resources.

#### **Chief Electoral Officer LAMC Meeting Attendance**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** My question is also for the Premier. Madam Speaker, there are two issues that we have at hand here: first, the issue is the very serious allegations that are being levelled against the government and the members or workers of the Conservative party, which should not be taken lightly whatsoever. The second issue is the integrity of the office of Elections Manitoba.

Given what has arisen over the last couple of days, I would again ask the Premier to acknowledge the need for the Legislative Assembly Management Commission to get together in an attempt to be able to deal with these issues that have been raised with the Chief Electoral Officer so that we can feel comfortable that not only are the resources there but also other concerns have been expressed in the last few days.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, I respect the member for Inkster's viewpoint on this. I think that he wants to be supportive of the Chief Electoral Officer and Elections Manitoba in this endeavour as in all endeavours. I know that yesterday, during concurrence debate, he expressed very strongly his support for the ability of Elections Manitoba to

carry out investigations and arrive at conclusions on this matter.

I would just say to him that, as I said yesterday, I do not want it to be seen that government or any party in this House is instructing the Chief Electoral Officer to come before a committee to do certain things. I will say this, and I am saying this publicly, that the Chief Electoral Officer, I believe, would come to ask to be heard by LAMC if he felt he needed more resources, and the Chief Electoral Officer knows that he can approach government if he is not in any way satisfied that he has the resources to carry out this mandate. That I am assured is not the case, but if indeed, in the course of the investigation more resources are required, financial or otherwise, I know that he would feel confident to come and receive those resources for this purpose, Madam Speaker.

\* (1400)

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Then, in part for those reasons, will the Premier acknowledge that we have to have an LAMC meeting? LAMC meetings have been cancelled in the past. We need to make ourselves available then, Madam Speaker, so that if in fact additional resources are necessary, there is a meeting.

My question to the minister is: will the Premier commit that we will in fact have a meeting of LAMC within the next number of weeks?

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, because LAMC is a nonpartisan consensus body of this Legislature, I have never even attended an LAMC meeting. I have certainly never got involved in scheduling meetings for LAMC. I have certainly never dictated what is on the agenda of LAMC, nor would I. So, as a consequence, I would suggest that the member go through the usual process of speaking with his colleagues, the government House leader (Mr. McCrae), the opposition House leader (Mr. Ashton), and talk about getting together to discuss some of these matters and perhaps inviting the Chief Electoral Officer, if that is his wish, to participate in discussions about something that he believes is relevant. Then I think it would be up to the Chief Electoral Officer as to whether or not he felt that that in any way constrained his independence or his ability to operate.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Then I go to the government House leader and ask the government House leader to acknowledge that there is a need for LAMC to meet. Will he agree with that and indicate to the House that he is prepared to see an LAMC meeting within the next few weeks?

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, the honourable member knows that the Provincial Auditor, the office of the Clerk of the Legislature, the provincial Ombudsman and Elections Manitoba have their dealings with this Legislature through the Legislative Assembly Management Commission. The meetings of that commission are handled in such a way that they are set by agreement between the members of that committee, and that is how that is done. If the Chief Electoral Officer, as the Premier has pointed out, has some requirement that he has not made known to us to this point, the honourable member knows full well that he is quite at liberty to approach the Speaker to see if issues related to his requirements could be placed on the agenda of LAMC. The Speaker would then inform the House leaders and it goes from there. It is all done as it has been done in the past.

#### **Commission of Inquiry Scope**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Madam Speaker, certainly for my part, and I think all members of the Chamber, I would like to commend all those individuals who had the courage in the last few weeks to come out and make public statements in order to have justice not only be done but seen to be done, and I commend their courage.

My question to the Premier with respect to the Order-in-Council that has been put before us for debate: can the Premier indicate—since the infractions referred to in the Order-in-Council or The Elections Act and The Elections Finances Act—whether or not the chief commissioner will have the opportunity to investigate offences or potential offences under the Criminal Code of Canada since it is not specifically referred to within the statute, within the O/C?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, I am advised that he can certainly confirm facts with respect

to what may be Criminal Code matters and that those matters would then have to be referred to RCMP or other police for the gathering of the evidence that would be required for charges to be laid. In the case of Criminal Code matters, it would not be the commissioner that would lay the charges, it would obviously be the law officers of the Crown based on relevant findings.

### Public Process

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** My next question, Madam Speaker, is it had been an insistence of our side—and the Premier said he was trying to respond to some of the issues—that this process be open and public. There is no reference within the Order-in-Council or otherwise that this is going to be an open and public process. Given the previous process and the powers under The Elections Act, can the Premier assure this House that this process will in fact be open and will be a public process?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** The conduct of the process will be in the hands of the commissioner.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, I mean, you have, on the one hand, one member saying that he fears for the safety of somebody who needs to be protected from the public; then, on the other hand, you are saying that it has to be out in the public where you would put him in jeopardy. This is preposterous. You cannot have it both ways.

The conduct would be in the hands of the commissioner, and the commissioner would obviously do his inquiries in such a fashion as to get to the bottom of all of the allegations and to come to the truth of the whole issue. In the end, he must make a public report of all his findings. That is to ensure that the public then knows the outcome of all of the allegations and of all of the information that he has investigated.

### Premier's Chief of Staff Leave of Absence

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Madam Speaker, my final supplementary to the Premier is: since the

Premier's assistant and chief of staff is one of the key figures in the entire issue, one of the key conspirators, or whatever term one wants to use in regard to this scandal, and since this individual is obviously in contact with the office of the Chief Electoral Officer, the very commissioner, what steps to guard the integrity of the Premier's Office is the Premier going to take with his assistant? Will he consider putting him on a leave of absence until these charges are dealt with in order to maintain the integrity of the Premier's Office?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Firstly, I can assure the member opposite that the individual whom he names would not have any contact with the office of the Chief Electoral Officer over the next period of time while this investigation is ongoing. That, I think, should cover the matter.

### Commission of Inquiry Scope

**Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns):** We hope that he has one important contact with the commission, Madam Speaker. It is a very important one and that is to be investigated.

*Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

To the Premier. The purpose of our request for a public judicial inquiry was to reestablish confidence in the electoral system of Manitoba because it is under a cloud. With that purpose in mind, I ask the Premier: why is it that the draft Order-in-Council restricts the commission to inquiring and reporting on alleged infractions of only two statutes, The Elections Act, The Elections Finances Act? Why does it not give a full scope, a broad scope, to the commission to look at matters of unethical conduct, which may not be illegal but may be wrong, very wrong, look at criminal matters, look at laws that should be created to ensure that, indeed, if these allegations are proven true, this never happens again?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, firstly, we have not restricted the ability of the commissioner to look at all issues that are relevant to this particular matter. I spoke earlier in response to the question of the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), and it may well be that there are Criminal Code matters that are identified as a result of these investigations.

Certainly, not only would the commissioner be able to refer those issues for the proper investigation for charges to be laid by the relevant police authorities, but also, of course, ultimately those matters would then be the subject of decisions by Crown attorneys and others.

So this is not in any way intended to restrict the ability to get to the bottom of any and all allegations that have been made on this matter.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Would the Premier not recognize that, indeed, does restrict the commissioner to look at whether there has been a breach of two particular provincial statutes? When we are concerned and Manitobans are concerned about unethical conduct, as well as illegal conduct, would he not recognize that this scope is not broad enough, and would he now agree to expand the scope to ensure a full inquiry?

**Mr. Filmon:** It is because we do not want the commissioner or any individual to be placed in a situation where there can be continuing innuendo for political gain by anybody, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that point 2 of the Order-in-Council says that nothing set out above shall be taken in any way as limiting the right of the commissioner, Richard D. Balasko, to petition the Lieutenant Governor in Council to expand the terms of reference to cover any matter that the commissioner may deem necessary as a result of information coming to the commissioner's attention during the course of the inquiry. The intent, of course, of that is that we cannot possibly anticipate anything that might come. If, in the end, he needs more time, that will be given. If he needs broader scope, that will be given. If he needs authority, that will be given for anything. That is the intent of that, and that is why we have set it up in this way.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am sure all members are aware the member for St. Johns is ready to ask his question. The honourable member for St. Johns, to pose his final question.

\* (1410)

**Mr. Mackintosh:** Since the purpose is to reestablish confidence in the electoral system, does the Premier not understand the conflict of this paragraph 2 that he relies

on, of the commissioner wanting to expand the scope because this is so restrictive, and who does he have to go and plead with? The Premier. He is going to go to the people being investigated to ask for an expanded scope. Would he not understand that that is inappropriate in this context?

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I assure you and every member of this Legislature that any request by the commissioner, Mr. Balasko, to expand his ability to do the complete investigation will be granted. The only difficulty we have is we cannot anticipate all of the possible eventualities. Members opposite, who wanted this before, are now trying to find ways to weasel out from under their commitments and their requests.

We are giving them what they asked for, and now they are trying to find ways to poke holes in it. Well, I can tell the member opposite this, that we are not interested in their cheap politics. We are interested in getting at the truth.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable member for St. Johns, with a new question.

**Mr. Mackintosh:** As I said, the purpose is to reestablish confidence in the electoral system. Unfortunately what has come to light is an investigation was conducted by Elections Manitoba into allegations three years ago, an investigation which failed, for whatever reason, to turn up and deal with some very serious aspects and important parts of the allegations and people who were key in any investigation, and we trusted those shortcomings of that investigation were in good faith, but something went wrong.

We ask the Premier now: will he not recognize at least that the scope of this inquiry is terribly restricted in that it does not allow for an investigation of the investigation done by Elections Manitoba to ensure that Elections Manitoba gets the confidence it needs and the confidence that we want the public to have in Elections Manitoba?

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, now the truth is coming out. What the members opposite are really saying is that they are investigating—wanting Elections Manitoba to be investigated. They are the ones who are making an allegation against a body that is set up to

have the integrity and the independence to be able to conduct elections in Manitoba without fear or favour from any influence of any political party, and they are suggesting now that somehow that body cannot do that.

The member opposite should get at the truth, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that is that it is their party that has put this forward as new information. That is the basis all week that they have been asking for this kind of investigation, this kind of commission of inquiry. It is not on the basis that the old information was not looked at; it is on the basis that the new information was available that they kept inquiring for this kind of investigation.

Well, it is now here. It is now here. The commission is here. It has the powers that you asked for. It has the ability to go back all the way to all those issues that have been raised, and it has the mandate to get to the truth, and that is precisely what it will do.

#### **Premier's Chief of Staff Leave of Absence**

**Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, three witnesses have implicated Taras Sokolyk in plans to corrupt the election process. They have made serious allegations.

Is it not reasonable that the Premier should ask Ms. Hueging and Mr. Sokolyk to step aside during this inquiry so that if indeed their names are cleared they will come back with dignity, and if indeed the allegations are proven then the consequences would follow? But they must not stay in office in the run-up to an election doing the jobs they are doing under an investigation, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think that we should be preached to about ethics and dignity by an individual who sat on this information for over five months and did not bring it to the House and did not bring it to the attention of the Chief Electoral Officer and did not bring it to anyone for whatever reasons. We will find out perhaps in the investigation.

I say that I believe we live in a democracy in which one of the principles is that a person is innocent until

proven guilty, and that is not the way in which we treat individuals in our society, by telling them that they have to step down because somebody has made an allegation. Until the allegation is investigated, until that allegation is dealt with, the individual is innocent until other information is provided.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Time for Oral Question Period has expired.

\* (1420)

#### **MEMBERS' STATEMENTS**

##### **Balmoral Elementary School**

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure of—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. Before the honourable member gets started, could I ask for honourable members who want to carry on conversations to do so in the loge or out in the halls. I am having great difficulty hearing the honourable member for Gimli.

**Mr. Helwer:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, this morning I had the pleasure of attending a ceremony to mark Balmoral Elementary School receiving the prestigious title of Earth School. The event marked the completion and recording of 1,000 environmental projects for the SEEDS program. Balmoral Elementary School becomes only the 100th school in Canada to achieve Earth School status from the SEEDS Foundation, and this is all the more impressive considering that Balmoral Elementary has been competing with much larger schools from across the country.

The SEEDS program is important because it helps motivate students and staff to take environmental action, and it encourages them to carry out projects that either communicate about the environment or enhance it directly.

Balmoral Elementary School completed its first Learners in Action project in 1992 when students took part in a Green Day in which they ate a garbageless



lunch and wore green clothing. Over the years, they took part in a wide variety of projects ranging from paper recycling to learning about ponds to making bird mobiles or to building robots from recyclable materials.

In a country with more than 15,000 schools, Balmoral Elementary School's achievement is truly remarkable. There are just over 100 Earth Schools in Canada and less than half a dozen here in Manitoba. I am pleased to add that another one of these schools is in my constituency, and that is the Stony Mountain School.

So I want to congratulate the students and staff at the Balmoral Elementary School for dedication to this project, and a special pat on the back should go to kindergarten teacher Brenda Margetts. She is affectionately known as "little earth worm" or "old mother earth." I know she has been a great source of inspiration and direction for this project.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

### Commission of Inquiry

**Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, if there is an eternal guide to human conduct it is written already: Seek ye the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

It is also written that all persons should be subject to some higher power. There is no power except from God, and the powers that be are ordained by God. But they are ordained and the judge, the ruler is ordained there to be a minister for the good of man and of society. If we do that which is good, then we shall have praise of the same, but if we do that which is evil, then we should be afraid because the judge beareth the sword not in vain.

No agency or institution instituted by man can be expected to act against itself. If Elections Manitoba, even if institutionally independent, is already involved in that process of questionable tampering with the election process, it cannot again reinvestigate itself. The same thing with a judge who has judged a case before. When new evidence comes up and there is a new trial, the same judge who had tried the previous decision will not be sitting there. It will be against his interest to do so. It will be another judge.

Therefore, with the greatest respect for Elections Manitoba and the person who happens to occupy the position of the office, it cannot investigate itself. It cannot reverse its own decision before. It has to be an independent judge outside of the government.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

### Seniors Month

**Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, this week I had the pleasure of attending a wonderful event at Assiniboine Park. As members of this House are aware, June has been proclaimed Seniors Month in Manitoba.

In recognition of Seniors Month, Seniors Day was held on Tuesday at Assiniboine Park. The Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Reimer) hosted a fun-filled morning for Manitoba seniors. Entertainment included line dancing demonstrations, bingos and singalongs, and everyone had a fantastic time. Participants were also invited to take part in nature walks through the park, and a tour of the Leo Mol Gardens and the Conservatory.

I had the opportunity to meet some very dynamic individuals. Seniors contribute immensely to the fabric of our society through the work they do. Moreover, the foresight and work of seniors in our province has contributed immeasurably to the quality of life we enjoy today. I hope all seniors across Manitoba have had an opportunity to enjoy the activities that were held in honour of Seniors Month.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask all members of the House to join me in applauding the efforts of seniors in Manitoba for the contributions they make to our communities. Thank you.

### Joan Wiebe

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** I am pleased to rise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and draw attention of members in this Chamber to an event that occurred this past weekend in my community. I was pleased to participate with the Transcona division of the Girl Guides of Canada who were organizing a benefit, a pancake breakfast, to help raise funds for a guider, Joan

Wiebe, who has been a long-time resident of Transcona, and has been a guider for approximately 10 years.

Recently Joan was diagnosed with Usher Syndrome. This syndrome affects one's hearing and vision. Joan has been impaired since childhood. Recently her sight has started to diminish, and she has been diagnosed with RP, Retinitis Pigmentosa. Joan has an opportunity to go for an eye operation to help preserve her current vision; however this operation is only performed at a clinic in Cuba. The operation and travel expenses will be over \$6,000 and are not covered by Manitoba health services.

This fundraiser was an overwhelming success in that over 400 residents of the community of Transcona attended the pancake breakfast, and it was quite a success in that the fundraising effort achieved some \$1,700 towards the \$6,000 cost for Joan. We congratulate the organizers of this fundraiser breakfast, and we wish Joan well with her operation and travels to Cuba, and we hope that she is able to stall the progress of this particular disease. Thank you to the organizers of this event, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

#### Commission of Inquiry

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** I did want to just add some comments, listening to what the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos) was talking about. I know the member for Broadway gives a great deal of thought to issues of this nature, and it was interesting in hearing his response.

I would suggest to the member for Broadway, amongst other members of the caucus, the concern that I raised today in Question Period. The one of the two issues, I think, do need to be dealt with separately, that you cannot on the one hand suggest an independent or a judicial inquiry into what has occurred while, at the same time, not call into question the integrity of the office of Elections Manitoba.

That is the only real concern that I have with the position that the New Democrats seem to be taking on this issue. I think there is a lot of legitimacy in terms of the allegations that they have raised that cause a great

deal of concern. I applaud their caucus in bringing the issue and aggressively pursuing it as they have.

What I would appeal to is to be very careful when we talk about the integrity of Elections Manitoba and its office. I think, in the long term, what we want to do is we want to restore or add as much credibility or confidence, public confidence, to the Elections Manitoba office. Far too often there is a small percentage of the population base that discredits any aspect of politics, whether it is Elections Manitoba, whether it is politicians, and I say that just as a word of caution in some of the things that might be happening later today.

#### Committee Changes

**Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas):** I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh) for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk); Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) for Flin Flon (Mr. Jennissen) for Thursday, June 25, 1998, for 3 p.m.

**Motion agreed to.**

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson) for the member for River Heights (Mr. Radcliffe); the member for Pembina for the member for Gladstone (Mr. Rocan).

**Motion agreed to.**

\* (1430)

#### MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

##### Comprehensive Physicians Resource Plan

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on this occasion to exercise my right to express a grievance in the House, and that is specifically with regard to the inadequate supply of

doctors in my constituency, indeed the city of Brandon and indeed the entire Westman area.

As members may know, a rally was held about a month ago, in fact on May 25 in the Keystone Centre at Brandon, which was attended by well in excess of 500 people, who I might add responded to an ad, one ad in the paper one time to come to this meeting, and with no additional effort on my part to speak of we had this overwhelming attendance.

*Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

Mr. Acting Speaker, on that occasion I announced that I would have a petition for members of the community to sign, and indeed we distributed the petition to those at the rally. I left them with the attendees to see whether they would care to sign the petition and get others to do so. I guess we mentioned it once I think in the press, maybe twice in the press since then by way of news, not an ad. Lo and behold, we received over 2,000 signatures, and they are still coming in.

We have over 2,000 people, I am sure of every political stripe, who have taken the time to sign these petitions, so well over 2,000. They are still coming in, and, as I said, essentially unsolicited with no organized effort on my part or any of my assistants to attempt to collect these. I believe what this does, along with the large attendance at the rally, is to indicate to the government and to all of us the depth of concern and the seriousness of the problem of inadequate doctor supply.

It does indicate that people are very concerned. In fact, I would go so far as to say, Mr. Acting Speaker, that there is fear among people that they will not get the medical services they require. I have had many phone calls. We have had letters. People raising the problem of just simply not being able to obtain a doctor. Indeed, at the rally there was one person who works in a clinic, I believe it was the Brandon Clinic, who said, in fact asked the question of the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik): what are you going to do about ensuring that we can have doctors? Because she maintained that she had dozens of people coming to her daily and weekly to ask to see a doctor, and she had to refuse them. She said that we do not have any doctors available to treat

you or to deal with your problem or your ailment or your illness. It is simply the fact.

This lady was one of dozens and dozens of people who lined up at the microphone during the evening. We had about a two-and-a-half-hour session, and most of that time there were people from the community asking questions of the Minister of Health, who was on a panel then, along with, I might add, the official opposition Health critic, plus the chairman of the Regional Health Authority of Brandon, plus the representative of the Manitoba Nurses' Union, and also a Dr. J. Duncan representing the Manitoba Medical Association. So we had a panel of five. Many of the questions were addressed to the Minister of Health, and this was one of many questions.

Obviously, there was a question about the lack of obstetricians and pediatrician services. Many questions were asked by women who were expecting a child, very concerned about what they were going to do when it was time for the baby to be born. But it was beyond that. We had senior citizens come to the mike. We had ordinary citizens asking: what are you going to do about the supply of doctors? As I said, there was this one person who worked for a particular clinic in Brandon saying and having to tell people, sorry, we do not have any doctors for you. We do not have any doctors to refer you to, and so it is just not a matter of lack of specialists because that is a concern too. We have lost dermatologists, ear, nose and throat people in the past and others.

Of course, the whole question of pediatricians was a major issue in the last couple of months, but it is beyond that. It is simply a matter of general physicians, general practitioners not being available, and they are not available because some have simply decided to leave the community to go elsewhere, and some have decided to retire. For these reasons we do not have the supply.

*Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*

Now this petition that I was hoping to hand to the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik) today but obviously cannot, I can and do so for obvious reasons to members of the House, but I will certainly see that he gets the message from these 2,000-plus people from the

Westman area, that they want the government to implement a Comprehensive Physicians Resource Plan to recruit and retain doctors in Brandon, because that is part of the petition. I might add the other part of the petition dealt with urging the government to enter into third-party binding arbitration with the Manitoba Medical Association, but that was done by the government, and I congratulate the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik) for finally moving in that direction.

But the other part of the petition is what we want some action on. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not as though this is a new item that we should rationally try and plan to get more doctors in Manitoba outside of Winnipeg. In fact, I have before me or with me a letter dated June 9 co-signed by Dr. Ian Goldstine and Roberta Ellis, who is associate deputy of the Department of Health to the Minister of Health, saying, on behalf of the Manitoba Medical Services Council, we are pleased to provide you with recommendations regarding the Comprehensive Physicians Resource Plan.

The letter goes on to refer to the fact that on May 22, 1996, his predecessor, the former Minister of Health, instructed the Manitoba Medical Services Council to establish a working group to review, assess and if feasible develop an action plan for the implementations of specific recommendations contained in the Comprehensive Physicians Resource Plan as recommended by the Manitoba Medical Services Council on March 16, 1996. I am reading partly from this letter.

But the fact is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no action was taken on these recommendations. There were various recommendations to ease the shortage of doctors outside of Winnipeg. The working group dealt with four recommendations, including fee differentials, the fact that there should be financial incentives for people in remote areas and rural areas as required. The report itself, I have a copy of the working group report. It is entitled Working Group on Physicians Resources, the draft report to the Manitoba Medical Services Council, where they delineate in some detail a point system for setting fees in the various areas of the province, an incentive scheme. A lot of thought has been given this by very expert people.

Secondly, there is some reference to relocation allowances, to allow doctors to easily move out of Winnipeg or wherever they are in Canada to that particular community. Also suggested was extending a loans program for medical students and to do more by way of attracting medical students who were born and raised in rural Manitoba and to provide particular incentives for them, also to provide for more incentives for women to come into medical school at the University of Manitoba to be trained as doctors and to be available in the various communities. So those are some of the suggestions. So, in a way then, perhaps we are beating our head against a brick wall because this is not a new idea to have a Physicians Resource Plan, but it is an idea that has not been acted upon.

\* (1440)

Now I know the minister has stated that doctors have been recruited from South Africa, and there were a number coming to Manitoba to fill different positions around the province. That is fine and I have no problem with that. I understand the South African doctors meet our standards, and we have no difficulty in easily accepting them and integrating them into the medical services community in the province of Manitoba. In fact, there may be doctors from other countries as well.

But we do know that in our midst are several doctors—I do not know, 20 or 30, there are quite a number of doctors—who have actually resided in Manitoba for some time but for whatever reason are not accepted by the Manitoba College of Physicians and Surgeons because apparently they have not met a certain standard. I ask myself why cannot these people be given an opportunity to upgrade or do whatever they have to by way of training and retraining at the School of Medicine at the University of Manitoba to bring them up to standard.

In fact, I met one individual myself, a young woman who is from Latin America, very articulate, very bright, very frustrated because she could not practise medicine in Manitoba. She loved Manitoba, and she wanted to stay in Manitoba. She was prepared to go anywhere in Manitoba, but she was not allowed to do so because of particular restrictions. But she would be a great candidate for upgrading, retraining or whatever to fulfill this need.

But there is a problem of bringing in doctors from South Africa or from wherever they may come, and that is they may not necessarily stay. You cannot require people to stay the rest of their lives in a particular community or indeed in the province of Manitoba. Probably the best you can do is about two years. Unfortunately, the experience has been, over the years, that many such doctors do not stay in those communities. They come, they stay there a year or two and they go. I know of some specific examples in one town at least where that was the case, one town in western Manitoba. A very good doctor came but left after a year or two.

This is a problem that has been identified by other doctors in Manitoba. In fact, I noticed that the director of the Brandon Regional Health Authority has stated also that his best supply of doctors are those who come who are indigenous to Manitoba, they are from Manitoba or from Canada. Those are the ones who are likely to stay and not simply come for a year or two and then take off. This is a legitimate concern out there. So I do not think the minister's enthusiastic announcement of bringing in doctors from South Africa is essentially the solution to a lack of adequate medical services.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the people who signed, the over 2,000 people who signed this—I would say, if we had an organized campaign, this could be double. It could be 4,000 or it could be 5,000 or it could be 6,000, but 2,000, surely, of people, real people out there who are really concerned should get the minister to be a little more serious, a lot more serious about this whole matter of physician supply.

So I suggest look at the old plan, but perhaps a better plan can be provided, a new plan can be provided, but not only do we want a plan, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we want action. It is easy for us to sit here and talk in generalities, but if you talk to the individuals who have been denied medical services because there is not a doctor available, who are afraid how they are going to manage—in fact, I know of one person who is leaving Brandon for that very reason, because of the inadequacy of a supply of doctors.

So there is a very serious situation. Unfortunately, I cannot give this today to the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik) as I would have, but I am going to ensure that

he does get it in the near future, plus any other additional petitions that come in.

I know my time is nearing the end, very close to the end, so I just want to conclude by publicly thanking in this Legislature all the people who took the time to read the petition and to sign it and to forward it to us, to help convince the Minister of Health, to help convince the doctor, that this is a serious problem, that we need action and we need action now. Thank you.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY (Continued)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker (Marcel Laurendeau):** What we will do is Committee of Supply will resume sitting.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Acting Government House Leader):** I am advised that it would be a productive and, indeed, brilliant idea if the House now dissolved itself into a Committee of Supply to consider the Supply to Her Majesty.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I thank the acting government House leader. The committee will now resume in the Committee of Supply.

\* (1450)

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

#### Consideration of Concurrence Motion

**Mr. Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau):** Order, please. The Committee of Supply has before our consideration the motion concurring in all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Chairperson, I would be more than happy to ask a few questions to the minister who made himself available to have some questions asked of him. One of those issues which come up every day it seems when you drive by—[interjection] No, not the banks, gas prices actually. Whenever you drive by a gas station, there is always this concern that is out there, and I know the government, at least in the past, has talked about well, it is doing what it can to monitor the issue. I think even

in the past they have blamed Ottawa for this one too, and that is what the current status is with respect to gas prices in the province of Manitoba. If I can get the minister just to give some thoughts on what his department or what the government believes is out there in terms of the setting of gas prices. I know at one time—I think it was Minister Ernst got fairly peppy one day and a little upset and said that he was going to do what he could. He was going to take it to Ottawa and so forth.

My question to the minister is what in fact has this government done, or has it done anything, to look at the whole issue of allegations or concerns with respect to things such as pump fixing.

**Hon. Mike Radcliffe (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Chairman, I would be more than pleased to respond to the honourable member's question. In fact, I can advise my honourable colleague that my research department is monitoring gas prices, has been monitoring gas prices under a specific model for I think probably over 10 years, but in fact I have looked at gas prices, I have looked at this information and I have access to this information on a weekly basis.

The government of Manitoba, in fact, monitors the price of retail gas in Winnipeg, in a number of the smaller urban centres across the province of Manitoba, watches the price of gas in comparison to the price at the pump in Grand Forks and also in other urban centres across Canada so that we can ascertain whether there is a particular rise or drop in prices in our centres in Manitoba in reference to other centres.

I have also researched the issue with a number of experts on the matter. I have interviewed a number of officials from the gas companies, from the association that purports to represent the gas companies. They tell me that there are a number of components that go into forming the price for retail pricing that we have at the pump or the bowser.

In fact, part of it is the actual price of the commodity itself and then secondly is the pass-through price, which is the price of transportation, the conveyance of the commodity from the wellhead where it is produced or from the port where it has been conveyed from abroad to the ultimate destination.

There are some interesting ramifications to this whole field of information as well in that from time to time one will observe that the price of petrochemical fuel will be cheaper in Toronto than it is in Winnipeg, even though Winnipeg is closer to the wellhead than Toronto obviously. So there is a component here of what they call the pass-through price. So the retailer is obliged to seek an ultimate price, a specific price which covers his overhead, which is the cost of doing business. So if there is a larger market with which the retailer can deliver the product, then the price per unit can be lower, and he can still obtain the same overall benefit.

So this is an interesting concept. This is, I think, a very rational explanation for how the prices vary. I have been convinced that the retail commodity, the retail pricing of gasoline is highly competitive. What gives truth to that issue, I think, is that, when you see a price war going on, I think each merchant leans out the window, looks down the street, hears there is a price war and automatically drops his price. [interjection] Oh, I am getting some abuse from some of my colleagues, but—

**An Honourable Member:** We are right behind you, Mike.

**Mr. Radcliffe:** That is right, all the way. Further, I can advise that I was at a ministers' conference last fall in Regina when this very issue was put on the table. My counterpart from Toronto, Mr. Tsubouchi, was trying to make some headlines and get some ink, alleging that there were some sort of nefarious transactions occurring in the province of Ontario and in the city of Toronto.

There was a year-long report undertaken or investigation undertaken by the federal committee of combines, I think it was, or anticompetition. The bottom line they reported to us was that in fact they were unable to ascertain that there was any collusion, combining or improper pricing behaviour amongst any of the oil companies in Canada.

This was the might and the force of the federal government at work here who was doing an inquiry under the colleagues of the honourable member opposite, your federal counterparts who reported this to us.

I think that one has to study the whole concept of the commodity market. The commodity market can be cocoa beans, it can be soya, it can be anything you want. In this case it happens to be petrochemical ethyl gasoline. So the price per barrel plays a part in the whole thing, the cost of transporting the petrochemical through the pipeline, and then you have to look at the ultimate cost for the producer, for the retailer, in their particular market.

I am told by a number of retailers—and they are all consistent in telling me this—that, in fact, now, many of the means by which they make a reasonable profit margin is not from the delivery of the commodity but rather all the extras, the add-ons that they furnish in a particular filling station, be it washing your car or selling soda pop or doing mechanical work, things of this nature. So this is the state of the knowledge that we have to date. We are continuing to monitor it because of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs must maintain vigilance to protect the consumer in Manitoba. We have a research analyst in my department who watches this on a regular basis, and I could tell you far more on this and I would be delighted to on another occasion, Mr. Chair, but I think that would suffice for the moment.

\* (1500)

### Point of Order

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Chairperson, with your indulgence and that of the honourable member and the minister, I have a wee point of order for you. I think that there might be leave for this committee to recess for a couple of moments, and we could perhaps have you resume the Chair, so that we can make an announcement.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is there leave of the committee that we recess for just a couple of moments to deal with some House business? [agreed]

The committee will recess for a couple of minutes.

### IN SESSION

**Mr. Deputy Speaker (Marcel Laurendeau):** The House will come to order.

### House Business

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I have a matter of House business to raise with you. To accommodate the business of the House and the various parties in the House, I would be announcing that the Law Amendments committee, previously scheduled for 3 p.m. to deal with Bill 46, would be postponed until 4 p.m. to deal with Bill 46.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Okay, so Law Amendments called for three o'clock will now take place at four o'clock.

**Mr. McCrae:** With thanks to all concerned, I might suggest that the Deputy Speaker resume his position as Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I thank the government House leader. We will now resume Committee of Supply.

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (Continued)

#### Consideration of Concurrence Motion

**Mr. Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau):** The Committee of Supply has before it for our consideration the motion concurring in all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Just to continue the dialogue, at least for a bit here anyway, Mr. Chair, I can recall over 20 years ago when I was pumping petro, actually for a Turbo station, we used to sell it for 51 cents a gallon, and today I think that it is well over 50 cents a litre. I remember actually even when they made the conversion.

But, anyway, what I can recall in my younger years is that we used to have huge line-ups for gas. There was this great, huge fear that we were going to be running out of gas, and what happened was the price of gas started to go up, and it was fairly significant jumps. I do not know the exact amount. The actual dollars is going to be wrong, but the idea should be relatively close to being accurate.

Back then, you would have, for example, a barrel of petroleum at \$30, and everyone was projecting that it was going to be going much higher. You could watch TV news or the media reports, and you would see these huge line-ups and people really concerned about the potential crisis that was looming. Automobile manufacturers were giving more attention to wanting to come up and develop vehicles that would go further on less gas type thing or better gas mileage, Mr. Chairperson.

You compare that to today when there does not appear to be, or there is very little concern of the earth running out of gas or petroleum, per se. At least you do not see the same sort of panic and crisis situation that was back then, but what you also see is a substantial decrease in the cost of that particular commodity, and significant. So back 20 years ago, the price of gas was, you know, 50 cents a gallon. Today, it is well over 50 cents a litre.

Governments, and particularly this government, will say that it has not increased gas prices. The federal government has not increased gas prices nowhere near in the same type of increments that were there. [interjection] No, no, they are taxes, I am sorry. You know, they have not increased their tax portion on the regular unleaded gasoline prices, generally speaking. I have had discussions with reps. I have had to make my local calls, and I end up in Calgary where I am talking to—let me tell you, these individuals can articulate and they can articulate quite well. They try to ensure that in fact there is plenty of competition that is out there, that we have nothing to fear, and they make reference to the different processes like you have the cost of the commodity, the piping cost, the big bad government taxes being applied and so forth. Every so often—I do not know if it is every month—across my desk I will see a report that the petroleum industry provides, where it gives somewhat of a breakdown.

Being somewhat of a skeptic with respect to gas prices, but a healthy sceptic, I am somewhat suspicious. I think that there are a good number of politicians who are somewhat suspicious, and I really have not seen, in my opinion at the very least, be made available some sort of breakdown of where those increases actually have gone over the years. So, for example, I was pumping gas back in I think it would have been 1972 at

the 51-cent-a-gallon rate and as the price of gas has gone up, where has that price actually gone to? Because we know one thing for sure, the cost of the commodity has not gone up. So there has been a lot of other things that have gone on.

I once can recall having a debate with an interesting chap who is a truck driver, and he was saying a couple of points. He said, you know, you could drive gas down south, Canadian gas, and that gas is being sold substantially less than what we purchase gas here, and that is even after you factor in the taxes that we apply, Mr. Chairperson. So many Americans, according to this particular driver, and he hauled petro—

**An Honourable Member:** They are taxing it and they are taking the money and not paying for our roads.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Well, that is another issue, and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and I talked about that to a certain degree yesterday. But for now, this particular petroleum truck driver—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. I hate to call the honourable member to order on this matter, but I am having great difficulty hearing you. If there are members on this side who want to inform the member, they might want to wait until they have been recognized by the Chair, and then they will have the opportunity if they are sitting in their chairs.

The honourable member for Inkster, to conclude.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Chairperson, the point is this particular petroleum truck driver had indicated to me that he would bring gasoline down to the States where, in fact, it would be sold for a lesser amount than what we pay here in the province of Manitoba, and that is even after you would apply the provincial and federal taxes that we apply to the gas here.

He also made the comment that even if you applied the taxes—now this discussion happened a couple of years ago. Unless things have changed quite dramatically down South, the example he had given me—and I did not have the resources to investigate it and make a full report on it or anything of this nature.



That is the reason why I bring it up. Maybe the minister can correct me on this. What he was saying was the gas, if you went there and you bought gas from that particular pump and you applied our provincial and federal taxes to that pump price, you could still get a better deal on Canadian gas than what we would be paying north of the border.

Now this was someone that was a fairly experienced truck driver. He has been hauling for a good number of years. He no longer stops by our local McDonald's, so I have not engaged him quite a while. I thought that was kind of an interesting point. What I would be interested in seeing, and I would suggest to you that other members of this Chamber would be interested in seeing, would be the type of incremental increases over the years of where those pennies for litres, a penny on a litre compared to, let us say, four cents on a gallon in the days in which I was pumping the stuff, it is fairly significant. One penny adds up awfully quickly, Mr. Chairperson. Where that money has gone, this individual—because I posed the question like, you know, could it be back then, and we continued the discussion. He said, well, do you know that in Canada compared to other countries that we likely have more gas stations per capita than any other country in the world?

\* (1510)

You know, you drive around. There are always gas stations relocating. [interjection] No, I do not necessarily think it is competition when you have a Petro Canada closing down here and reopening here and that sort of shifting around. I do not know to what degree the costs are there. I think that the governments—and it implies more than just the provincial government here—other provincial jurisdictions, the national government, that we have to be a little bit more, I believe, aggressive with these gas companies. That is why I posed the question. The opportunity was there when the minister asked me some questions. I thought here is a question that was sitting in the back of my mind for a while.

Now that he is there, I pose the question because I would ask specifically: can the minister in his department provide for the MLAs inside this Chamber some sort of a listing of incremental increases towards

gasoline? That would include information, because he has met with the big petroleum companies. They will provide him with the information, I am sure, upon request. He has the expertise in which he can maybe review and find out the legitimacy of some of those numbers and provide us in the last decade, let us say, where the increases have actually come from. That would include the provincial tax, the federal tax and so forth.

On somewhat of a related area—because it was suggested from the seat from one of the government members—about the federal gasoline tax not going towards roads, I think there is some legitimacy towards that particular question. You know something? I would ask the minister: can he assure us that every dime of provincial tax that is raised from gasoline—without conferring with his ministers, if, in fact, he can maybe answer this question first—if every cent of provincial tax raised on gas is put directly back into roads? Without conferring and getting any assistance from his ministers, Mr. Chairperson, I await his quick response to that. Hopefully, no one is going to tip him off on it because I am sure that this government is maybe throwing some rocks at glass houses on that particular issue.

**Hon. Mike Radcliffe (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my honourable friend opposite has asked that question, because that gives me the opportunity to respond and say that I have made the observation over the few years that I have had the wonderful experience to represent the people from River Heights in this Chamber, in this government, that when one is assigned a particular responsibility, one does one's best to study the exigencies of that issue and the parameters of that issue, and when a politician strays beyond the area of the discipline to which he has been assigned, that often that particular politician or minister can do some strange things and make some strange answers which can implicate him in an area where he does not want to be.

So I would suggest with the greatest of respect that the honourable colleague opposite has raised an issue which more properly belongs under the expertise of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson). The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs would—it would be totally presumptuous of me, it would be totally

presumptuous of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to make any comment or any aspersion or any reference to an area which is properly the expertise of the Minister of Finance.

I must tell my honourable colleague opposite—because that is one of the wonderful things about the Filmon government, that this is truly a team. Everybody is assigned a particular area of responsibility, and it is an interlocking, mutually supportive group of individuals. While I am sure my honourable colleague has seen that we all come from very disparate backgrounds and we have different educational levels, we have different monetary levels, we have different experiential levels, but this government has been able to effect such an interrelation of individuals with our interdependent skills that we are, in fact, one seamless stream of consciousness. That is why the good people of Manitoba have chosen over this last decade to continually return us to the responsibility of leading government in Manitoba. [interjection]

All right, well, now, Mr. Chairman, I have just received an indication from my honourable colleague that I have satisfied his query with regard to the issue of tax and roads and the interlocking responsibilities. I, too, would respond now to the other comments of my honourable colleague where he was reflecting back on his recollection of the '70s and the price of gas and the panic that was striking the populace of Manitoba. I can remember even holidaying in the United States where the speed on the freeways was dropped and where in some of the inner cities in larger centres in the United States people were shot by other motorists when they were lining up for gasoline at the gas stations. I mean, there was a curious social phenomenon that swept through America at that point in time, and Canada I do not think was any exception. But my honourable colleague did allude to the fact, quite properly, that 50 cents on every dollar, 50 cents on every dollar spent at the pump goes to tax—goes to tax—and the oil companies would tell us that. [interjection]

Mr. Chair, the Liberal members who sit in this Assembly today and those who allude to the fact that they have some sort of connection with the Liberal Party are all honourable colleagues and individuals in whom we have the highest regard, but I can only point

to the nefarious activities of a former Prime Minister of Canada who came from the province of Quebec, who tried to take over the management of the petrochemical industry and tried to nationalize and impose price control on energy, and it was a complete and utter bullocks.

The federal government of the day had to abandon that process, and that only goes to show that ultimately the free market forces are the only real true forces that can truly pay for and bring a commodity and a service to market. We must never abandon that position. We must monitor them. I commend my honourable colleague for his natural and innate suspicion, and that belies a real concern for the public and for the consumer of Manitoba. I would like to put on the record that I had great hopes for the aspirations of my honourable colleague opposite when he was making a bid for leadership of the Liberal Party in Manitoba, because I felt that he would have brought the Liberal Party to a new threshold.

I want to put a salient fact on the record here for the benefit of members opposite that with regard to the pricing of the actual commodity, if one removes the tax component out of the retail price of gas, if one factors in the CPI index, the price that the oil company is getting today I have been told is in fact on a par with what it was getting 20 years ago and 30 years ago. When my honourable colleague has been asking what has happened, where is the money going, one can look to the fact of inflation in our economy. One can look to the fact of what are wages today for the workers at the pump. What are the wages today for the muckers at the wellhead? What are the wages today for the people who work for the pipelines, and how are they in relation to the actual prices that we pay for our goods and services?

\* (1520)

I can remember back when I was in second year arts and studying money and banking, and one of the—I think it was Ruben Bellan who—now, I do not necessarily hold to all his political theories or any of his economic theories. He tried to dispense a Keynesian top-down economic theory. What he did tell me was that, and what I firmly believe, the whole economy is interdependent. So when collective agreements go up,

and I see the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) is listening very carefully to my remarks and I am sure I hope this will be elucidation for him, that in fact as soon as the collective agreement drives up the price of the wages of the worker in the street, that will have a domino effect through the economy, and that only succeeds in fuelling the inflation. I can remember back to the days of Lester B. Pearson, Lester Bowles Pearson, with the firemen's strike on the CPR. He was—

**An Honourable Member:** A fine railway.

**Mr. Radcliffe:** And a fine railway it is, says one of my colleagues. [interjection] Well, some people say that; but he caved in. He started the ever increasing spiral of inflation in this country to which we have all been prey. I think that the federal government has a large answer to respond as to why our currency has been debased, why today our currency is only worth 68 cents on the dollar to the American dollar. [interjection] That is right. Back in the days when John Diefenbaker was Prime Minister of this country, our currency was on a par with the American currency.

So it is a very complex issue, but, Mr. Chair, I would urge the member opposite to remember my words that if you remove the price of the tax on this commodity, if you factor in the consumer price index, the actual price of the commodity is on a baseline with what it was historically. Further, if you use the model which we rely on and which I think was—I am told and I say this in a very hushed voice, very confidentially, that Mr. Costas Nicolaou had some impact or import into creating the model which we use to analyze gas prices today in this government.

So one Costas Nicolaou, the university professor who is a self-proclaimed expert on this issue and one to whom some people give significant reliance, but, nonetheless—[interjection] Yes, that fellow who used to camp on the front steps of this building, Cy Gonick, and the fellow from Thompson, Joe Borowski. I mean, I think they are all fellow travellers with Mr. Nicolaou, but, nonetheless, he certainly possesses an academic expertise which has been respected. This model shows that the price of gas, when you factor in, of course, as well, the difference in currency—[interjection] But the cost. What I am directing my honourable colleague's attention to is the price of gas in Grand Forks vis-a-vis

the price of gas in Winnipeg. Do you know what, Mr. Chair, the price of petrochemical fuel in Winnipeg is cheaper in the recent past?

Now, I cannot speak to apparitions of years ago to which my honourable colleague is referring, but I am referring to what I have been observing since my watch in this department, and it has been shown to my satisfaction, through my observations, through the information I have been getting from my analyst, that the price of gas in Winnipeg is cheaper than the price of gas in Grand Forks when you factor in all the components to make them on a par.

So this, I would suggest, with the greatest of respect, debunks the aspersions or allegations or satisfies the queries, and I would choose to give my honourable colleague the benefit of the doubt, that these were honest and sincere queries on this issue, because it is a matter that concerns all of us. We all have to go to the pump and fill up. I am told that it is a highly competitive market, and, yes, there are only two or three suppliers in Winnipeg of gas. I think it is Shell and Esso are the two major suppliers of gas, and then Domo goes to them and Petro-Canada and all these. But when you truly analyze this and look at all the drivers in the market, you will see that there is not any significant abuse or major skewing of the prices.

Now, my honourable colleague asked me if I would conduct a survey of where all the pricing went, and I have been told by the representatives of the gas companies that they are very wary of disclosing confidential material, because I have asked that question, too. I think that discloses natural curiosity on the part of my honourable colleague, because I have displayed that same concern, and I have been told by the individuals that they are not disposed to give this information to government or to make it public, because they are so competitive with their counterparts in the industry.

So they do not want one gas supplier knowing confidential information as to what percentage of their gas revenue goes to overhead, goes to profit, other than, of course, one can buy shares in an oil company and look at their annual report or go to their annual meeting and ask the company treasurer. So, I mean, that is information that is, of course, in the public forum.

These are a few reflections that I would share with my honourable colleague which I hope would give him some illumination on the topic.

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Chairman, recently in the House, my critic, the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen), had asked if I could provide information on the comments that markers had made on their exams connecting their feelings on the exams with the professional development exercise that they felt it was. I was able to pull those comments, and I have three copies to table in response to that request.

**Mr. Chairperson:** I thank the honourable minister.

**Mrs. McIntosh:** You are most welcome.

**Mr. Stan Struthers (Dauphin):** Mr. Chairperson, again, I would like to pick up where we left off this morning with some questions to the Natural Resources minister.

*Mr. Peter Dyck, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair*

We had been talking about a provincial overview plan for the east side of Lake Winnipeg that had been drawn up quite a number of years ago, a plan that I think does hold some merit and at least shows us the lesson that we cannot just go ahead on our own, as a provincial government, in conjunction with a company of one sort or another, and make a decision on a resource in a part of our province without, No. 1, consulting with the stakeholders in the area and, No. 2, looking at all the different economic development ideas, all the economic development strategies that could complement the one activity that this government, in this case timber with the Pine Falls Paper Company, without looking at all the different economic development opportunities that are prevalent in that area.

The minister, I believe, when we last left was part way through answering a question. It had to do with quite a lengthy question that I supplied for him. So I am wondering if the minister would like to finish the comments that he was making in terms of the importance of taking a look at the studies that have been done in the area already and indicating to the

House what aspects of that provincial overview plan for the east side of Lake Winnipeg he would be willing to implement, at least in conjunction with plans that he has to move ahead with Pine Falls Paper Company.

\* (1530)

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Natural Resources):** Well, if I understand the concern of the member for Dauphin correctly, he is expressing, on behalf of either himself and others, perhaps that the development in the area of Pine Falls licence area will occur without sufficient input and influence from the people who live in the area.

As I said just before we adjourned prior to the noon hour, I am confident and fully intend to make sure that the people in the area have an opportunity for input, but he prefaced his question by saying that no licensing, or no agreement, and I would first of all address the term agreement, that no agreement should occur.

One of the problems that I think the member for Dauphin fails to appreciate is that there is an inventory of cuttable forest in this province. That inventory makes allowances for a number of things, including potential for losses due to forest fires, bug infestation. All of those things are factors that are brought to bear on what is considered the allowable cut, and then, of course, that is also dealt with in relationship to the age, the regeneration capabilities of the forest and everything else.

I do not need to get into the details of the forest licensing and how it is structured so much as to say when you have that information, you sit down with a company that is interested, and it does not need to be Pine Falls. It can be Spruce Products, it can be Tolko, any number of companies out there—it could be Prendiville, for that matter—that want access to forest-cutting opportunities. The first question is whether or not they can have some assurance that they will have access to X number of allowable cut, X number of cords.

Now, I ask the member just how complicated does he intend to make this in terms of consultation before discussions can actually occur regarding the infrastructure that goes with building a sawmill or a

plants that create the jobs that go with cutting forest. Can he not see, or would he not be prepared to join me in explaining to the public that when you have, for example, in Louisiana-Pacific, we know there is lots of hardwood out there? They want 900,000 cords annually, I think something in that range when they are cut. As soon as it became apparent that there was a market for hardwoods, then all of a sudden the amount of allowable cut that was available in the forests across Manitoba changed, because now there was a market for what used to be a waste product.

The other thing that changed the amount of available product that is available for industry is infield chipping. Some very small portions of logs that are cut that used to be waste now can be used and shipped as chips, as opposed to try to cut them into appropriate lengths for going into the pulping process.

It strikes me that it is quite appropriate to be able to sit down with a company that is interested in development, establishing construction, in other words, spending several millions of dollars of investment, at the same time saying to them, yes, there may be a certain number of cords, certain number of thousands of cords that are available to you on an annual basis. But any of those FMLs, you have to work with us to develop a forest management licence in that area, which will set down the conditions of the forestry. You will leave certain areas; you will leave setbacks and so on. Besides that, an environmental licence will be imposed that does the protection of the waterways and the sensitive areas, and all of the other things that come to bear.

There is a dual track licensing process, one of the only ones in Canada that are done this way. Sometimes the frustration of some very large companies have come in here when we force them to follow this process.

That, I think, should logically explain how it is not as contradictory as our critics would like to make it appear. An agreement can be discussed, and in fact an understanding can be reached that X number of thousands of cords of product will be available provided you meet the conditions of our licensing process, provided that you consult in the areas. Our licensing process can accommodate the results of those consultations. There are other conditions that can be

put on a licence, that jobs be, in the main, woodcutting jobs in the field, they should be tendered in the area where the product is being cut. All those sorts of things can be part of a process.

I think it is a little bit unreasonable to expect that no understanding should be struck between the government as the regulator and the ultimate responsible body for whether or not Crown lands and the trees on them can they market; that nothing should occur until there has been a whole range of consultations, because you have nothing to offer in the consultations. If you do not have that upfront understanding from the company about what they are prepared to offer, what it is they are looking for in terms of wood, then you take that and you work that through a consultation process to the benefit of the communities.

That is bridging a lot of work that has been done by—that is putting in two pages in Hansard, the results of thousands and thousands of pages of work that are put together under different environmental licensing processes and forest management licensing processes that have been put together by Repap, Tolko, L-P, Pine Falls, the work that they do, and that very roughly describes what I think is the reality of the process as it works.

It is easy to portray it as being nonconsultative on the front end. It is just as easy for me to defend the fact that once the general understanding of the volumes that are available and the general areas that are available that consultation then proceeds to bring input from those various communities and various stakeholders, I might say. The environmental community has a lot to say about what we do in forestry.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, the Model Forest program is working and working well on the east side of the province, getting a lot of co-operation from Pine Falls, to enhance and in fact encourage excellent forestry practices, which are meant to be long-term, sustainable development opportunities for these communities.

**Mr. Struthers:** If we want a baseball terminology, the minister just hit a single, but he cannot score a run from first base.

Nobody is saying to the minister to go and close down all the plants that are working out there in rural Manitoba. Nobody is saying to the minister, go and close down Pine Falls Paper or Louisiana-Pacific or Tolko or whatever. Nobody is saying that it is bad that these forest companies provide employment. Nobody is telling the minister that the spin-offs from that are not a good thing. Nobody from this side of the House has ever told the minister that. That is why he is at first base. If the minister wants to get all the way around, he is going to have to look at all the other activities that can go on within these areas.

I am afraid the minister failed to outline the other things that he has been doing in the area in order to encourage those other things to happen. For example, I would like to know what kind of consultation over the last several years the minister has taken upon himself on the east side of Lake Winnipeg in consulting not only with First Nations communities and other aboriginal people, but outfitters, lodge owners, small floatplane operators, trappers. All these people make an economic contribution to that area.

Now, if the minister wants to get off of first base and score the run, he is going to have to take into consideration all of these things. I am not just asking him to be very narrowly looking at the plant itself, the agreement itself, I want him to tell me what kind of things he has done to encourage other economic activities, and then convince me that those other economic activities will not suffer if the minister goes ahead and signs an agreement with Pine Falls Paper. I want him to assure me that there will not be those detrimental effects on the rest of the economic activity that should be taking place in that area.

\* (1540)

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, if we want to follow the baseball analogy, I do not actually mind that. That was not a bunt, that was a good single that we have because we have attracted—in fact, it might even be a double—some good, viable industry to this province.

I am not going to miss the opportunity to remind the member for Dauphin that we might not even be talking about Pine Falls if this government had not taken the initiative and backed the employee buy-out about six,

seven years ago, and helped them, through backing, which in the end they did not need all that much of, give them the confidence to even take a cut in their wages and all the other things that they did locally to make their position solidified so that they put themselves in a position of being able to take advantage of the market as it came forward. They modernized the plant. They took a risk on behalf of their own jobs.

So we now have Pine Falls, which is the area the member is primarily interested in, as I understand it, but we have three other large companies that are operating successfully in the province. I hope that I do not then see some concern about whether or not we have only large companies and not small ones, because that was also part of a question earlier, whether the small operators, the member for Swan River was asking, whether or not small operators indeed had an opportunity in this province. I believe they still do. There are a number of them that operate successfully and they work successfully in partnership with these larger companies.

The reason I have referenced the three companies that I did, however, is that we put an onus on the operator, on the company in this case, to be part and parcel of the consultation process. They are expected to take their plans out to the community, and they are expected to make those plans known, to consult on them, and they are then to carry them forward and see if there is input and/or compromise in the position they put forward with the communities. That has happened in spades in many areas regarding the opportunity for contracting, the opportunity to back certain independent operators who want to get into buying loggers, skidders and trucks, and so on, involved in various aspects of the industry.

So I am quite confident that the process is appropriate, but I want to put on the record that I do not disagree with the observation that there needs to be more and better consultation occur with the local communities.

**Mr. Struthers:** If the minister is trying to stretch that single out to a double, I am afraid he got thrown out at second base. Again, if we are talking strictly about the gains to be made within the forest industry, then he can stand at first base all he likes but he is not going to get

around to home. When he talks about smaller loggers, given the number of complaints that smaller loggers have come to us with, with the treatment that they have received, not even particularly from some of the L-Ps and the Tolkos and the Pine Falls of the world but from this very Department of Natural Resources, then I would suggest that indeed he did get thrown out at second base, just to further our baseball analogy along here. Mr. Chairman, that is one out here in the bottom of the ninth. It is nice that the pitcher and the umpire are all together, I know that.

I want the minister to consider another fairly controversial factor in the whole debate on economic development on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, and that is the plans of Pine Falls Paper to construct a road, an all-weather road, along the east side of Lake Winnipeg. Maybe so that we know just where we are going with this, I want to give the minister a chance to update the House on the status of Pine Falls' desire, or application, to build this all-weather road, and what the status of that is. Have there been studies done to take a look at the effects, both positive and negative, that a road would have on this area, exactly where this road will actually physically be on the map on the east side of Lake Winnipeg? Maybe the minister could try again to get to second base.

*Mr. Chairperson in the Chair*

**Mr. Cummings:** There is a 30-mile extension, I believe, that Pine Falls is looking for to access the next level up, on access to timber on the east side of the province, east of Lake Winnipeg. The interesting part about that is most of that road, except for the last 30 miles, is already providing access up into that area. So the people who are concerned about the road, while they express concern about the entire road, and ultimately that is going to have to be the subject of some discussion and planning and input and all of those things, but right now the reality is that Pine Falls only wants a relatively small extension into the next area where they propose to cut. They will have to meet all the FML and environmental conditions that will go with that, and the road will have to meet standards as well, particularly conservation standards.

The overall plan on the east side, I think that there is every good reason for communities on the east side to

engage themselves in some discussion. I mean, politically, I am sure the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) and his party would not be all that thrilled if we suddenly had an agreement for sale of power that might mean the construction of Conawapa. He knows full well that the economic spin-offs from that would simply vindicate the work that we have been doing for years to position this province where it is rightfully located as a producer of some of the best and cheapest power in North America.

Now, I am not going to get into the type of irresponsible debate that occurred about four or five years ago when Conawapa was a potential and there was a reality to the hearings that were going on. Really, what we were into there was an irrational debate about whether or not one of the cleanest power sources available to anybody should be (a) allowed to be produced for export and (b) whether or not the security of having another line on the other side of the province was a good and sound plan. It was being opposed for all sorts of interesting reasons.

I do have a problem with those in society who say the east side should not be opened up at all. I understand the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) is not saying that. I want to make it clear, I think he and I might differ on conditions, might differ on standards and might even differ on policy that would be put in place in order to enable any kind of development to occur going up that east side, but I think he is smart enough to realize that there is a tremendous opportunity for the people on that side of the province. They should not be denied it. They should have an opportunity for input, and that is what he has asked in his questions, and they will have an opportunity for input.

If he is asking will they have a veto, then that is a different situation. Everybody on that side should have a fair opportunity to influence the decisions for the benefit of themselves and for the benefit of their children and their children's children and whatever other phrase he wishes to attach to it. It is the very essence of how an untapped area should be looked at. But there are those who will align themselves from time to time behind the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) and others of his political persuasion who may well wish to stop development of any kind for the sake of stopping it. I say that because of my experience with

the original discussion around the potential licensing of a power line to feed Conawapa.

\* (1550)

There were people who opposed it just because they did not want to see anything happen on that side of the province, and I hope that he will not support that kind of thinking. What we have to have and what I support, and the question he is asking is do I support meaningful input from the communities on that side for forestry and logging road access, and, of course, I do.

But as soon as the logging road is put in—there is a main road and there is the logging roads that feed it—there is a very interesting debate that quickly arises around the logging road, because once the logging road has been put in, all of a sudden there is an access for hunting and everything else. Do you know who usually opposes the closure of the logging road and the potential for hunting more than anything else is, in fact, the local people who then all of a sudden realize they have an easy access into an area where they before had difficulty going to hunt?

So when sometimes we accuse government coming in and imposing standards from afar, very often the very people who opposed the regulator, whatever branch of government it might have been, coming in there in the first place, they very often, and I have seen it in the Duck Mountains, I have seen it in the Swan Valley, and seen it further north in the various cutting areas, that once the logging roads are in place—and we have a mandate, and we mandate the logging companies to shut them down afterwards so they do not open these areas up unnecessarily for traffic and for entrance that would not normally be involved there—the very people to oppose it, in the end, are sometimes the local people who are very glad to have seen them put in.

**Mr. Struthers:** Mr. Chairperson, my understanding is that Pine Falls Paper, over the next couple of years, can access enough wood without having an all-weather road to meet its needs. If that statement is true, and the minister can correct me if I am wrong, I will score him a hit on our little baseball game that we are having, if we can, but my understanding is that they have enough wood without an all-weather road to meet their needs

for the next couple of years, and that there is no need to build an all-weather road for the purposes of Pine Falls, for the purposes of the two-year plan that they are asking for from this government.

I would ask the minister to confirm what I said is either correct or not. If it is not correct, can he advise me as to the situation that is different?

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not believe I can verify how much wood they have available, whether they have enough on the existing roads for two years or not, but let us suppose they do, it takes a while. I mean this industry is worse than farming in many respects, in terms of long-term planning, so suppose they do have two years' access, they have to start planning three and four years ahead. That is the very reason why the consultation and everything that the member is asking about has to occur as this opportunity evolves. Also, remember that some of their wood comes out of the west side of the province.

I have some views about that. I do not know whether the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) does or not, but if they do not get the wood on the east side, they are going to have to take it on the west side in order to keep their supply up, and that has certain implications as well. So without getting into the specifics of that, I think a logical extension of what are considered normal, harvestable numbers is not unreasonable while we go through the planning stages.

I have had occasion to indicate—and they have responded appropriately, and this was at a meeting, not on any written correspondence. Pine Falls recognizes that they will be required to, and then fully intend to, get out and further communicate their concepts and get feedback. In fact, they will say that some of the communities that are complaining about lack of consultation have, in fact, had a pretty good opportunity to consult, but apparently are unhappy with some of the results of that as well. That is not a shot; that is simply an observation. That happens in lots of situations where one party thinks they are consulting, and the other party thinks they are not. It is a reality very often of consultation, so Pine Falls, I think, would acknowledge they have to get out and talk to the communities and share their plans with them as best they can.



**Mr. Struthers:** Mr. Chairperson, the figures that I have been able to get, to dig up, indicate that each year Pine Falls Paper Company has a requirement of 360,000 cubic metres and that over the next couple of years, that could be met. There is no need for an all-weather road to be built in order to get that supply, if that is there for them. The minister is saying that, as in farming and in other occupations, you have to look further down the road. Of course, there is nothing wrong with that kind of logic.

Indeed, when I was a member of the community at Norway House, being a young guy I came across people who had put many years in on Mother Earth more than I had, and they talked in terms of making decisions, not for ourselves, not for our kids and our grandkids, but seven generations ahead, that we have to not just look in two-year or four-year or 10-year blocks or even just one generation to the next but that we are making decisions that impact seven generations into the future.

So I came very early in life to realize that that made eminent sense, that when you are in a position to make decisions, you have to try to look down the road at the impact of the decisions that you are making. In the case of the elders at Norway House who talked with me, they talked in terms of seven generations. It made good sense.

However, at the same time, I have had opportunity to see a map of the east side, a map that says where the existing roads are, the number of kilometres they take up. The maps also indicated the proposed number of kilometres that the minister has mentioned today, but the map also indicated many kilometres of road that are proposed over the next number of years into the future. This is a company that is looking into the future, and I do not fault them for that. That comes with the territory. When you have a company and you want to be maximizing your profit and you want to be doing the job that the company is designed to do, then you are going to want to look at into the future. You are going to want to get certain guarantees now for the future so that you can have, in this case, a road to access the very product, the very raw material, the natural resource that you are turning into a product to make your money off of. It is a well-known fact that many people will draw

their living from exactly that, from accessing this natural resource.

What I do not want to see, Mr. Chairperson, is a case where we give the company right now a two-year plan to tell them to go ahead and build this road and then turn around down the road and talk about a 10-year plan to increase the number of roads even further. The minister makes a good point. It is not just the roads that are visible on this map that I saw, it is all the small, little logging roads that shoot off from these main roads that will need to be built in order to access more and more and more timber. Again, that is what logging companies do. That is their essence.

\* (1600)

The key in all this, though, is the provincial government. The provincial government has a responsibility to be the watchdog, to make sure that these roads are not impacting in a negative way all the other economic activities that could go on, make sure that all the studies done that are necessary to be done are being done so that these roads do not have a big, negative impact on the other economic development activities.

I think it is the responsibility and incumbent upon this minister to make sure that any decisions that are made in terms of this road on the east side are studied so that he knows the potential impact of these roads and consult with people who are living on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. Because I know that I have talked to people who think that the prospect of a road coming into their community is a good thing, and I am not going to be the one who stands up and says they cannot have a road. That makes good common sense to me. I am also not going to be naive enough to think that there are communities who will not want a road

When I lived in Norway House and talked to some of those very elders I mentioned just a few minutes ago, they said that road from Jenpeg into Norway House had a tremendously negative effect on their community. There were others in Norway House, of course, who thought that it was a good thing. It was another way to connect them with other communities in Manitoba, and they liked that idea. But there are also people out there

who think that this road is not a good idea, and again the minister referred to those people as well.

You know, Mr. Chairperson, in a way that is how a balance is produced here. You have on the one side people who will never ever, ever agree that a road on the east side is a good thing. They will never agree to that. That is a fact of life that is out there, but the minister has to realize that there is also a group of people who believe that road is good come hell or high water, that it is the best thing for the company, and that it is prodevelopment, development, development, and no amount of problems caused by the road is going to stop them from building a road up the east side of Lake Winnipeg.

That I reject, as well, because both those extremes negate any kind of logic in this debate. What I am looking for and what I am looking for from the minister is an approach whereby we understand exactly the impacts that this road will have, that we understand exactly the impacts of all the roads branching off from these roads will have. I want the minister to indicate that even though Pine Falls is asking for this one little stretch of road to be built now, there are plans to build some 337 kilometres of all-weather roads along the east side of Lake Winnipeg. Before we start with the little stretch of road that he has mentioned so far, we have to have an environmental impact study on the total picture, the total number of roads that the Pine Falls Paper Company wants to construct over the next period of time, whether that be 10 years or 20 years or however many years.

I think the minister has to realize that once we go down the road of an all-weather road that we are going to go right down that road, and we are going to do whatever we can to have those roads available to the company. It would not be honest for any government to chunk that up into small little chunks of road which will eventually produce the same as the whole network of roads that are planned by this company on the east side of Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairperson, I see it along the same lines as what happened with Louisiana-Pacific in the Swan River Valley. In my opinion and in the legitimate opinion of this side of the House, we did not like the fact that the environmental process was split when they looked at

Louisiana-Pacific. I think that was simply a ploy which this government allowed that company an easier way to receive the licensing that it required. In that case, it was my opinion that he should have done the whole environmental study, not just the building, and then do the question of whether there were enough trees to run through the mill or the effects of the river or the effects on the wildlife or the effects on the fish. It should have been done altogether or indeed, I guess, if they wanted to split it, why do we not do the effects of the forest and the trees and the wildlife and the fish and the riverbanks and all the rest of it and the vegetation? Do it first and then do the building.

But, no, what this government decides to do is an environmental impact study on the building, on the plant itself, get the plant most of the way built, \$80 million or whatever it cost in the end, and then look to see if there were enough trees to put through the facility and the impacts on the environment after that. Well, who is going to tell Louisiana-Pacific to take their building down if they came up with something detrimental on the environmental side? This is the same way I see what is happening with this road.

You are going to build in little chunks until you get to the point where you say, well, we cannot stop now. That is what the fear is. Now, whether this fear is based on reality or whether this fear is based on a relationship of mistrust over the last number of years since forest agreements have been signed by this government, I do not know, but that is the fear that has been expressed to me by people living on the east side. I have heard from both sides. I have heard people who want that road because it is going to improve their communities, and I have heard from people who do not want that road because they are afraid of the negative impacts. I have heard from people who have said—and these are the people that I agree with—we cannot get started on this road until we are absolutely sure that we have done a good enough job of figuring out the impacts of this road on our area.

So, Mr. Chairperson, I think the concept of the road is key and should be right in the middle of a big discussion about what economic activity is going to take place along the east side of Lake Winnipeg. I would like the minister to indicate to me what exactly the process is that is going to take place to study the

impacts, negative and positive, of building not just this road that he has talked about so far, but the plans of Pine Falls to build 337 kilometres worth of roads along the east side of Lake Winnipeg, and how is he going to guarantee that those negative impacts will be mitigated against?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Chairman, the member makes an argument that on the surface seems to make sense, but when he used the analogy of Louisiana-Pacific, then I am afraid he started to lose his argument. If he thought he was going to throw me out at second base, I could be at third base by now because the difference here is that when you talk about waiting, in the case of Louisiana-Pacific, until all of the environmental work was done on both the plant and the forest, does he honestly think he can convince me, or the public, that we were not confident that there was enough poplar or hardwoods available in this province to supply the L-P plant? If he believes that, then I will accept his argument, and I am out. But he is wrong, and he knows he is wrong.

There are all kinds of quivering aspen in this province. We tramped them down when we cut the softwoods, they were in the road. They are now a marketable product, and all of a sudden lands, for example, Crown lands that we used to put out for grazing—my colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) and I have jointly shared some pain on this. There are people who wish to acquire Crown lands that they have rented for a few years, or maybe they are just renting now and they wish to buy them. We say, well, you can buy them but you have to acknowledge the value of the wood that is on them, or No. 2, if you want to buy them and clear them, you have to wait until we clear the poplar off them and put it in a marketable state.

\* (1610)

Generally speaking, that would be an L-P or a contractor of L-P. So I think that is the most salient way of saying: to say that in all cases you have to wait until all aspects of the environmental work are done before you proceed with any kind of a contractual agreement and/or licensing flies in the face of common sense, and that, frankly, after having spent a fair bit of my recent life responsible for the Environment portfolio, begs the question about is there a difference

between just pure environmentalism as opposed to a sustainable development approach that says yes, realistically we know there is enough poplar in this province. Realistically, when it comes to cutting it, we know we got 50 years before we are going to get anywhere near coming across all of the land that we might be removing hardwood from. So we can work section by section in terms of protecting the environment and the impacts of the harvesting and the reforestation, or, in some cases, other management practices that might be followed on some of these lands that are going to be cut.

Now let us take that back to the east side of the province. We know that one way or another, there is far more wood up the east side of the province than Pine Falls is going to ever be able to contract, or perhaps they will if they grow. But given today's size and their projected growth, you get far enough up that east side; in fact, they start to infringe on some wood for which there could be competition from other large harvesters who want to take it to another plant rather than down to Pine Falls.

I do not know a lot about that country, but some of the harvest areas that I did have a chance to visit last summer appear to me to be remarkably productive and are not really known to most people. They think of the east side and going further north as nothing but rocks, streams and bog, but in fact there is some very productive land in there as you go further north. As a farmer, one of the things that fascinates me the most is the regeneration capacity, because we are farming to some extent when we harvest. You should not cut it in the first place if you do not think you have an ability to regenerate it, in my view, and I think that is a fair reflection of a basic tenet of forestry. In the meanwhile, you better make sure you do not let it erode or burn or get infested with disease and bugs, or you are going to have a worse situation than if you had not touched it at all. In some cases, not touching it is worse, because then you end up with a mature deadfall situation where you have forest fires that are uncontrollable if the wrong conditions arise.

So I can roll those arguments into whether or not we believe there is enough wood, whether or not we should wait for all of the environmental licensing to be done, I would say that is impractical. What is practical is that

we work on some long-term planning. I do not object to the notion of long-term planning; that is essential. But do we hold up everything today because there needs to be some further long-term planning done? I would suggest in the name of common sense that is not necessary, that we can work with the communities. We can deal with them on a pragmatic and practical basis to give them their input, and even if there is further decision making that has to occur, they will be part of it. The world does not need to come to a halt tomorrow.

*Mr. Gerry McAlpine, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair*

The very people who will want to have input into this harvesting opportunity are the very ones who will, hopefully, take some jobs and some opportunity out of that forest-cutting licensing that we would become involved in. Their livelihood presumably will change, because it is very ironic that we are having this discussion about whether or not we should continue with the possibility of a road when the federal government, the Minister of Highways, are going to the bank to upgrade the air traffic in many of these communities. There just is not going to be enough money spent on the upgrading of the air capability into some of these communities to give them the stability that they believe they deserve.

It is not a matter of shutting down the airport development until the road gets there, but if it is practical that they can have both or if it is practical that a decent all-weather road can service their community, then why would we not move forward in that area? Why would we not consult and ask them about that? Now for the member to say there are some communities out there who might not want a road, that is probably true on the surface, but when they are asking for \$16 million for an airport into one or two communities out there, then it becomes a very real question about whether society is going to build the airport or are they going to build an all-weather road, and that is the type of debate that has to occur as well.

I have seen smaller communities develop in my area, and the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) has seen them, too. They lobby for years for a good paved road into their community. You know what happens? The road goes both ways, and suddenly the development

that they had hoped for in their community is not necessarily what they had expected, and, in fact, they start losing their youth and they start losing some of their opportunities because they choose to move out of the community even though the all-weather road is there.

So I am not so foolish as to say that developing the road and/or a highway is going to create nirvana, but what will create a viable opportunity in these communities is a reasonable opportunity at a job, will create some feeling of self-worth and pride, and that will also be based on whether or not they feel they have had some opportunity for input and growth as a result of any development that might occur in their areas.

So we do not disagree at all on the premise that there needs to be consultation and input. We disagree on whether the world should come to a halt while that occurs and whether there should be no incremental development in an area while consultation occurs.

**Mr. Struthers:** Well, to continue our baseball analogy that we got started here a while ago, first of all, I am surprised that the minister still thinks he is on base, because I believe we threw him out at second a while ago. But, fine, if he thinks he is on second and going to third, he would have to try to steal third base, especially with the answer that he gave. So I am afraid that he got thrown out at third, in my role as both pitcher and umpire again, and the reason why he got thrown out trying to steal third is that for some reason he wants to separate the words "common sense" from the word "environmentalist."

Now, I just do not agree with that. If you look back to our discussion that we had about the procedure that was being used at the site with Louisiana Pacific, I believe what the minister tells me. I believe that this government figured there was enough timber out there in that cut area to go ahead and build a plant. I am not suggesting that this government is stupid. I mean, they would not build a plant if there were not enough trees. [interjection] Well, last time it was the campaign trying to suggest they were tough on crime. Now they are going to say we are not stupid. I do not know if that will work, as opposed to what they said last time, compared to the Filmon team signs that we saw last time.

Mr. Chairperson, I do not doubt there was enough wood. What I am saying to the minister is that they missed the boat, they got thrown out at third base because they thought they could just make that decision on their own, make the decision to split the environmental process, go with the plant first and the trees and the effects on the environment second, when if they were really confident that this plant was going to be okay, they would have done the whole process in one, not given out partial licences here and there. They would have gone the whole process and then said yes or no, and, presumably, if there was nothing wrong, they could say yes. Then they start construction of the building.

\* (1620)

Now, the minister, I am afraid, did not answer the question I put forward to him about doing the same kind of thing, again switching back to Pine Falls on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. He did not answer my question about the incrementalism that is going on with the road going up the east side of Lake Winnipeg, and I told the minister that I have had people say to me that they do not like the road, people who live in those communities. I told the minister that I have had people say they do like the road. I have had people tell me that they like the road as long as it meets these criteria, that the negative effects of the road can be mitigated. It is not a question of who has the most people on what side of the issue.

It is a technical question, a scientific question; it is an environmental question. Can the minister indicate to this side of the House what exactly the effects will be of this road on the resources and the communities on the east side of the lake? I ask it in a very scientific, factual kind of way, and I am hoping that it is a very scientific, factual kind of an answer I get from the minister so that he can get to run around the base again so I can throw him out at second.

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, I slid into second, in my view, and if I am going to get to third, if he is going to be pitcher and umpire, I am either going to have to display blazing speed or, in his view, provide a diversion, but in fact what I think is the appropriate way to deal with this—he said he wanted to ask a practical and scientific question about what is being done in terms of the

environmental impacts. I think he is alluding to what is often a very thorny question about what are the social impacts that go with the environmental concerns when any kind of debate like this is potentially there to occur.

I have met with the group that refers to themselves as the Turtle Island Protectors. I have considerable esteem and respect for the people representing the community and the concerns that they raised. I did not have at the beginning a particularly good meeting because of the fact that their spokesman wanted to speak only about whether or not what our grade had been on the Endangered Spaces Program when we were there to talk about the future of these communities. I do not consider those communities to be endangered spaces or endangered in any other way. But what they are, however, is at a crossroads in their future, a crossroads which to some extent those of us in this Chamber will have some impact on, but to a greater extent, the reality of the harvestable timber in their area, merchantable timber in their area which will bring economic development pressures.

I think, without being unfair, one would have to say that it is not a question of whether or not merchantable timber will be eventually sought out in this province. I mean, we build houses. What are houses built of? Merchantable timber, as a rule. We waste thousands, if not thousands, certainly hundreds of cords worth of newsprint in this building alone, but my point in saying that is simply that there is an enormous economic opportunity that is presented to the province and in part to the people who live in the area, who receive any impacts from the cutting.

We do have to do our best in terms of development of a sustainable community. We do have to do our best to make sure that they receive the benefits as well as some of the negatives that will occur with that potential development. It comes right down to as simple as something as a road.

*Mr. Chairperson in the Chair*

I remember distinctly in this Chamber, either hearing it said in debate or certainly having it implied in debate and said in other forums, that these communities are asking: are we not legitimate citizens of this province? Is it not legitimate that we should have road access?

This debate was occurring during the height of the spring breakup when the winter roads were impassable. It occurred when the air transport had an accident and there was loss of life and injury and people were crying out for help. What better way to talk about the future and sustainability of communities when you have a tragedy on one side and an opportunity on the other? Why can we not marry those two together and deal with those problems in a forthright way?

So this debate is probably far too esoteric for the folks who are going to be impacted by any decisions that are made. But I am confident that whether we spend five years studying the social economic impacts of development in the area as opposed to working, in some cases, incrementally with the communities but certainly consulting and presenting the opportunities for development for enhancement of their communities, that can be done within the bigger picture as we look at what the long-term opportunities are in the area.

There is protection of an environment for tourism purposes. Tourism is a significant opportunity in that area, but I do have a bit of a problem with those who say that it is tourism the way they like it and not tourism the way other people might like it, as well. There is a certain elitism that sometimes says that if I fly into an area, it is very remote, pristine and only me and 20 other people get to see it once a year. That is one thing. That is a source of revenue for people in the area, but if it is a recreational opportunity for fishing, cottaging maybe in some cases, all of the other things that go with going to some of these lakes, if the access is better and some cases cheaper, average guys like me and thee may have a chance to go there along with our children in the future, whereas today it is probably prohibitive because of its remoteness.

Some of its very attraction will be its remoteness, but I do not need to believe that every remote opportunity will forever stay remote. Some of them will be impacted by the development of a road and by forced harvesting opportunities, so I see the evolution of opportunity for Pine Falls, in particular, to cut on the east side, being tied closely first of all, as I said, in consultation with the communities. There does need to be a larger plan considered and that will evolve, but I have already had people who have come to me and said, I am just the guy, hire me as a consultant. I am

just the guy to develop the plan on the east side. This is a bit like a lot of other things where people see potential, and everybody has the best plan. I think that our system of environmental licensing, our system of planning for forest and other opportunities up that side, if it should ever be Hydro, those things need to be considered.

The planning system that we have in place can accommodate the concerns that are raised. What we need to do is keep our eye on the ball in terms of answering the question, No. 1, first of all, should there be anything happen on the east side? I think even the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) would agree that there is good reason to say yes, there should be some opportunities on the east side. Now the question is: how do we best involve the people there and engage everybody in an appropriate review of that, but to say that we cannot extend the road today another 30 miles because we do not have any kind of a master plan in place with finality, I think is foregoing an opportunity that we should be considering.

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** I have some questions for the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik), and then our agricultural critic has some questions for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns). As the minister knows, I wrote to him I believe it was February 16 of this year with some questions about increasing funding for the sleep disorder clinics at the Health Sciences Centre and St. Boniface Hospital. One of the reasons for my questions is that I believe there are waiting lists for people to be tested in a sleep lab of approximately two and a half years. Some people, as we know, have given up, and one patient at least is going to Thunder Bay, Ontario.

\* (1630)

Sleep disorders can be quite serious; in fact, they can be potentially fatal. One of the things that I said in my letter to the minister was that one of the advantages of increasing the funding is that I think we can actually save money for government and taxpayers, because people with sleep disorders such as sleep apnea put themselves and others at great risk, especially people employed in occupations such as truckdriving, but also anyone who is a motorist who may get in an accident as a result of falling asleep at the wheel. We know that

people who are involved in serious accidents, the public pays for those costs, particularly hospital and other related costs.

So I am wondering if the minister can update me on whether or not he and his staff have had a chance to follow up on my letter of February and what, if anything, might result.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health):** First of all, I appreciate the letter. I know that the matter has been raised with the Winnipeg Hospital Authority as they take over operations of the delivery of service in the city of Winnipeg. Part of their plan, of course, is to identify priority areas and recommend the resources that have to be put in place to deal with those areas. That was part of the plan that they provided to us some weeks ago. But I am not sure of the specifics on that particular area. As the member can appreciate, I do not have my notes with me here in committee on that particular subject, but I will endeavour to get a report for him on where it stands.

Two comments that I would like to make are that it is always difficult to be able to provide every service. Priorities are set as to where new resources are able to go. We do not have unlimited resources. I recognize the importance in this area.

The other particular part of the problem, and he does flag the issue, is that it is an ongoing, difficult accounting issue that investment in one particular area may result in savings in the other. How do you move the dollars from one place to the other in a world that is meaningful? That has always been an issue that governments have had to grapple with, both within departments and certainly within a large health care system.

I have no doubt that there are probably some savings to be had. It is a matter of how you find those savings after a period of time and be able to move them to pay for the program. That is a problem faced in a whole host of areas in health care, because often the savings are not directly accrued by even government. They are accrued by the automobile industry, they are accrued by Workers Compensation, they are accrued privately, and, as a consequence, how do you move those particular resources.

So I appreciate his issue. I will get him an update on the plans for the Winnipeg Hospital Authority, and I appreciate the question and the opportunity to respond.

**Mr. Martindale:** I have a different question for the Minister of Health. If he cannot answer it, perhaps he could get some help from the Minister of Urban Affairs. The Minister of Urban Affairs and the mayor of Winnipeg and Mr. Axworthy, representing the federal government, recently announced that under the Winnipeg Development Agreement money would be made available to Teen Challenge to renovate an apartment building for I guess a drug and alcohol treatment facility.

I would like to ask the Minister of Health if his department will be providing ongoing funding after the building renovations, since I assume that drug and alcohol treatment may fall under the Department of Health. If either minister can reply, that would be fine.

**Hon. Jack Reimer (Minister of Urban Affairs):** The program that the member is referring to regarding the funding to the Teen Challenge is funding that was allocated under the Winnipeg Development Agreement for the physical restructuring of that building. It is \$375,000, I believe was the announcement.

What it is is Teen Challenge is an organization that has about 250 chapters throughout the world. They have been in operation since 1958. They operate in Manitoba here with a Teen Challenge home in and around Steinbach someplace. I believe it is Hadashville or out that way anyway. They are in the process of setting up a women's Teen Challenge in that particular area. This particular area here in Winnipeg, in the core area, was an abandoned building that the City of Winnipeg donated to this operation for one dollar. Our involvement is for the physical restructuring of this building. There will be no ongoing operational funds, as they operate on a contribution and a charitable status, so that we have no ongoing commitment for funds for their operation. We are funding them strictly as a bricks and mortar revamping of that particular building.

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether his department is doing any reviewing of the act that

governs farm organizations funding. When the minister brought in that act, he knows that there were many farmers who disapproved of the compulsory checkoff and that there are other organizations that are looking at different ways of funding farming organizations.

Suggestions have been made that, in fact, we should not have negative option checkoff, but the participation should be more voluntary and that participants should have the option of which farm organization—to have their funds go to the farm organization of their choice rather than what we have right now, which is the farm organization with the most membership automatically being the designated group that would have the funds, and any amendments must be used to enhance the participation of farm organizations.

So the legislation has been in place for a couple of years now. Farmers still continue to suggest that they do not like the negative option, that they would want a choice. So I would ask the minister whether his department has reviewed in any way the effectiveness of the legislation and whether any consideration is being given to the suggestions that have been put forward by farmers, that if there is going to be funding for farm organizations, if they have some choices in it.

Certainly, we do need farm organizations to speak up during these challenging times that the farming community is going through. Farmers are suggesting that there should be some option. So has the minister given any consideration—is anyone in his department looking at reviewing the legislation and the merits of it and whether or not there should be any amendments, changes that should be made to that legislation? I would certainly like to see the change brought forward that would give the farmers some voluntary choice as to which organization they would belong to.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the honourable member and, indeed, members of her party did not support the checkoff legislation that she refers to. I, however, continue to be convinced that the legislation has done precisely what it was intended for, to strengthen a number of farm and commodity organizations, provided them with the kind of financial resources that are important to any organization's ability to provide service to its members.

I can indicate to her and take this occasion that a number of organizations in the course of time have taken advantage of that legislation, forage people, canola people. There are other groups that are currently looking at organizing to do the same thing, particularly when one recognizes that in the very important area of research and research development that I know is near and dear to the heart of the honourable member for Swan River who often reminds me that sufficient research is not being done in agricultural issues here in Manitoba and Canada—she is well aware that so much of the public research funds that are available have to be triggered by an organization or the proponent having some means at their disposal to contribute to that research.

\* (1640)

Even our own research program, the ARDI program, the Agricultural Research and Development program that I am very pleased is off and running and operational, and some \$4 million have been dedicated to specific projects in its relatively short career or time that it has been operating, but the same thing applies, for instance the forage growers of the province of Manitoba were the recipients of several hundred thousands of dollars of research money only because they had the wherewithal to put up the \$40,000 or \$50,000 that leveraged those kinds of dollars. Much of the federal money, the \$75 million that my colleague the federal Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Vanclief, has available, is available to agriculture only if it is matched, either by provincial dollars or by commodity dollars or by business dollars if it is a private sector involvement.

So in my opinion, the reasons for originally promoting and passing the check-off legislation that is in place in Manitoba is as strong today, if not stronger, than at the time that I introduced that legislation in the House. It was the appropriate legislation to help out our farm organizations.

Now I invite the honourable members—I am aware that there are some farm organizations that would like to be part of it. Dean Elliott still is the chair of a small, three-person committee that supervises, and from year to year reviews, the appropriateness of continuing the check-off legislation for not just the general one that is



available, the KAP checkoff, but the Cattle Producers' checkoff, and I certainly invite the spokespersons for organizations currently not now enjoying any funds coming from that organization to make their position known to this group. I am well aware that one old farm organization, the National Farmers Union, for instance, that feel left out, have in the past requested reconsideration. I have no problem with revisiting that situation and seeing whether or not there is some fair number-wise way that we could reconsider that situation, but that is a position that would have to be taken before the accreditation committee, where Dean Elliott from the Faculty of Agriculture in the University of Manitoba is the chair.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** It was my understanding that it would have to be changed to regulation or legislation that would allow for more than one, that would allow for farmers to have a choice as to which farm organization they would want to support, and I speak about general farm organizations, whether that is KAP or the National Farmers Union. I am not talking about commodity groups at this point, but is the minister saying there is that ability now that farmers could have a choice, or whether the committee can make the decision as to whether more than one farm organization should be certified? Or is it going to require some change in legislation or regulation, because it is my understanding right now that as it is, only one general farm organization can be certified, not more than one, and certainly the minister is a firm believer in choice.

You know he talked about the marketing boards, Manitoba Pork. He changed the regulations for Manitoba Pork because he said this would give producers more choice. I am raising an issue that has been brought to my attention by farmers who are saying that they believe they should have a choice in which farm organizations will work for them, and I think that we can have more than one farm organization and that two groups can work together if there is a way to address this.

If the minister is saying that all that is necessary is for them to lobby Dean Elliott and the panel to have another organization certified, well then that would be something I would take to these people to certainly pursue, but my understanding right now is that it will not be quite that easy. What I am asking the minister is:

is he saying that he is prepared to look at making the necessary changes to allow farmers to make a choice as to which farm organization they want to belong to and then have their check-off funds directed? That would certainly be an improvement of what we have right now, because the minister knows well that there are people who have different views and that is part of democracy to have some choices. So I would ask the minister for his comments on that issue.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, I must confess and admit that it has been some time that I have looked at the legislation, and it has been, of course, some time since we dealt with it in the House. I may be wrong when I am suggesting that it is possible as the legislation is currently structured, without an amendment to the legislation. I am aware roughly how the accrediting group works. They have to be satisfied. When a group comes before them, represents them as speaking in the interests of the canola growers of Manitoba, they ask for some evidence to substantiate that claim, either through membership or through, in some cases, direct votes or referendums on the question amongst their members. They take all of that into consideration in coming to the judgment that, yes, this group that is making the appeal for being accredited to properly access these funds are, indeed, legitimately entitled to them.

With a general farm group—now we are not speaking of the commodity thing—it is a little easier when you are talking specific, what is forage or canola, it is precise, but I know what the member is talking about. She is talking about the general farm group, and there is that universal levy, and she knows exactly where to press the right buttons. She knows that I have a softness for democracy and of choice and of being able to allow my farmers that privilege. I would entertain to look at that on two fronts. First of all, confirm whether or not—she probably is right; I suspect that it is either/or. The accrediting committee makes a decision which, if there are two or three applications before the committee as to which general farm organization should be accredited, they have to make the choice, and they obviously did. They made the choices. In Manitoba, it is the Keystone Agricultural Producers, that is the farm organization that is recognized as the farm organization and, therefore, deserving of the support.

I will have to give that some thought, and I invite her to think about that as she enjoys the summer on her farm, as she strolls through the pastoral bliss of the pastures and looks at her cattle in the morning, counting her calves and seeing how they are doing, occasionally patting the sheep or the goat on the head. She will think of these schemes that will make the life of the Minister of Agriculture more interesting when next we meet in fall.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** We have had many, many discussions in this Legislature about the fate of the Manitoba Telephone System and the privatization of that telephone system. I know that the Minister of Agriculture knows that with modern technology where it is, with computers where they are, and the electronic information, telephones play a very important role in the lives of farmers as they try to determine when they are going to sell their products and information on the Internet on how they can do better business and various kinds of pricing.

However, we have had discussion over the last little while about the increased telephone rates that we are having in Manitoba and the negative impact this is having on people in rural and northern Manitoba. I would like to ask the minister whether his department has done any analysis on what the impact of these increased telephone rates are going to be on the farm community and whether he sees it as something that will definitely be a detriment to farmers as they try to go about their business.

\* (1650)

Has there been any indication that there are less people who are accessing the information that is provided through the Internet? Does the minister consider this to be something that will be a detriment to farming? Does he see this as having a negative effect on farming business or something that can create a serious burden?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, while acknowledging that basic telephone rates have increased not just in rural Manitoba but throughout the province, and not just in the province but throughout the country, as the degree of deregulation has been imposed on the system. You know, it would be very interesting, particularly in the

rural and, she says, the northern members. What we often neglect to mention as we talk about the increase in the basic phone rate, the very substantial reduction that occurred in the same period of time in long distance rates. Long distance rates have come down significantly. The other factor that we do not talk about, and certainly all of us who have lived in rural areas, whether it was under the period of time when MTS was still under public ownership, and now, there has been a constant expanding of the call areas.

There was a time when I had difficulty just calling beyond a few towns in my area. Now the area that I call long distance without incurring long distance charges are considerably expanded. I suspect, I do not know, but it is an exercise that maybe somebody in the Economics branch of the Department of Agriculture may wish to undertake just to see what the net impact of telecommunications has been with respect to some of the changes that have occurred, say over the past five or 10 years. I would suspect they are pretty well neutral.

Farmers, rural people, I would think just on average, that is just thinking standing on my feet, probably make more long distance calls than urban people, just because we phone to more distant places. If that is the case, then we have certainly been the recipient of the benefit of those significant reductions in long distance rates that have occurred. And, Mr. Chairman, they have been significant. They really have been significant. What used to be a \$10 phone bill is now a \$2 or \$3 phone bill. How that would average out with the admitted rise on the basic telephone rate would be very interesting to see. I suspect it would not really have an impact of one that would measure among the concerns that we legitimately have: poor grain prices, increasing other input costs to farming. I think on the scale of that, if I were to go out and talk to a farmer now: is the rising cost of telecommunications your major concern? He would look and say, where are you from, man? I do not think that would come automatically to his mind as a concern of his today in farming.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Certainly, I would have to agree with the minister. When you take into consideration farm machinery, costs for fuel costs and pesticide, all of those costs—the telephone costs are not a major cost in that scheme. We have modern technology that is out

there. What I was looking for is whether we are seeing people use less of it, being deterred from accessing the information that is available out there because of input costs.

Of course, the minister talks about not having to make all these long distance calls. My recall, when Gary Doer was the minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone and he came out to Swan River—that was before I was elected—we had the opportunity to see these maps where we were going to get the larger calling area. I really want to congratulate the NDP for having the vision in those years to start the process of enlarging calling areas and for the government of today for carrying through on that vision that was put forward by the NDP, because it was the NDP that started that.

I live in rural Manitoba, as does the minister. That opportunity to be able to call 30 miles down the road instead of being able to call only five miles has made a tremendous amount of difference. It was a vision by one government carried through by someone else that followed through that gave the opportunity for rural Manitobans to have much larger telephone calling areas, but it also—I would hope that increased rates would not deter farmers from accessing information. I would encourage the minister to check on that one for me.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to move onto another topic, one that we have not had very much time to discuss when we were doing Estimates. That is the expansion of the hog industry and the concerns that many people have with operations going in certain areas. I wanted to ask the minister if he is familiar with a particular proposal called the Wallen Colony Lagoon proposal. In that proposal the operation was okayed by the residents and the council to put in a 3-million U.S. gallon glass-lined storage tank. The community supported that kind of thing, but after the approved project was revised to a lagoon which was a concrete tank and that tank would hold 8 million Imperial gallons, which is equivalent to 9.2 million gallons, which the residents opposed, but this giving it triple the original proposal and they got the approval for it.

So I wonder if the minister can tell me—his department is involved with the technical review committee, the Department of Agriculture. How do

these kinds of things happen and why would these kinds of decisions be made to allow an operation to increase that much in size when it is recognized that in the community there is opposition, but they have given their approval for a smaller operation, and then this is what happens? This is where you get community members fighting against the proponents of barns. We have to find a better way to do this.

The industry is going to grow, but we have to find some way to keep the public informed about what is going on and then not do things that will then upset the community. So I ask the minister: how does he see something like this happening and how does he see it improving? I visited many communities over the last winter where people raised very serious concerns with the technical review committee. What they said was that the technical review committee was really there to help the proponent but really the people who were not necessarily opposed to the operation. But the people who lived in the area who had concerns and wanted to be sure that all their concerns were addressed did not seem to get the support. So I think that is a real challenge.

We know the industry is going to grow. How does the minister envision the technical review committees and other support for departments working in more harmony with both sides of the equation, that is, not only the proponents of the operation but people who also live in the area, people who are concerned that there might be a negative impact on their quality of life or concerned about water. In many cases it is water quality. How does the minister see addressing this so that we do not face the negative publicity to the industry that we get right now?

\* (1700)

**Mr. Enns:** I am concerned about the manner and way in which we continue to make opportunities available in Manitoba for what I believe to be one of the more important agricultural initiatives, namely taking the advantage of our unique position on the continent now in this post-Crow era that has third-party, nongovernmental, nonindustry think-tank organizations like the Morris Centre located in Guelph, Ontario, that looked at countries around the world, looks at different provinces, looks at the American Midwest and

concludes that Manitoba, the eastern prairie region, is undoubtedly the place that is most favoured, relatively speaking, to comparative costs than anyplace else in the world. That is what is a feeling of the pork industry, not the Minister of Agriculture, not this government, not the Department of Agriculture. Our responsibility is as government, and specifically as the Department of Agriculture, to ensure that it is done within the guidelines—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Order, please. The hour being five o'clock, time for private members' hour. Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I understand there might be leave to waive private members' hour.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there leave to waive private members' hour? [agreed]

### Motions of Condolence

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Would you kindly call the condolence motions beginning with Mr. Hamilton?

### William Homer Hamilton

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Pitura), now the member for Morris,

THAT this House convey to the family of the late William Homer Hamilton, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty and a useful life of active community and public service, and that Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

### Motion presented.

**Mr. Enns:** Madam Speaker, I am privileged to be able to address this resolution of sympathy to the Hamilton

family on this occasion, particularly from the point of view that it was my privilege to have served in this Chamber with Homer, as we called him. I have very fond memories of Mr. Hamilton during his service in this Chamber with the Roblin government and two years of the Weir government.

He was first elected in the early '60s and was a forceful member in this Chamber for the area that he represented, the particular seat then was, as they all keep changing from time to time, but his place of birth and his home was Sperling. I can remember Homer's particular interest in pursuing agricultural issues that were important then and continue to be important today.

Drainage was something that was always very close to Mr. Hamilton's concerns, as he expressed them here in the Legislature. I was pleased to join the Roblin team in the mid-'60s as a very young and green Minister of Agriculture. Homer Hamilton was physically a very full and robust gentleman. He let it be known then, when he had concerns in his constituency, that ministers ought to pay attention to them.

Mr. Hamilton left the provincial scene as a result of redistribution that occurred in 1969 and then proceeded to provide ongoing assistance to his member of Parliament, Mr. Jack Murta as a counsel and as help to Mr. Murta who had recently been elected to the federal House as a member for that region.

I know that the efforts on behalf of the community that Mr. Hamilton represented were appreciated then, and are remembered in this resolution. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I want to add our words to the contributions in life of William Hamilton and our words to the condolence motion to the family. I want to thank the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) for his comments. I did not know Mr. Hamilton, but certainly one gets the measure of the person beyond his life description from the words from the member for Lakeside on William Homer Hamilton. Obviously, he is a person who has contributed greatly to the province of Manitoba and has had a deep interest in agriculture and 20 years as a trustee of the Dufferin Agricultural Drainage Board

prior to his election in 1959 to the Duff Roblin team. He certainly has had a life of public contribution.

He is a person who looks to have enjoyed the wonderful resources of Manitoba—fishing, hunting, his hobbies with guns, his days of being in the woods with friends. According to one record of his life, apparently he was a great teller of tales, and he would regale others with tales of the Great Depression. Some of us remember those same kind of tales from our own family and growing up with people who have gone through the Depression.

He liked to talk about political life and took pride in public life. He obviously had the right ingredients: dedication to the people and humour, which of course I think is crucial to really keeping in perspective one's responsibilities to your constituents and the things you believe, but also the ability not to take oneself too seriously when the occasion demands it.

I want to pass on to his wife, Helen, and his children, our deep respect for the contributions he has made to this province, our thanks for the contributions he has made to the people, and our condolences on his passing this year.

**Madam Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion? [agreed] Would all honourable members please rise and remain standing to indicate their support for the motion?

*A moment of silence was observed.*

\* (1710)

**David Orlikow**

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer), that this House convey to the family of the late David Orlikow, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. Can I just get clarification, because when the government House

leader was leaving, he indicated that this one was to be dealt with last, and Mrs. Morrison to be dealt with prior to this one. [interjection] Oh, it is okay. All right.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Enns:** Madam Speaker, while there are no present members in the Chamber who had the opportunity of serving with David Orlikow in this Chamber, many of us certainly recall and are reminded of him walking just about on a daily basis into this building, particularly in his latter years, as he continued to give advice and counsel, no doubt, to the party of his choice, the party that he dedicated a lifetime of service to.

Mr. Orlikow was first elected to this Chamber on June 16, 1958, then re-elected in the election of 1959, and, then, resigned his seat in 1962 to contest the federal seat of Winnipeg North, which he then proceeded to hold for a significant number of years.

I had that privilege of being in this House when Mr. Orlikow was a member of the party that went through a change of name and, I suppose, some direction. When I first was elected to this Chamber, it was the CCF Party that sat in the benches opposite. I believe that stood for the Canadian Commonwealth Federation, a co-operative that was borne to some extent here on the Prairies. Certainly, we recall the kind of binding document known as the Regina Manifesto that to a large extent provided the philosophical and intellectual basis for this prairie movement that then went on with some considerable success in its transformation to what we now call the New Democratic Party. That transformation took place in the year 1966, here in Winnipeg, and elected as their first leader the then and still well remembered and successful leader, Tommy Douglas, to head the New Democratic Party onto the national scene.

I pass on, certainly, from the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and from all members of the government, our sincere condolences and sympathy to members of the family. We remember him and his presence in this Chamber very well. Thank you.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister of Agriculture for his comments. I would like to also start

my remarks by saying that the member for Lakeside, the Minister of Agriculture is correct. It is hard for us to come to work and not see David, listen to David, hear his inspiration, take advantage of his reading. Day after day after day we would see him in our offices, in the loge, in the cafeteria. He was a source of inspiration to all of us and a source of so much intellectual research that he constantly provided to us.

I recall in his last week of life he was still researching material on the impact of smoking and the potential lawsuits the governments should take, the national and provincial governments should take against tobacco companies to reinvest in the health care system in Canada. He was doing a considerable amount of work in research on tobacco products. As a former sponsor of the nonsmoking bill of rights and a person who has supported the government in previous initiatives, I found quite a lot of comfort from his research and advice from the work he had been doing. I know that Judy Wasylycia-Leis, our former member for St. Johns and the health critic of our federal party, was using David's expertise continually.

He read so much. He read the Scientific American and talked about what the impact of early childhood intervention programs could be on the lives and poverty of children. He would supply that to you. He read about health care alternatives. He read the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, as I say, Scientific American. He was always researching reading material, passing on articles, passing on advice. We truly miss his intellectual capacity for researching and formulating policies that we must use to deal with some of our challenges into the 21st Century.

David was an inspirational person. He was very passionate. He was very articulate about his passions. Working people and their families were his passion. The principles and policies that affected the livelihood of average working people, organized workers and nonorganized workers were always front and centre on his mind. He would often be involved in campaigns to help organize workers into unions. He would be involved in campaigns to ensure unions got first contracts.

In fact, I am advised that he was one of the first people up in Thompson helping to organize the steel

workers' local when Inco first moved into Thompson years ago. He was tenting in northern Manitoba, signing cards and establishing the first union local in that area, and of course, something that obviously later today continues to be a success in representing the families of northern Manitoba.

He obviously was a person who had respect from the public. He was elected for 43 years into public life, 43 years. I mean some members of this Chamber are not even that old. I have just barely turned that age myself, but 43 years is a long time—school trustee, a representative, an MLA in here, and over 25 years as a member of Parliament from the north end of Winnipeg. After that long, long 43-year period, the demographics changed and the north end constituency changed considerably, and he ultimately was defeated. But anybody who could be successful for that long a period of time deserves the respect and received the respect of people and members of the public from all walks of life and from all political persuasions.

I was proud to be at Tec Voc at the memorial service for David Orlikow. Our member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) spoke; our former, as I say, deputy leader, Judy Wasylycia-Leis, spoke; Bill Blaikie spoke; Ed Schreyer spoke; Rob Hilliard spoke and others about his contributions to our province. All of us have the same kind of memory that David was always in your face for his beliefs. He never ever stopped in pushing for what he believed would provide working families with decent health care that he felt was a responsibility of the community to provide, a quality education that would give kids, children and families equal opportunities in this Canadian country, in this province of Manitoba.

\* (1720)

He, of course, would always work tirelessly for working people and the rights of workers to have safe workplaces, organized workplaces, and workplaces where issues of justice could be resolved in a way that protected people from capricious activity from the odd employer that may practise that.

He, of course, went through a very, very difficult time, a very public time. He was the first one that went public, I believe, on the CIA experiments on his wife,

Velma, and he went public with the fact that, I think there were some 40 patients in Canada that were part of experiments conducted by the CIA in Canada. I believe this took place during the Second World War—53 Canadians that were subject to these experimental brainwashing and interrogation techniques. He went public with this with a lawsuit that eventually was successful for the Orlikow family and for the children. Certainly he is to be congratulated for his strong stand, but I know of equal importance was his love of his wife and the feeling that she left this world too early because of those experiments on her.

Certainly he is a member of a north-end tradition and a group of politicians that have been tremendously successful in our party and in our movement: the, Saul Miller, Saul Cherniack and others in the north end of Winnipeg. They were really a very effective team, the federal MP and the very, very effective MLAs working together on behalf of their constituents.

I certainly always treasured the advice I received from David, the inspiration I received from David. I know that he as a person would have enjoyed in some ways the words of the speeches that were articulated at his memorial at Tec Voc in terms of his 43 years of service, but he was also very humble. I think he would have felt that we were spending too much time eulogizing and speechifying at the service, and not getting out researching or organizing a union or signing another member to the NDP or organizing another fundraising event so we can run another campaign in the north end for the party of his love and his beliefs.

He had extensive energy, extensive contacts, voluminous research, and a never-ending commitment to social justice. As Ed Schreyer said at the memorial, David, job well done, and I would like to say to David and his family: job well done on behalf of all Manitobans and all Canadians. You are, he is, has been one of a kind. His 43 years in public office are unparalleled or rarely matched, and he is a person who I know that the week he passed away, continued to articulate and study issues such as smoking that he felt were important to the health of his community and the health of his children. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** I would like to spend a few moments talking about my friend, David

Orlikow, and spending a few moments discussing both the man and some of his accomplishments.

I really got to know David initially—I had known David by reputation, of course, but I really got to know David initially during my first campaign in 1990. As I repeated to David on several occasions, and to many other individuals, he kind of set the tone for the kind of MLA that I wanted to be when I was elected. I remember going door to door with David. Remember, we are talking about a man that was quite elderly but was spry and full of energy, and going door to door with him, and the thing that struck me, without exaggeration, every second or third door, someone would say to me—say to us, because they did not know me, Mr. Orlikow, you helped me in 1958 with UIC, or Mr. Orlikow, you did this, or Mr. Orlikow, you helped my son. People hugged him at the door, overlooked me, which was appropriate, and it struck me that this man had worked so long and so hard in our community, that he was recognized for that.

He never took a lot of credit for that, and that is why I told a story on several occasions, because he only felt that was his role in life and his job, and he did not take credit for it. He simply felt that was what he had to do. I said after I was elected that if, perhaps, 20 percent of the individuals who acknowledged David could acknowledge me after my tenure in this Chamber, that I, indeed, would consider my tenure in this Chamber as successful.

I am not prepared for this speech, and that would have probably bothered David because he was an incredible researcher. I do not think he got the credit for the intelligence that he had and for his incredible capability of providing research and tracking down information. He was forever at my office the last eight years with research and documents to read, and, frankly, I could only read probably 30 percent of them. He had read them all, and he had them marked up for me and provided me with a wealth of information. His variety of reading was astounding, and when he picked a field to study, his knowledge was extraordinary, and he was always prepared. If you look and review his speeches, both in this Chamber and in the House of Commons, you will always see that he demonstrated incredible accuracy in terms of his speeches and his public pronouncements.

A couple of other anecdotes. About a year and a half ago, David was ill and in the hospital. So I visited him in Victoria Hospital, and he had done his typical style there. The entire room had been redecorated and turned into a mini-office, and there is David sitting on the edge of the bed with piles of sheets of paper around him and books. He had turned the hospital room into an office. He had a cell phone or some phone there, and he was connecting and he had continued working, much to the chagrin of his physician who had wanted him to rest.

David's most common phrase repeated to me was what can I do for you. He would come bounding into my office on a regular basis and say what can I do for you, and generally, was essentially looking—and that was actually his credo. I think that was basically the theme of his life, what can I do for you? I think we could do a lot worse in this life. We could do a lot worse than to have a credo like that, what can I do for you.

I have been blessed. David gave me a copy of his memoirs. He was convinced by individuals. Again, it is not something that he did easily, but he was convinced by individuals to write down his memoirs. I felt honoured that he provided me with one of the copies of his memoirs, and I have had a chance to go through them.

There is material for several books in those memoirs. Some of the stories are of a most extraordinary nature. The extent to which David would go to help his constituents is unparalleled in my experience. I mean I know a lot of elected officials and I know a lot of people here work hard, but some of those stories are absolutely extraordinary, the extent and the length that David would go to help a constituent if he felt that cause was right.

The member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) has talked about David's boundless energy. That was something extraordinary, that was something he was blessed with, and that was something he did not waste. He utilized it. He utilized it always in being active and in public causes.

The work that he did, even after Val passed away, with respect to the CIA experiments was something he

did not have to do. It was something that caused him a lot of pain, but nonetheless he did it, not for himself, but for others and for the memory of Val. He worked very hard, and he pursued diligently the CIA and tried to get to the bottom of this situation in order to help those who had been harmed by the CIA experiments. That comprises a considerably long chapter in his memoirs that he provided to me.

\* (1730)

I was visiting with a mutual friend of David's and mine about two weeks ago, and he said something which I think is very appropriate. He said: You know, I still miss David. I still expect to get those abrupt phone calls that all of us, who knew David, would get. David was not one for small talk. He would simply phone and start conversing about the issue that concerned him and that concerned us, bounding to the door, you know, ready to go with full energy on the project. My friend said to me: I still miss David, and frankly, I miss David too. I half expect him, when I am sitting in my office, to come bounding in, shuffling in with his can of Coke and a pile of papers in hand, but that is not to be, and I guess it is up to the rest of us to do our part to live up to a legacy of David Orlikow.

I know we are all extraordinary in some ways, and each human being is valuable. I certainly feel honoured to have had a mentor and a friend like David Orlikow. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Madam Speaker, I am privileged to be able to put a few remarks on the record about our friend David Orlikow.

What kind of person will I remember him as? First of all, as a tenacious fighter for causes that he believed in. In the early 1980s he lobbied me on changes in the federal Bank Act. One of the things that he wanted to see was a community reinvestment act or section of the Bank Act that required chartered banks to invest some of their money in the local community in which their branches were located. He borrowed this idea from American legislation. He continually brought this up in speeches and continually brought it to our attention. Our federal party is still promoting this idea. I suggest it is probably because David Orlikow promoted this idea 15 years ago that we are still talking about it.



David Orlikow was a consummate politician. He always kept in touch with people in his community. I was one of dozens of people, as the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) pointed out, that he used to phone. When I worked in north end community ministry during the 1980s, he would phone up and say: What is new? I discovered that I was one of many, many people that were on the receiving end of these phone calls. I suspect that he phoned from airport lounges, and whenever he had even one or two minutes, he would phone someone. He would say: What is new? You would tell him, and then he would say thank you, and he was gone.

But I really appreciated his keeping in touch that way. He often came to see me at my place of work in the north end. I can also say that the member of Parliament for that area did not come to see me and also did not get re-elected, but David came to see me, and David got re-elected many, many times as we know. I think this was probably one of the reasons that he was re-elected so many times.

David Orlikow was very concerned for justice for all people, but especially for the poor and the marginalized. He was passionate about issues like poverty. He once said to me: if I was as concerned about suburban issues as I was about inner city issues, I might have been re-elected in 1988. A very interesting comment. I remember going with him as part of a delegation to City Hall in the 1980s to lobby a standing committee of City Council regarding an increase in social assistance rates, an issue that probably affected very few of his constituents in north Winnipeg, because he represented the area at that time north of Church Avenue, but an issue that was of concern to him. He also helped organize a meeting of inner city activists, including myself and cabinet ministers in the Pawley government, on poverty and housing issues, once again, inner city issues but something that he was very interested in.

In preparing to speak today, I asked the Legislative Library to find some of his Throne Speech Debate speeches. They found two for me. One from 1960 and 1961, and it makes for very interesting reading because he talks about amendments that were brought in regarding social assistance recipients and who qualified, and also about medicare. The speeches are

really quite fascinating. His comments, I will not repeat them on the record, but very, very interesting reading about his views—I presume, speaking for his party being opposed to hospital premiums. In fact, there was a huge premium increase that he spoke against and speaking in favour of comprehensive health insurance which Canadians got just a few years later. He talked about the first experiment in universal health care insurance in Swift Current, Saskatchewan.

David gave me advice after I was elected. He said that I should deal with every issue brought to my attention by a voter, whether it was municipal, provincial or federal, which is something that I have continued to do, except more recently I now refer federal issues to our federal member of Parliament, Judy Wasylycia-Leis.

David Orlikow never really retired, as we have heard. He continued to do research for sure for provincial members of the New Democratic Party, and I suspect for federal members of Parliament in the NDP caucus as well, and for anyone who would listen to his ideas. He was extremely widely read, and he photocopied hundreds of articles and distributed them very widely.

In the federal election of 1984, my son Nathan worked for Mr. Orlikow. It was the first election that he worked in at the age of seven years old, dropping literature in mailboxes, and worked for him again in 1988. In 1988, David Orlikow worked in my election campaign. It was a brutal campaign. Voters were not very kind to me on the doorstep, except when Mr. Orlikow went with me canvassing door to door, because so many of them recognized him, so many of them called him by name, and he had helped so many of them as individuals as their member of the Legislature or as their member of Parliament. It was very interesting because I won half of the polls and lost half of the polls, but the polls that David Orlikow canvassed door to door with me, I won, and adjacent polls with similar voters and income next door, I lost those polls. So obviously his effect at the doorstep was very influential.

We will miss David Orlikow. He died so suddenly that it was hard to believe that he was here one day and gone the next. He made a wonderful contribution to the political process in Winnipeg and in Manitoba and in

Canada, both serving his constituents and promoting social and economic justice issues. Thank you.

**Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway):** I wish to pay tribute to Mr. David Orlikow, former member of Parliament for Winnipeg North. As the former MLA for Burrows, I had direct interaction with Mr. Orlikow. I remember when I was first campaigning, he offered to walk with me in the riding knocking door to door. I remember we had to climb the elevators in 145 Powers Street, the seniors home there, and introduce me to all the old folks in that place. I learned from him the fact that you have to be in touch directly with your constituents, and that is a lesson that I wish I will carry through.

Mr. Orlikow was a dedicated person, dedicated to his constituents. His priority was in following up cases of his constituents. That I also would like to emulate and follow. He had been a victim, through his wife, of injustice. The wife was one of those who were the victims of experiments, and yet when compensation was given the wife was ignored and omitted from those entitled to it on the grounds that she had already passed away. Mr. Orlikow had to fight and finally got justice. For this reason, I would consider him as a universal man with universal values for social justice, human rights and fighting for equality of treatment and against double standards.

He had been in touch with his constituents, I said. I was also frequently in his office there with Bill Puloski, his executive assistant, and he was devoting his time to following up cases of his constituents. As my colleague for Burrows stated, he was a constant communicator. He was on the phone all the time in the evening with people who not only had problems but with people who would be of help to those people with problems. But the one quality that I most admired in David Orlikow was his simplicity of lifestyle and his humility as a person. He never loved the limelight as other people do. He never sought the headlines. He just did his work with a dedication for the ordinary person and for the ordinary members of his constituency.

\* (1740)

Let me conclude and say it is better for any person in public life to have his own monument in the hearts of

people whom he had served, rather than a monument in concrete in public parks or public places. If there is any meaning to dedication to public service, it is selflessness, forgetting oneself, and dedicating his life to the service of others. He had done that for 43 years. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns):** As the current member for St. Johns, I want to pay tribute to the first member for St. Johns, Mr. David Orlikow.

I think that, of all the observations one must make of Mr. Orlikow, here is an individual who devoted his entire life, his entire being, to others and to a political cause. This was not just a day job for David Orlikow. It was not a passing interest. He thought day and night, every day, of the good, the greater good, and the purposes and objectives of our movement. I think, for example, of his later years, and after his retirement from the House of Commons, how he was almost permanently in this building, but then I hear from other people that, no, he was apparently everywhere. He spent a lot of time at the Union Centre in different offices.

He had a lot of different interests, but at the heart of his interests was always the needs of others. I can think of particular circumstances where this was exhibited in somewhat a humorous way. I recall one morning, before coming down to the Legislative Building, getting a call from Mr. Orlikow. He was suffering at that time from some ailment that had to be diagnosed, and he was in Victoria hospital. It was around 8:30 in the morning, and he said could I come and pick him up at the hospital, that if I signed him out and agreed that I would keep an eye on him, they would let him out for the day and he could come down to the Legislature and do his newspaper reading and photocopying and provide advice.

So I went down to get him, and I was not too sure when I saw him. I signed on the line and took him down to my car, and as we drove down Pembina Highway he, of course, was going on about one issue after another. I am sure that, for anyone watching, they must have been wondering who I was talking to or whether I was singing along with the radio because he was at that time becoming smaller in stature, and I do not think he could barely be seen. I was getting very

concerned about his health, and that day in particular. I did not know what I had got myself into, but as we came to the Legislative Building he hopped up those stairs like he did on every other day and got into some of our offices here and began his work. Later that day I picked him up, all was well, and away he went back to the hospital. I do not know who picked him up the next day and the next day and the next day, but I suspect that someone did. He had schemed that out very well.

I remember one time, it was a Friday afternoon, I think around 5:30, and the kids, of course, were yelling and screaming and dinner was on, and the phone rang and it was David. Sometimes he would not introduce himself, you just knew who it was. He said that we had to do something about some regulation in the cab industry. It turned out, by the end of the conversation, that the reason this was on his mind at 5:30 on a Friday afternoon was that he had just come in from the airport and had got a ride with a cabbie who had relayed these concerns. He followed up with me on how we were dealing with those issues, but it showed his concern for public policy and for others.

He was canvassing in 1995 in St. Johns with me. He insisted on that. We went to the seniors blocks in particular, and the highrises, went door to door. What I noticed—it was a very important lesson—he asked people how they were doing, where they were from if they had a bit of an accent, went on to ask them how the adjustment was coming, what needs they had and how they could be met.

It was a long canvassing excursion always with David, but it was one where I clearly had an insight into how much this man cared for others. I respected and I appreciated his advice from time to time. I appreciated his research, often very extensive. He was someone who was aware of newspapers I had never heard of. He gathered information from around the world. I know one of his concerns in his later years, and a growing concern, was the use of tobacco and the harm that it was causing not just individuals but causing communities and causing a challenge to government as well.

He also had one of the most extensive networks of contacts. This was not simply because of his longevity

in political life. It was because he took an interest in establishing contact, an interest in learning from others. If you had a question about any area of public policy, he would have contacts from coast to coast and elsewhere beyond these borders to assist.

So I am going to cut the speech short, because I know he would want that. He would want me to get back to the work of public policy and to further the goals and objectives of our movement. I salute Mr. David Orlikow, and at this time, once again, on behalf of the people that he served as a provincial MLA as well as a federal member of Parliament, recognize his invaluable contribution to the well-being of others. Thank you.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, I know that many have said a great many appropriate things and reminiscences of David Orlikow, but as a person born and raised in the north end of Winnipeg, I want to add my own thoughts and condolences to the family of David Orlikow, particularly his daughter and grandchildren on the significant loss of a person who devoted virtually his entire life to the public.

As a matter of fact, growing up in the north end, I can hardly recall anybody else representing the area in which I lived because David Orlikow was so prominent. When you look at the history of his having been on the school board from 1945 to 1960 and then overlapped with being on City Council, an alderman at the City of Winnipeg from '51 to '58, and even overlapped his service on school board with his first election to this Legislature, which was, of course, between '58 and '62, he was a man who was totally devoted to service. In fact, he was literally a workaholic.

I know others have talked about the fact that he was always coming in and out of this building even in his retirement years with a stack of books, reference manuals and papers under his arm, whether he was working for the Manitoba Society of Seniors or, obviously, for the party, lifelong CCF, New Democrat, or whether it was for individuals with whom he had had contact over the years and for whom he still cared and acted really as their advocate, and in many ways as a shadow representative even after he had retired from Parliament. He was a remarkable individual in that devotion to service and the sort of individual that we

know has made up the history of this Legislature and the Parliament of Canada, and yet in many ways probably the last of a breed, the last of an era, those who stay for three and four decades in public life and retain the same vitality and the same vigour and commitment to their cause and to their people. These are certainly things that I do not believe we are going to see in the future.

\* (1750)

I just say, Madam Speaker, that although we had a different political belief, David and I always said hello as he was entering or leaving the building or walking down the halls. I think I probably saw him within a couple of weeks of his passing, because he was still coming into this building, either to do some research in the library, which was a place that he frequented, or perhaps just a chat with members opposite.

So for that devoted service to the public, for that sense of commitment to the people of his province and his area of the city of Winnipeg in particular, that I know he loved so well, I just want to add my thanks and those of our party for a life of public service well served and indeed a life of service of which we can all be very, very proud and for which we are all very thankful.

**Hon. David Newman (Minister responsible for Native Affairs):** Madam Speaker, if I may just add some words to really complement what the Premier has just said. I made it a point to attend the memorial service of David Orlikow at Tec Voc because I had bumped into him from time to time and always had discussions with him which were meaningful, and I had a great deal of respect for someone that took his job as a parliamentarian so seriously.

He practised what he preached, and he performed the role of a service provider in ways that were not using charm, were not using political tricks, but were using his intellect, his time, and with a great deal of commitment and a growing experience. I just wanted to pay tribute to him and express my condolences to his family for whom he was a role model in terms of providing of service. He did not have, in many cases, the balance in his life that many do, but hearing his grandson at the memorial service, it is very clear that he

has left an imprint which is going to be very positive, and the family can be very proud of the legacy that he has left behind.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? [agreed]

Would honourable members please rise and remain standing to indicate their support for the motion.

*A moment of silence was observed.*

### **Carolynne Morrison**

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck), that this House convey to the family of the late Carolynne Morrison, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of her devotion to duty and a useful life of active community and public service and that Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, on behalf of members on this side of the House, all my colleagues and members of our party, I join with all members of Carolynne Morrison's family and her friends, through the many experiences and activities in which she was involved throughout her life, in giving thanks for her devotion to her family, to her fellow citizens, to her neighbours, to her friends, to her community, indeed, to Manitoba in general.

Carolynne Morrison was a member of this Legislative Assembly from December 9, 1960 until the June 25, 1969 general election, which she did not contest. She was elected three times, in 1960, '62 and '66. I had the great privilege of meeting her in Morden in 1981, when I was a member of the cabinet of Sterling Lyon and we were on a cabinet tour in that area, and she came to a public function that we had, a coffee and conversation, introduced herself to me. We had a very pleasant chat. Then, after that time, at a number of other occasions at

various party events in southern Manitoba, I had a chance to see her.

I was absolutely fascinated at all of the things that she had done in her life. Certainly, she was elected a member of this Legislature at a time when there were not many women. In fact, I think that she and Thelma Forbes served together and were the only two in this House during that period of time. She actually took the seat that had been represented by her husband, her late husband, and had been approached by members of the party to contest it after the seat had gone to a member of another party. She was successful in a by-election and then, as I said earlier, continued to serve for a period of approximately nine years.

She was certainly a Manitoban in every respect: born in the Ridgeville area, near Emerson; took her schooling in Ridgeville and in St. Jean; attended Brandon Normal School and earned a teaching certificate in 1923; taught at Overdale, Windygates, Myrtle and Miami; married her beloved Hughie in 1938; was very supportive of all of his activities, whether it be as a farmer, as an auctioneer or as a member of this Legislature, until his death in 1957.

Carolyn epitomizes so many women that I have come to regard as the backbone of our rural society in so many ways. When you look at all the organizations that she devoted herself to aside from public life, aside from her career as a teacher, aside from her career as a wife, as a participant in the farm and all of those things, you know she was in office with the local Red Cross; 12 years on the Manitou Hospital board; was the local correspondent for a western Canadian newspaper for her district; was an organist for both the Baptist and United Churches; and, quite fascinating, she was an active participant in the Manitou Horticultural Society; very proud to have been involved in the development of a small park on the edge of Manitou that features a one-room school.

You look at all of those things, and you know why Carolyn Morrison was elected to represent those areas, because she was spending her whole life representing people and working for people as a volunteer and as an active participant in all these organizations. I found it interesting that she was known for many acts of kindness and her generosity of spirit and for saying the

right thing at the right time to people, writing them that note just when it was most needed. One of the things that she wrote on one occasion was, and I quote: I have heard it said the service we render in this world is the rent we pay for the privilege of being here. I hope I have paid at least part of my rent.

\* (1800)

Indeed, when you read her biography, she certainly did pay her rent in full at all times as a very active contributor in all respects to the betterment of our lives here in Manitoba. Because of her many services within our party and as a member of this Legislature, she was made an honorary life member of our party, something of which we should all be very, very proud.

So, today, on behalf of all members of our party, Madam Speaker, I want to extend our condolences to her surviving family and friends and certainly put on the record our thanks for a life filled with service to fellow citizens, to neighbours, to friends, to community and to Manitoba.

### House Business

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, in order to accommodate the work of the House, I wonder if we might not see the clock until 7 p.m.

**Madam Speaker:** Is that the will of the House? [agreed]

\* \* \*

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I want to join with the Premier and pay tribute to the late Carolyn Morrison and her contributions to this Legislature and the people of this province. I had a chance to read through Carolyn's contributions just a few moments ago. I did not know her. It was interesting to note that Dr. Jack Armstrong is a nephew of Carolyn. I do know him, if he is the same Jack Armstrong who is the former head of the Medical Association here in Manitoba and the national president. I bumped into one of his relatives this morning. On my way in I almost blocked the Premier's

route in. We were having a long chat about the issues of the day.

So I know Carolyne through a couple of other relatives. It is a family, obviously, of strong personal commitment to their fellow citizens, as the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has indicated in his comments. When you look through her tremendous participation: a teacher, a local Red Cross representative, on the Manitou Hospital board, she is, as the Premier has described, a person who exemplifies the kind of community and co-operation and family participation that makes our community so strong and makes our province so rich. It has always been my belief it is our people who make us strong and make us rich in our lives.

I have not visited the park that she established, but the one-room school house is not only a park that she should be credited for establishing, but—I would like to see it and take my kids there. I am sure that they would find it strange to know that at one point in our history that school was the one-room school house and all the kids in there were different grades, as each community had their school. I think that lasting legacy is important for our history.

I want to pay tribute to Carolyne's contributions to this Legislature: elected in 1960; re-elected in '62 and '66; obviously another strong representative of the Roblin government that I felt was a very, very worthy government; brought a lot of modernization to our province; was a decent human-balanced government; brought a lot of Manitoba, if you will, into the latter part of the century with education and health care, and obviously people like Carolyne contributed to those decisions with the background that she brought to this Legislature.

So on behalf of our party, I want to thank Carolyne Morrison for her contributions to her fellow citizens. I want to thank her for her lasting contributions to our community, and I look forward to someday visiting the one-room schoolhouse park that she has left for us in Manitou. Thank you.

**Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina):** I, too, would like to just put a few words on the record. I had the opportunity of attending the memorial service, and at the service I had the opportunity to speak to members of her family.

Certainly the quote that the Premier read was indicative of her life, and so I asked the members of the family as to what I could remember her as and what some of the words were, the thoughts that came to their minds in memory of her. I think, as has already been indicated, she passed away—I believe she was 92 years old, but she was afflicted with a disease, Alzheimer's, at the end—but the comments that were made about her at that time were simply the fact that through everything and through her illness, there were three words that they remembered her by, and those were the words gracious, dignified, and generous. Certainly this was something that they remembered her as, even in the last days of her life.

She loved young people. She loved teaching. Her nieces and nephews were known to come to her place in summer. As an MLA, she spent the majority of her time in Winnipeg during the winters, but during the summer she went back to the farm and would run the farm, but her nieces and nephews would come and stay at her place. They just remembered the tremendous times that they had together with her.

The other comment I would like to put on the record is that legend has it that as a teacher, approaching Christmastime each year, she would be convincing her students and telling them that in order to be able to have the program at the school, she would be out looking for Santa Claus. So this is something that I am told she did year after year, and this is what they remembered her by. She was a great person. I did not have the opportunity to learn to know her, but certainly I want to also express my condolences to the family and the fondness that they remember her by. Thank you very much.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture):** Madam Speaker, I just want to associate myself with those comments that have already been made with respect to Carolyne Morrison.

It was my privilege to have sat in this Chamber with her for a period of some three years. I have very fond memories of her in our caucus. She was the only woman member in our caucus at that time, the other woman member being a Speaker of the House, Miss Thelma Forbes, as the Premier has already alluded to, so Carolyne had a lot to put up with sometimes, as you

can imagine in those days. But certainly to her family, to her loved ones, she was a tremendous inspiration.

I had the privilege of some years later, sometime after she had left public office, to visit in her home, and as has already been alluded to, she was an accomplished pianist and organist and served in that capacity for many years for the Baptist Church and for the United Church, but I recall spending a pleasant evening with her at her piano in her home, and myself in my modest way enjoying singing some hymns which provided for a nice evening of meditation. So, certainly in the memory of Carolyne Morrison, the years that I was privileged to have served with her in this Chamber, my most sincere sympathy to her family. I take this opportunity to join in this resolution of sympathy.

\* (1810)

**Madam Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion? [agreed]

Would all honourable members please rise and remain standing to indicate their support for the motion.

*A moment of silence was observed.*

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, with the leave of the House, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns), that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**Motion agreed to.**

### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (Continued)

#### Consideration of Concurrence Motion

**Mr. Chairperson (Marcel Laurendeau):** The Committee of Supply has before it for our consideration a motion concurring in all Supply resolutions relating to Estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Chairperson, as we are sitting around and seeing some discussions

ongoing, I figure, as opposed to sitting idly, I thought I would ask a few questions of the Minister responsible for emergency services (Mr. Pitura) with respect to last year's flood.

To start it off, I wonder if the minister can indicate in terms of numbers of individuals that would currently, today, be displaced as a result of last year's flood. Does he have those numbers here?

**Hon. Frank Pitura (Minister of Government Services):** I would advise the member that the latest update I have, I will just give him the date that I have here, because there have been some changes since that time. Originally, the end of May, there were 81 families on temporary housing. We went into a case management mode with all the families that were in temporary housing and are meeting with them on a regular basis.

For the most part, some 62 of those 81 families have now indicated to us as to what they expected they would have for return dates into their homes, whether they be reconstructed homes or new homes. So we are left with a number approximating 20 in the flood plain area, in the rural area that are, as of today, trying to go through a process of trying to decide exactly what they would want to do. Some of them are senior citizens and the extended families involved. They are trying to decide as to whether they would rebuild on that site, whether they move into the ring dike community closest to them or if indeed they might even move into the city environment.

As they go through these decisions, we are prepared to work with them on a regular basis, keeping regular contact with them to see how they have progressed, if they need some assistance whether it be financial counselling, whether it be somebody from the trauma team, Manitoba Health or any other resource that they might need. We are there to help them with that. We are prepared to give them as much time as they need to decide as to what they want to do. At this present time, all the families except for about 20 have definite dates of return back to their residence.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** More so for clarification then, of the approximately 81 families, there are only the 20 then, around 20 that are in that situation. So it is no fault of

government in the sense of compensation that is being questioned. It is strictly a question on those residents trying to determine what is in their best interests. I just seek that for confirmation.

**Mr. Pitura:** In most of the cases, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the individuals are trying to go through this decision process. Now there have also been some properties as well that would—well, they are not in terms of temporary accommodation, because people who are in temporary accommodation have either had structural damage or have had their house declared as unsalvageable.

We have also had, since, once the flood waters receded and people cleaned up, we then entered into another phase as well. That was with the determination that there were some homes infected with mould. So they essentially triggered a new claim that occurred, and since that time we have had numerous inspections with mould. So there are some families that are affected as a result of having mould. Indeed, some homes have been declared unsalvageable because of the mould.

\* (1820)

For the most part, all these residents, it is not because of an inability of them to access the programs. It is just a case of them not knowing for sure what to do, because the dollars are there for them to access, and, in fact, a lot of them have their dollars up front already.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Chairperson, can the minister give some sort of indication of all those individual family homes that would have, in fact, been flooded or individuals asked to relocate, if you like, what percentage of those that would have been outside of protective areas, if you like, would have actually relocated their homes? Does the minister have any idea on the actual numbers?

Again, it is individual homes that were outside of protected areas in which the homes themselves were flooded. Have we seen a majority, for example, of those homes rebuilt to the way in which they were, or with some modifications, obviously, but still in the same location? What expectations were there of those homes in reconstruction to build for the future?

**Mr. Pitura:** Mr. Chairperson, it is interesting now to travel through the flood plain area. I do not know if the member for Inkster has had the opportunity to go south of Winnipeg either on 75 highway or Red River Drive and to see what is happening with regard to the reconstruction process.

The vast majority of people have a lot of faith in the Red River Valley as a good place to live, and you can judge that by driving down, in particular, Red River Drive or St. Mary's Road, where these homes are either protected with a ring dike or they have been built up on these huge pads. In fact, I think some of the new homes that are being built on these pads are, indeed, better homes than there were there before. They are going to have one magnificent view when they look out of their window, because they are now probably 30 feet higher than they were before.

So, for the most part, the majority of people have decided to rebuild. Of the number of homes affected, houses with structural damage, for example, 593 homes, the vast majority of those have decided to build on their locations and protect themselves. We have had, as well, in the ring dike communities—and if you look at Emerson, St. Jean, Morris, St. Adolphe, to some extent, but particularly in the communities of Morris and St. Jean Baptiste, that a number of farm families have decided that it is better to have their homes within the protected dike and drive to work every day, rather than rebuild at their home site because, for many of them, they have gone through several of these floods now, the 1997 flood, I guess, you could probably say was the straw that broke the camel's back because it did not take them long to make that decision that the next home was going to be inside a ring dike community.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** I wonder if the minister can give some sort of indication of family dwellings that would be somewhere in the flood zone, that would not be in protected areas that would actually be below the '97 flood level. Do we have any idea of—and I am talking about family dwellings. No doubt, there is going to be other construction or other buildings, but strictly speaking with families. Do we have any idea of actual numbers that would be unprotected today?

**Mr. Pitura:** I can give the member for Inkster probably an approximation, because we are going



through a process now of identifying properties that either did not sustain a great deal of flooding and were protected through the flood but now are sitting at an elevation below the 1997 levels. There are also some properties, as a result of being on small lots along the Red River, where, in particular, bank stability has been identified as a major problem and there is not enough room to either build a house up on a pad because it is so close to the river, and it is also too close to the access road.

We have those problems as well identified along the Morris River. In total, there are approximately 70 properties that have been identified that makes it very difficult for them to be protected for any future flooding. So that is an issue that we are trying to address at the present time and are having discussions with the federal government in regard to a program that would address their issues.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Chairperson, do we have any plans in terms of beefing up some of the protections that were there, that were built, things such as the Z-dike? Are things going well with its long-term development? There was some discussion of the needs for the flood gates for example. Are the monies allocated to be able to make the renovations that are necessary to make sure that, in the future, if needed, these valuable flood fighting tools will in fact be there, that we will not have the potential same sort of a crisis situation that we had, for example, in having to build that Z-dike and some of the problems that resulted as a result of our having to build it so quickly? How is that work proceeding? Is the minister, in fact, satisfied?

**Mr. Pitura:** Mr. Chairperson—[interjection] Thank you, I did not understand what you said. Actually the questions about the Z-dike—I am sorry, I knew what the honourable member for Inkster said—being bolstered or being reconstructed, really the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cummings) should be answering those questions.

However, since it is at my back door, so to speak—the Z-dike is only, the west floodway dike is only about a mile from where I live. Reconstruction has begun on that part of the west floodway dike that had the most threat of water going over it, being breached, that is being reconstructed as we speak. The Brunkild Z-dike,

or the Z-dike, as it is often referred to, is, I understand, coming down and a portion of Provincial Road 305 west of the west floodway dike, because they join together, is being rebuilt and constructed, and approximately three miles of that is needed to be at a level above 1997, which is where the water was during the flood. So that is being reconstructed as well.

With regard to the floodproofing in the Red River Valley, it is going well. The floodproofing is going well within the valley. For the most part many of the private residences have, as I indicated earlier, indicated to us the dates that they will be returning back to their residences in a floodproofed zone. The floodproofing designs for communities such as Ste. Agathe have been put into place, the design is there, the engineering work is there and also the dollars are available within the existing memorandum of understanding to proceed with the construction of that dike. That construction will begin this year and will be finished off next year.

Other communities such as Rosenort, Riverside, Aubigny and the extension to St. Adolphe and the dike around Grande Point, the designs have all been done. In some cases we are waiting for the communities to give the final okay as to what they would like to see for a dike. In most cases, where the communities have given their approval already, the municipal council has indicated its willingness to go ahead.

Our basic blockage right now is funding. The original floodproofing agreement had some \$24 million in that agreement. Most of that is going to be used for private diking. In terms of the diking around communities, we are short on the capital that would be necessary to do the ring dikes around some 20 communities that have been identified. We are back in a process right now of trying to have discussions with the federal government. The federal senior level bureaucrats have already approved the projects that have been identified and also have approved with regard to the way it should be cost-shared. I mean there are no problems with that.

\* (1830)

The problem that we do have is the fact that the Treasury Board, the federal Treasury Board is saying that they cannot get the money put into place for us to

continue with these programs at the present time. So we have responded and said, look, we will start. We will front end this whole project and we will spend the dollars. Whenever Treasury Board in Ottawa meets to approve the funding, then forward us the money. They said, no, if you do that, then anything you do—and start out with provincial funding, we have this retroactivity clause that is in, I think, all federal government programs. So they indicated to us, if you do that, if you start doing, say, the ring dike at Rosenort, which is a \$12-million project, then it is 100 percent all yours. Now what we are asking them to do is please drop the retroactivity; we will cash flow it up front, and you come in at the tail end and ante in your money.

We are in those discussions right now. I think there is room for optimism, because I think that they understand as well as we do that a number of individuals are affected by the ring dikes around these communities. They are either in the way of the ring dike, in which case we would have to expropriate their property, the provincial government would have to expropriate, or they are just outside the ring dike, which then the effect of the dike on their own personal property would create a lot more damage for them in the event of high water. So the opportunity for them to be able to sell their property should be there. We have identified that, and that is part of those 70 homes that I was telling you about.

It is slow. It is falling into place. It is not falling into place as fast as I would like, because my goal as minister in this department was to have everybody—I would like to be able to announce that everybody is back in their homes by the end of August. I do not know if that is going to be a realistic goal or not because of these other areas that we have to work through. But that essentially is where the floodproofing program is at right now.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Chairperson, it would be nice to be able to say that you have Duff's Ditch that saved the city of Winnipeg, and if we had the Filmon floodproofing, we would ensure that the rest of Manitoba does not have to suffer the type of emotional toll in the future that we have experienced in the past.

Within the city of Winnipeg, there was a need for diking. I know the member for St. Norbert (Mr.

Laurendeau), for example, did a lot of sandbagging amongst other politicians in the north end along Scotia Street. There was a great deal of sandbagging that was done. I even had the opportunity to throw a few sandbags myself, Mr. Chairperson.

I think that we do not want to overlook—once you get past the flood gates and some of those external mechanisms that are out there, there is also the need internally from within the city. To what degree is the government getting involved in some of those issues?

I remember talking to one lady on the sandbag line out on Scotia Street. She was saying that the street itself was kind of like the ultimate dike. If it goes past Scotia Street, really it goes right into the city, into the north end. There was one chap that I was walking up on top of the dike with, and he owned the house that was right below it, and he was showing me some pictures of how the water went over and into the city. So obviously it is important that we beef up the stuff on the outside but not necessarily to forget that we do have some sore points on the inside. To what degree is the government involved in ensuring that those are in fact also being floodproofed?

**Mr. Pitura:** Again, I just share with the member that the question he is asking might be best answered by my colleague the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cummings). But I would share with the member that the properties within Winnipeg that have been identified, we have identified those in discussions with the city. We are having ongoing discussions between the federal government, the city and ourselves to try and arrive at a reasonable solution as to how to address those properties. Given another 1997 flood level, the ability—the top of their dike is at 24.5, any additional water above that, they would have to have artificial, well, in place some other type of floodproofing such as sandbags or something like that.

The goal that we have is to be able to arrange and make a suitable arrangement with the federal government and the city to cost-share and to arrange that these homes would have sufficient protection in future. There are some problems that creep up as we take a look at it, in some respects the numbers of homes and properties that are in those high risk areas. If one were to take a look at a property purchase such as

Grand Forks is doing, as an example, the total dollar value of all that property would be a tremendous price tag for even all three levels of government to address. So we are looking at alternatives in the whole process with regard to not only making sure that the existing dikes along the river are sufficiently stable but at the same time to address the situation with the individuals that indeed may be prone to some water damage or the threat of water, should another 1997 occur.

At this point in time, it is discussion. We have got some ideas on the table, but really we have to go much further along the way before we can really get some rationalization to this problem. We have identified it, and we are in the process of hoping to do something about it.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** No doubt there are many Manitobans who have a lot of opinions on what actually has taken place where maybe we feel somewhat vulnerable to the higher levels of water. I am wondering if the minister in his capacity—because even though I realize that some of the questions being posed could be best posed to a different minister, I also then acknowledge that this particular minister has a great deal of expertise from within that department with what the problems were of the last flood.

I am sure, Mr. Chairperson, that the role that the government could play would be very positive in ensuring or marginalizing any future damage by water. For that reason, I look at some of the communities that were affected. What I found is that you had leaders of those communities, not necessarily in an elected capacity because I know that many members of this Chamber, many members from Ottawa, candidates from the last federal election, all got involved in doing what they could. It is not to marginalize their opinions and thoughts, because they have different forums in which they can express that, but they were also Joe Q or Jane Q who put in just so much energy and resources, and so familiar with the community that there could be some benefit by getting these individuals involved.

\* (1840)

Does this particular minister—or would he be aware of any sort of a listing of some of those personalities

which we could tap into to find out how we could again make our communities more floodproof? Does such a list exist?

**Mr. Pitura:** Mr. Chairperson, no, I am not sure I know of any list, so to speak, of personalities that could be listed out in terms of contact to help assist in this area. We have been working with and maintaining contact with the M.P.s that are certainly involved in the flood, Mr. Iftody in my part of the country, and the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson), Mr. Duhamel, who is the Minister responsible for WD, Mr. Axworthy, Mr. Alcock. Like we have been making sure that they are all kept up to speed with regard to the issues at hand. In fact, we are depending on them to carry our message through into the Liberal caucus to help us address the problems that have been identified here in regard to floodproofing.

I think our goal, if we can accomplish what we set out to do, would be that in another flood of a 1997 level, that we would have minimum damage. If I can share with the member right now, as of today, or I am sorry—yes, as of April 29—no, I am sorry, as of today June 24, in the private claims, we have paid out \$66.8 million. In municipal claims, we have paid our \$55.2 million. We could in another 1997 flood event potentially save in excess of a hundred million dollars worth of damage to private property and to municipal property if we are willing to spend somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$300 million to \$400 million now to get everything back into shape and get all the floodproofing in place. So it would not take long for these dollars to be paid back in terms of the benefit cost.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Chairperson, I appreciate the time from the minister. I thought maybe what I would do is, just seeing that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) is also here, to pose a few questions regarding agriculture, which is obviously another important area for us to have some dialogue on.

Mr. Chairperson, there has always been a great deal of entrepreneurship in rural Manitoba as we have seen the farmer and others adopt so well to the getting rid of the Crow. There are certain industries that have done exceptionally well. One of those industries, in general, has been the hog industry, and I know that the Minister

of Agriculture (Mr. Enns) has done his best at keeping on top of that particular issue, so we have a few questions that I wanted to pose to him with respect to that, amongst possibly one or two other issues, depending on how things evolve here this evening.

The first one is to get some sort of an idea of the current status of the hog industry from this minister's perspective. What I am thinking of specifically is the type of production that we actually have today and the type of production which the minister is realistically expecting over the next couple of years, as many Manitobans are being told to expect considerable increase in production. I was hoping that the minister would make sure that we have our feet on the ground in dealing with that particular issue, if he can give us some sort of an idea of our current production, what he anticipates the future—in talking about the future I am talking about the next couple of years. I know the government House leader was wanting to, before the ministers respond, have a few words.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Chairman, I really do ask the understanding from members opposite to appreciate what is fuelling the expansion of the hog industry. It is not the Minister of Agriculture, it is not my department, it is not this particular government. It is the very hard and unavoidable economic fact that in the post-Crow era we simply have to find a way of using humungous piles of feed grain that this province produces. My nonfarm friends sometimes ask me, well, if it is so uneconomical now with having to pay the whole freight, why do farmers grow feed grains, barleys and wheats if it is difficult to economically justify the production of that crop?

Farmers do not necessarily just grow feed grains. Weather determines very often—excessive rains at harvest time turns the best malt barley, which normally goes into the brewery business for the production of beer, after a week of bad weather in harvest time, the only utilization of that grain can be for feed.

The same thing with premium quality milling wheat that expectations are to be milled into flour to bake bread, the same thing applies. Inclement weather turns that into No. 3 grade utility wheat which is used extensively in the feather industry, particularly, but also

to some extent in hogs. So that is the issue, and I use this as a dramatic kind of example of just how serious that situation is.

A farmer sends me a letter from the Swan River area, and that area, of course, is the most severe example, where he shipped two carloads of grain. One carload was not sufficient to cover the freight. It took a little bit of the second one. Now, if the farmers and these entrepreneurs that the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) spoke of just a moment ago, they see the opportunity of converting those—instead of paying those freight grains and converting them and value adding them into hogs, that is what is fuelling the industry, and we in the Department of Agriculture have to acknowledge with them, we, together with the association of my colleague, the Minister of Environment, and I say this without being boastful or something like that, that we have probably now in Manitoba the most stringent regulations with respect to the proper management of some of the associated problems, manure disposal, proper use of the land.

But before we look at that manure as a problem, let us look at it in its true light. My farmers are right now spreading \$200 million worth of chemical fertilizer on our land, and, quite frankly, that fertilizer can do exactly the same damage, in some instances more, than hog manure if it is done improperly. In fact, in some of the soil testing that my department has done, the most severe degradation of land does not come from hog manure but from intensive application of this chemical fertilizer.

My department estimates that we can cut that reliance on chemical fertilizer, the chemicals that we put on our land, by half, saving the farmers \$100 million and properly utilizing this organic fertilizer hog manure.

\* (1850)

Now, we have to know what we are doing, and we are the only jurisdiction, quite frankly, in North America, to my knowledge, that is doing it. We will demand annual soil testing every year from heretofore, so that we can build a data bank and we can check not just a proponent saying it or the Department of Agriculture saying it, but we can, in effect, keep an annual check to see what is happening—is the nitrogen

going down; is it threatening our ground water supplies—and then take appropriate corrective action if it is.

I would like to institute—I have spoken to the Minister of Environment (Mr. McCrae) formally about this. I would like to do it this summer, quite frankly. I would like to employ several youths in our STEP student program or something like that. I would like to take a sample of every well in Manitoba this summer and have it analyzed in a laboratory for the simple purpose of saying this is the quality of the water as it was on August 15, 1998, and particularly around those areas where hog operations are operating. I want to do that over the next five years.

It would not be a big-ticket item, but what it would start telling us, instead of arguing emotionally as many of these arguments go, instead of arguing in a fearmongering kind of way, we would have science telling us, no, we are not doing anything injurious to our ground water supply, because nobody wants to do that, least of all this minister, least of all this government, and, more importantly, least of all the people who live in those areas.

So these are the things that give me confidence that we can continue in an orderly expansion, remembering that every thousand hogs that my farmers raise produce six jobs, and they are good jobs.

To date, we are rapidly approaching 4 million hogs in total production in the province. We have surpassed Alberta. In my belief, we will surpass Ontario and Quebec in the next few years. Certainly, with the commencement of the construction of the processing plant in Brandon, and there are indications that the Schneider people are not finished expanding, that it is the estimation that the processing capacity will call for upwards of 6 million to 7 million hogs; in other words, another substantial increase in the next few years.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Chairperson, I realize that we want to move on to other areas, so even though I had indicated that there was going to be a number of questions, hopefully, there will be another day in which we can continue the discussion on this very important issue. Thank you.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Thank you.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Chairman, with the leave of the House, I suggest that you adjourn this committee and—

**Mr. Chairperson:** Interrupt the proceedings.

**Mr. McCrae:** —interrupt the proceedings and return to the Chair.

**Mr. Chairperson:** Is there leave that I interrupt the proceedings of the committee at this time? [agreed] I am interrupting the committee, and the Speaker shall take the Chair. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

### House Business

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, with the leave of the House, we are going to deal with a number of bills now, and I would ask that we not see the clock until eight o'clock?

**Madam Speaker:** Is there leave to not see the clock till eight o'clock? [agreed]

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** The bills I contemplate dealing with this evening would be Bills 2, 10, 32, 34, 36. I would ask that Bill 2 be called for Report Stage.

## REPORT STAGE

### Bill 2—The Elections Amendment Act

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, on behalf of the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), and seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson), I move that Bill 2, The Elections Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi électorale), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

**Madam Speaker:** Does the honourable government House leader have leave? [agreed]

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Downey),

THAT Bill 2 be amended

(a) by striking out section 21 and substituting the following:

21 Section 31 is repealed and the following is substituted:

**Inmates disqualified from voting**

**31** Every inmate of a correctional facility serving a sentence of five years or more is disqualified from voting in an election, and the name of such a person shall not be placed on a voters list.

(b) by striking section 22; and

(c) by striking out section 35.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Filmon:** Madam Speaker, as members know, Section 31, which is being repealed in this legislation, was in fact struck down in the Manitoba Federal Court in 1988, and our Elections Manitoba has been in effect giving the vote to all prisoners since then. They have been operating in accordance with the decision that was made by the Federal Court in Manitoba.

The Chief Electoral Officer has recommended that we repeal this Section 31 to ensure that our practice is reflected in our legislation. I know that many members are uncomfortable with the thought that prisoners and those who have, in a court of law, been seen to have violated society's standards and laws and have had their rights to freedom taken away, to be put in prison, that they should obviously give up their rights in a free and democratic society for the period of incarceration, one of which is the right to vote.

Unfortunately, the Federal Court does not agree with my colleagues on this side of the House in that matter. I know that members opposite have said that they have a different feeling about that, that they do believe that some prisoners should have the right to vote but others should not, and that view was expressed in committee just a couple of days ago by the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) and the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

Madam Speaker, the difficulty is in trying to find a midway solution to this issue that might be acceptable to a court in the future, because the member for Thompson said that he wants some prisoners to have the right to vote, but he does not want somebody like Paul Bernardo, who has been the perpetrator and convicted of various heinous crimes. But the problem is that you cannot create a law that says, well, Paul Bernardo will not be able to vote, but everybody else will. So the Supreme Court is going to eventually have to deal with this.

\* (1900)

In the absence of that kind of resolution, we have to try and pick something that makes sense as a limitation beyond which people still are denied the right to vote in reflection of their paying their debts to society through their periods of incarceration. After much discussion, it was felt that a period of time of the sentence that would exceed the normal period of time of a government, for instance five years, a period that also reflects normally more serious crimes, a sentence of five years or more, generally speaking, reflects very serious crimes. That would be a standard that we ought to put in law as a reflection of the fact that we do believe that there is still a need to ensure that those who are in prison for serious crimes ought to relinquish some of their normal freedoms and privileges in a democratic society.

Therefore, this reflects that by saying that those who are imprisoned serving a sentence of five years or more should be disqualified from voting in provincial elections, and I believe that is a supportable amendment and one that we ought to include in this legislation.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question is report stage proposed amendment to Bill 2. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Madam Speaker:** Agreed. On division? On division.

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, on behalf of the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), and seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson), I move that Bill 2, The Elections Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi

électorale) as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

**Madam Speaker:** [interjection] You were voting on—the question was report stage of Bill 2 as amended.

### THIRD READINGS

#### Bill 2—The Elections Amendment Act

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, with the leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Downey), that Bill 2, The Elections Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi électorale) be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, just prior to its passage, I want to indicate that, in fact, we think that the amendment is a positive amendment. I just want to get that on the record. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 2, The Elections Amendment Act, as amended. Agreed?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**An Honourable Member:** No.

#### Voice Vote

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

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

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** On division.

**Madam Speaker:** On division.

#### Bill 10—The Mining Tax Amendment Act

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I think leave might be required here for me to move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 10, The Mining Tax Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la taxe minière), be now read a third time and passed.

**Madam Speaker:** Does the honourable government House leader have leave? [agreed]

**Motion presented.**

**Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk (St. James):** Madam Speaker, this is our final opportunity to urge the government to hold in abeyance this bill, a bill that has two parts and a bill that is seriously flawed. I would like to point out, particularly to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) who is also the chair of the Round Table of Sustainable Development—

**An Honourable Member:** Not any longer.

**Ms. Mihychuk:** Madam Speaker, formerly the chair of—formerly First Minister, we hope, but that is in the future or to be seen—but as the trumpeter of Manitoba's sustainable development movement that he created or initiated or propelled, which created a number of books or positions that the government was to take in accordance with sustainable development principles, principles that were developed in a long and fairly widespread public consultation with a number of different professionals.

I had the opportunity to actually participate, even way back in the '80s, in some of these decisions, and that is why it is so important that the First Minister actually consider what this bill means. One of the policies that the sustainable development mineral policy recommended, and that was 8.2, was that the government recognize the need to protect traditional mining areas. Those are areas where we, as the people of Manitoba, through our governments, have invested a great deal of money and resources, roads, railways, bridges, infrastructure, hospitals, and now we are facing a time of serious crisis, although the Minister of Mines likes to present a very rosy picture.

We know that commodity prices in all metals, all precious metals, all base metals are in a situation which

we have never seen before so that our mining sector, our mineral industry, is in crisis. In particular, we have two communities, as the minister well knows, as the First Minister well knows, and those are Lynn Lake and in particular Leaf Rapids. Leaf Rapids has a very limited known reserve left for the life of the Rattan Mine, a mine that basically allowed for the development of Leaf Rapids, for a lot of people to have beautiful homes, to make good money, to pay taxes to the government.

Unfortunately it is that very reason why the mineral policy was developed and why we call it a sustainable development policy, that we focus our attention into areas where there is already a great deal of investment, like Leaf Rapids. Unfortunately the present Minister of Mines (Mr. Newman) has not seen, in his wisdom, to focus attention into the Leaf Rapids area, and I urge the First Minister to read policy 8.2. I would like to do just that, that policy 8.2: programs shall be developed to encourage and direct exploration into areas threatened by permanent mine closures, specifically what is threatening Leaf Rapids. These metal reserves, copper and zinc, have been declining for more than a decade in northern Manitoba. True, as we have seen, numerous programs attempted, unfortunately not very successfully, we have had a recent disaster in a prospectors program which was going to provide more training. The program never got off the ground. People got insufficient training and never had any practical experience. So that program did not work.

\* (1910)

In order to offset this serious trend there needs to be an increase in the level and effectiveness of mineral exploration if we are to maintain the economic viability of northern mining communities. Unless efforts are made now to rebuild reserves and sustain the industry over the long term, mines will continue to shut down and the rate of economic activity and quantities of mineral reserves will continue to decline.

Government-produced geoscience information can be an essential front-end step towards decreasing the risk in finding new ore deposits. At this point, I would like to point out that even though we are in a situation of extreme crisis in Leaf Rapids, the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Newman) has not deemed it valuable to

redirect staff into this area of crisis. I urge the government to reconsider that policy and put some immediate attention to areas which do need support. As exposed near-surface orebodies are depleted and the search for new deposits extends to greater depths, mineral exploration companies depend on geoscience information and state-of-the-art exploration technologies.

Madam Speaker, we know that just in the last month we have had two announcements of further fairly significant deposits, one right under Flin Flon and the other one underneath the mine at Snow Lake. So it is not like we know that there are no further reserves in Leaf Rapids, unless this government or the Minister of Mines has some additional information. As far as I am aware, the geological information has not been used to its utmost, that in fact there is a great deal of potential in the mineral belt in the Leaf Rapids area, that in fact Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting has put out a considerable effort to look for additional resources in that area. Unfortunately, it appears that the government of Manitoba has decided this is not a critical issue and has turned its back on Leaf Rapids, at least in the short term. I would say there is no time to turn your back on Leaf Rapids because of their very limited mineral potential or their known reserves.

In Manitoba, considerable potential for finding new copper, zinc and nickel deposits currently exist, particularly under rocks overlain by the Paleozoic carbonate rocks. That is true, and we see Falconbridge doing extensive exploration south of the Ponton area, and that is looking to the future. We know that these things take a great deal of time to develop. We are hopeful that Falconbridge will be successful, but it is not going to provide jobs for the people that are in Leaf Rapids. It is not going to preserve their home values. I understand a five-bedroom home, worth over a hundred thousand in the Winnipeg market, went for less than \$10,000.

These homes were bought, built, loved, created by those individuals who thought there was a future, and unfortunately the only ones that think there is no future is apparently this government. People are losing a great deal of their investment and not only are they individuals, for instance, the person who had that home, but so are the people of Manitoba.



We invested money in the infrastructure of providing a thriving community of Leaf Rapids. We do not want to see a ghost town, a mining ghost town. I am sure that the government does not want to see that, but given the present state of the mineral industry, the mineral situation in a world perspective, it is no longer an option to be a silent partner, as the Minister of Energy Mines has indicated over and over again. Now is the time to be interventionist. Now is the time to say we have resources invested here.

If we do not provide a bridge or at least some opportunity, at least put our resources which we have the ability to control—and that is the geologists that work in the Department of Energy and Mines—focus some attention into an area which is in crisis, then I feel that the government needs to review what they are doing, needs to review what the present Minister of Mines has decided as a priority and urge the government to actually review this bill. For it, too, lacks consultation and the consensus of virtually any sector in the mineral industry.

The policy, 8.2, Madam Speaker, the intent of the policy is to maintain the economic viability of communities by finding new orebodies, ore reserves. The present philosophy, the present direction of the Minister of Mines, is to focus special initiatives into an area of unknown geological potential, an area that may hold potential in the future, but I think that anybody in the geological or mineral industry would say that these are very long-term prospective developments. This is an area with virtually no infrastructure, has a winter road that goes from Cross Lake over to the eastern communities, but other than that, very, very little infrastructure.

The workers at Leaf Rapids are not going to be working in the new mine opening in the Superior project. Common sense tells you that it is going to take four to 10 years to do some exploration if you find a near surface ore deposit, another 10 to 20 years to get that economically viable deposit into production. The people who are losing their homes and are getting laid off at Rattan will be in retirement. Their opportunities in that new land are not going to be there. That hospital we are not going to transfer from Leaf Rapids over to a brand-new community in eastern Manitoba where there are no roads, there are no people living there.

The purpose of the Mining Reserve Fund, which is what this bill talks about, was to focus the attention and the resources—money that is collected through mining taxes, profits—is put away in a fund that can be used to sustain those communities where there is potential mine closure or other economically stressful times. [interjection] It is not 40 minutes, is it? Oh, 40 minutes.

*Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

Mr. Acting Speaker, the purpose of the Mining Reserve Fund is to provide that bridge, provide an ability for a community to survive tough times. The mineral industry goes through cyclical periods in the market, and unfortunately, we are heading into a downturn. Some projections I have seen have been quite bleak, that it is going to be a very long-term downturn. Hopefully not, but the president of Inco, for example, here in Manitoba division feels that nickel prices, for example, will be depressed for perhaps a decade, and that what we are going to have to do is deal with those challenges in the North. That is a very significant challenge indeed, when so much of our infrastructure is built and supportive of the mineral industry and the mines that exist there now.

The policy, 8.2 of the sustainable development process identifies applications, applications that the government of Manitoba will do. This is not shall do, not may do, not shucks, maybe if it is convenient. It says: to meet the intent of this policy, the government of Manitoba will conduct geological and mineral appraisals and make this information available. Well, they are not sending a geologist up to the Leaf Rapids area. In fact, they are only sending up one geologist for one week into that region.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Downey), having previously been the Minister of Mines, understands that is not much of a commitment to the area of Leaf Rapids, that, indeed, with a staff of 35, we could surely find a more significant direction of resources into this area.

Number two, in applications, the government will provide incentives and programs to attract mineral exploration and development in areas threatened by permanent mine closures. Is the government doing that,

Mr. Acting Speaker? Absolutely not. When the minister has been challenged to comply, or at least listen with all seriousness the requests of the Chamber of Commerce, a group that usually has the ear of the government, a certain sector of the community that this government seems to be very responsive to, in this case they have turned their backs to the Chamber of Commerce.

The Chamber of Commerce has come out and asked for incentives to be in place for the Leaf Rapids-Lynn Lake area, a very reasonable, very reasonable request. Why? They are running out of known reserves. We have invested hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in infrastructure.

We know that there are further reserves available if we do some work in that area, and No. 4, it complies with the government's own sustainable development mineral policy which says that there is a commitment from the Premier (Mr. Filmon), who is the chair, who apparently endorsed these policies, from all of the other ministers who were at one time ministers of Mines, from the government who presented this as what their commitment will be, but indeed, there was a commitment to follow these policies. I ask the government why, at this time of crisis, they have decided to not do this.

\* (1920)

Now the incentive program is through an exploration program that the government established called MEAP, Mineral Exploration Assistance Program. It provides a grant, a rebate, for exploration in certain sectors, and there is the ability that governments provide an additional incentive to do work in the Superior Province. The Superior Province is the one, Mr. Acting Speaker, to the far east of the province, north of sort of the midline of Manitoba. That is an area that will receive a special provision. Instead of 25 percent, I believe, they are eligible to have 30 percent of their exploration investment returned to the exploration company.

There has been, in various meetings and conferences, a real emphasis on promoting exploration in the Superior Province. That is the provision, the special incentive, that the Chambers of Commerce of Leaf

Rapids and Lynn Lake have asked the government to provide for their mining areas, the traditional mining zones, the very areas that we maintain the roads, that we support the grants, that we provide the schools, that we provide public money to maintain these communities, and is clearly the area that is discussed under policy 8.2.

The Chamber of Commerce has requested that the government provide, extend, only extend what they already provide for the Superior Province. That is all they asked: just provide us with that window. The Minister of Mines, and presumably this government—but perhaps they did not know—have said no to those people, those businesses, those miners and Hudson Bay who operate the Ruttan mine at Leaf Rapids.

Now why would the government choose to say no knowingly? Why would they choose to break their own word? Why would they knowingly publish a sustainable development mineral policy book that gives the government's commitment to do one thing, and why would they turn their backs on the very thing that made sense? This bill makes no sense. This bill relates to the Mining Reserve Fund. This is a bill that is two parts: No. 1, it increases the minimum amount of the Mining Reserve Fund from \$5 million to \$10 million, a position we agree with, a position that we have urged the government to take. Five million was the base amount over 20 years ago. It is high time that more money was provided into the fund and significantly more.

The fund itself, its purpose, Mr. Acting Speaker, is stated in the bill itself which created the Mining Reserve Fund. The Mining Reserve Fund as set out in The Mining Tax Act, and I quote here from The Mining Tax Act, is for the welfare and employment of persons residing in a mining community which may be adversely affected by the total or partial suspension, the closing down of mining operations attributable to the depletion of ore deposits.

Clearly the intent of this fund was to help those miners that are actually working in those communities, those mines that are threatened under shutdown. This is the situation at Leaf Rapids. This is the situation with hundreds of families who depend on the Ruttan Mine for a salary. I do not know if the government understands what a crisis is being faced by those people

that live in this town. Can you imagine that you would not have an income in three years, that your investment in your home is going to be virtually worthless, that you are going to have to uproot your family, and during this period where you know that the end is coming, the government refuses to even send up a contingent of geologists or listen to the Chamber of Commerce and provide the ability to do some additional exploration work in that area?

What justification can the government have in this case for turning its back on a traditional mining community, turning its back on the policies of sustainable development, turning its back on the people of Manitoba? You are wasting tax dollars. You are using them inefficiently. I urge this government that wishes to pride itself on proper management, that this is indeed a crisis situation and a situation where well-intended investment of public monies is going to be wasted because of the shortsightedness of this government, because this government refuses to listen to any mineral sector that has an opinion on this topic. Does the Mining Association agree with the government in its position that it is going to take money out of the Mining Reserve Fund and put it into general revenue to fund exploration programs? Do they agree? No, they do not.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the Mining Association opposes it. Well, if Hudson Bay, Inco, Falconbridge, all of the major producers who sit as members of the Mining Association oppose it, then perhaps it is the workers, the miners that like this idea? I do not think so. The labour unions, the workers at Thompson and Hudson Bay and Leaf Rapids, in particular, are strongly opposed to the idea of taking money out of the Mining Reserve Fund, a fund intended to preserve them, a fund intended to be there in that emergency time, a fund that is created out of profits from the mines themselves, to be there when they need it.

*Madam Speaker in the Chair*

It is not the workers, it is not the miners who made this recommendation to government. It was not the mining companies that made the recommendation to government. Maybe it was the Chamber of Commerce. Did the Chamber of Commerce recommend that the government tap into the Mining Reserve Fund for a

little bit of extra general revenue? Clearly it was not the Chamber of Commerce in the North. It was not the Chamber of Commerce in Lynn Lake or Leaf Rapids. It was not the Chamber of Commerce in Flin Flon or Thompson. So whose ear was the government listening to?

Madam Speaker, I must be getting close to my 40 minutes. What I meant to say was: whose voice is the government listening to? It is not the Chamber of Commerce. It is not the mining industry. It is not the miners themselves. It is not the people that live in the North. It is not the opposition. There is no sector that I am aware of, after I have done considerable consultation on the proposal presented before us in Bill 10, who support the government's idea. Nobody who I have contacted supports this.

Perhaps the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Downey) can indicate how pulling the tap on funds that are to preserve Leaf Rapids is going to help industry and trade in those mining zones. Perhaps there is an explanation for the government's refusal to help a mining community in a traditional mining zone.

\* (1930)

This is a bill which is clearly unacceptable to any sector in the mineral industry. Now the minister, when he presented the bill, said you know I am going to give this some flexibility. If I find that the sectors in the mining community or the mineral industry do not support this, I will look at amending it or changing it. So the Minister of Mines did bring in an amendment in the committee stage. He brought in an amendment to guarantee that the government would not tap into the \$10-million minimum amount. Is he trying to do us a favour? Was there some thought by the government that they were going to, what, drain that fund down to zero? I mean the idea of a minimum amount is that that amount stay in the damn fund, but no, that is his amendment. Do not worry, to those mining communities. Do not worry, we are going to guarantee that you have \$10 million.

I believe that is an affront to the very purpose of the bill. The fund itself has amounts that exceed \$20 million and the minister, in all his greatness, has decided to guarantee that \$10 million will remain in the

fund. It is absolutely unacceptable that the government would find it is advisable to take money out of a fund like the Mining Reserve Fund, built up by those very communities, and put into general revenue. It is unethical, it is unwise economically and it hurts the North. It hurts the miners, the businesses and the communities that they have invested in and that we have all invested in by tax dollars.

The government is very eager to look at mining profits, to use those revenues for funding all sorts of programs, many that we support. We want to see a strong education system. We hope that one day it will be rebuilt. We want a strong health care system. We want beds and services for Manitobans, but when the times are tough it appears that this government has decided that now is the appropriate time to tap into the very fund that is there for that crisis situation.

In fact, the fact that the minister brought in the amendment is basically an admission of their own past misuses. There were indications that the government was reviewing the whole Exploration Assistance Program, so why would the government be bringing in a bill now if they are going to cancel the whole program, if not to justify their past misuses?

For the past, I believe, three years they have by Order-in-Council tapped into a fund that was not intended to be used that way. Yes, they had the power under that bill to use extraordinary powers to tap into the fund, to use whatever the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) deemed advisable. Well, I guess, the Minister of Finance deemed it advisable to take out \$6 million of that fund this year alone, \$6 million to put into general revenue. This bill says, if passed, that next year they do not require an Order-in-Council. They could do it automatically. They could tap into that fund and withdraw sums and use it for whatever means they want, and we find that totally unacceptable, the principle that it basically is an affront to the very purpose of that fund.

In April, the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Newman) was forced to admit that the revenue from the Mining Reserve Fund was diverted into general revenue. This was during the Estimates process, a process that revealed a number of situations, a number of issues that required direct attention. Unfortunately,

what became extremely apparent in Estimates, Madam Speaker, was that indeed this minister was not knowledgeable of the mining industry, was not on top of the issues in the mining sector, did not work with or consult the various sectors in the mining field which is second only to agriculture in terms of what it provides to Manitoba's economy.

A symbol of how this government belittles the mining industry is the fact that one minister works part time on that whole sector. We have one minister responsible for Energy and Mines and Northern Affairs and Hydro. It is a sector which deserves its own attention. This is a sector which employs over 4,000 people directly in the mining industry, provides over a billion dollars of economic activity in Manitoba and which has a number of very serious and complicated issues that require the focus and attention of a minister who actually is interested in mining, a minister who is going to spend time understanding the mineral industry, understanding the importance and complexity of a very important sector in Manitoba's economy.

The mineral industry, Madam Speaker, is extremely significant to Manitoba, and, unfortunately, the government has decided to split those responsibilities with two other very important sectors. Northern Affairs is also a very important department, and so is Manitoba Hydro. The fact is this minister was not aware of basic policies, has done virtually no consultation with the chambers, the workers, the mining industry, and it has brought forward a bill that they cannot support and that we cannot support.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading Bill 10, The Mining Tax Amendment Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Some Honourable Members:** No

**Voice Vote**

**Madam Speaker:** No? All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

**Some Honourable Members:** Yea.

\* (1940)

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

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

**An Honourable Member:** On division, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** On division.

### House Business

**Mr. McCrae:** Madam Speaker, a little revision here for you. I believe when eight o'clock arrives, everyone will agree to not see the clock till nine.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there leave of the House or unanimous consent of the House to not see the clock at eight o'clock until 9 p.m.? [agreed]

**Mr. McCrae:** The other revision, Madam Speaker, would be to continue with Bills 32 and 34, then skip over Bill 36, as previously we talked about dealing with Bill 36, but the revised list is Bills 32, 34, 13, 20, 30, 31, 35, 52.

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

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Now, with the leave of the House, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 32, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

### Motion presented.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Madam Speaker, I just want to take two or three minutes to make a few remarks about Bill 32, which is one that we are supporting. We are not opposed to it. But I just want to put on the record our concern about the lengthening of the term of office for municipal councillors outside of Winnipeg from three to four years.

The Brandon City Council on Monday night unanimously passed a resolution opposing this move. The members of the council, some of them were not aware that this particular legislation was coming before the House even though it had been discussed at the law meeting in Thompson. I believe the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities discussed it, and I think approved it even, although I am not sure what the vote was like. The Union of Manitoba Municipalities, of course, was aware, but I gather that organization was not entirely together on where they stood. They were not too certain on where they stood on this particular matter of the length of term of office.

I know there is no magical number, whether it be three, four, two, one or five or whatever, but those who argue against it say that in rural Manitoba, in particular, it is sometimes difficult to get people to run for office. If you ask them to make a four-year commitment as opposed to a three-year commitment, it would therefore be more difficult to attract—[interjection] Yes.

I am putting forward the argument that I have heard. I am not saying I necessarily agree with all these arguments, but this is the one argument that is put forward, and that is that it may discourage people from running in rural Manitoba, particularly the smaller municipalities.

**An Honourable Member:** It never discouraged you, Len.

**Mr. L. Evans:** That is true. And then the other argument that is put forward—and this was discussed at some length at the City of Brandon on Monday—and I believe the mayor or the city did forward a letter to the Minister of Environment, the government House leader (Mr. McCrae) on this matter. At least they faxed me a copy today stating their objection to it, and their concern about the four-year term, and in effect, asking us to defer the legislation.

Well, I do not believe the legislation can be deferred, because there are other important things in there, and incidentally, including the grandparenting clause for certain members of councils who want to be able to carry on in that capacity, even though they are an employee of the municipality. So it is just not possible,

I do not believe, because of other important elements of the bill, drainage and so on, that are important, that we support, that we would want to see the bill hoisted.

But on the other hand, it is regrettable that the government at report stage saw fit to vote against our amendment which was put this morning by the MLA for the Interlake (Mr. C. Evans), particularly after the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) stated publicly and quoted on the front page of the Brandon Sun yesterday, I believe, that he was prepared to listen, that the government was prepared to listen to the council and other municipalities on this particular matter.

So, Madam Speaker, I think there is a conflicting signal out there, that on the one hand the minister said that he was going to listen and the next day, the House, the government majority defeats this particular amendment. If the amendment had passed, of course, we would have just maintained the status quo, given municipalities an opportunity to be heard, to think it over more and to communicate more with the government and then, at some future time, appropriate legislation could have been brought in perhaps about timing of elections.

At any rate that was not to be, and it is too bad because there are many, many people out there who are unhappy with this move by the government.

*Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Speaker, in the Chair*

Many people in rural Manitoba are not happy with the move by the government and certainly the Brandon City Council and the mayor of Brandon are not happy with what the government has done. I am taking this opportunity, Mr. Acting Speaker, to voice their concerns to the Legislature, to say that it is regrettable that this matter was more or less rushed through. Having said that, I realize there are arguments for a four-year length of office and there is nothing really magical about any number, I would submit, in the long run. But nevertheless, in the interests of democracy, in the interests of listening to people, and particularly the municipal representatives, it might have been advisable to hold this aspect of the bill, or to make the amendment that we proposed this morning, eliminating the reference to a four-year term.

Having said that, Mr. Acting Speaker, as I said, we are quite prepared to pass the bill into law.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Acting Speaker, briefly on this particular bill, I do believe that the government has been quite negligent in its responsibilities, primarily because I was surprised to the extent which a caucus which has a good number of rural members and the general lack of knowledge that I have picked up on the actual change.

If I were to speculate, I would suggest to you that we see this here today because, in essence, of changes that were proposed through the Cuff report, and these are just coming on side as a result of that. I have had opportunity to talk to a number of individuals who have expressed in part the concern that the member for Brandon has just put on the record.

I think that, if the government had done its homework on this particular issue, it would have been much better received in rural Manitoba, in particular individuals that are in fact following the legislation. Secondly, I think it would have allowed for some sort of public input. I would apply the same words to Bill 34, as opposed to having to stand up and speak to that bill, too. Thank you.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Sveinson):** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 32, The Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités et modifications corrélatives). Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**An Honourable Member:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Sveinson):** Agreed and so ordered.

#### **Bill 34—The Public Schools Amendment Act**

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** With the leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr Findlay), that Bill 34, The Public School Amendment Act, be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Acting Speaker, just again a couple of words on this particular bill which we are not opposing, in general, but just to point out that this bill provides for lengthening the term of office for school trustees to four years. What makes me so surprised about this move is that this is being done with the total opposition of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. MAST is on record as opposing the extension of four years. I am very, very surprised that the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) and the government have not seen fit to have maybe further discussions with MAST to either get agreement or to perhaps hold off on this.

We were contacted by Mr. Draper representing school divisions in the Westman area, western Manitoba, who is very upset with this move. They believe, again arguing, that it is hard enough now to recruit people to run for a school board and then this would make it more difficult. I might add, as well, that the mayor of Brandon this morning, Reg Atkinson, indicated to me personally that he and his council had similar concerns about the four-year length, and that it was unfortunate that it was proceeding at this time.

I said that we had spoken against it—

**An Honourable Member:** So, in other words, we should shorten it maybe.

\* (1950)

**Mr. L. Evans:** Maybe so, maybe so. Our Education critic had spoken out about this in committee and in the Legislature expressing her concerns about this particular move, and again, as I said, particularly since the School Trustees of Manitoba, MAST, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees are adamantly opposed to this particular section of the bill. So again, I simply wanted to go on record to express the views of the school divisions in the Westman area and the views of the mayor of Brandon and others on this particular element of the bill. I am not commenting on other parts of the bill, most of which we support.

**Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk (St. James):** Just a few words on Bill 34, The Public Schools Amendment Act, which also has two parts. It has a part that relates to the taxation and mill rate adjustment for school divisions

that choose to amalgamate and another part that deals with the term of office for a school trustee.

In terms of the amalgamation, we are pleased that school divisions have seen it wise to voluntarily amalgamate, and that this is being facilitated by the government. Part 2, the decision to change the term from three years to four years, as expressed by the delegation which came to committee, indicated that there was generally unawareness and, No. 2, that the government appeared to be jumping to a tune dictated by the mayor and council of the City of Winnipeg, that in fact this was not a proposal supported by rural Manitobans in general. It was not an idea that was supported by trustees.

They indicated that a motion was presented to MAST at their last convention by urban trustees to extend the term to four years. That motion failed at convention by a strong majority, I understand, and the concerns are legitimate. I challenge the government to look at how they value trusteeship. It is a position where it can be extremely difficult. It is a position where you are looking at diminishing resources for a long time, unfortunately. For the ten years since this government has been in office, we have seen less and less go through to school divisions, placing trustees in a position where they are forced to increase property taxes for their own neighbours, a situation where they have to cut programs to their own children and to their neighbours' children. It is extremely difficult, in particular in rural Manitoba, where the communities are small, where you know your neighbours, where you know the demands and the needs of the children. So it is not surprising that in many divisions members or trustees are acclaimed. It is not surprising that there is a turnover, that in many circumstances trustees do not complete their terms as they are now.

The pay, Mr. Acting Speaker, does not compensate as we have seen in various studies for the work and the number of hours that trustees put in to serve their communities. It is a role that is complicated, quite difficult, and demanding. It is a role, I know from personal experience, that can be very meaningful, but is also extremely emotional.

You have parents phoning who are upset with perhaps a reduction that you have had to make because

of budgetary considerations, which has unfortunately been the case for year after year after year. They are saying that their child needs the services, and why are you doing it? So it can be extremely difficult. So they are saying, we are going to lose the continuum that we even have now, which is not sufficient. It is going to be more difficult to recruit quality candidates to fill the position of trusteeship, a role that is extremely important because it deals with our own children, and ultimately it is going to hurt public education.

Now, that group of trustees represented by the delegation that came to committee actually represents a very significant number, percentage of trustees in Manitoba. Almost a quarter, I believe, of trustees were represented in that delegation.

So I just wanted to express that one of the concerns, and I think it is a very valid concern, is that trustee is already a challenging position and that this bill will make it even more challenging for a number of rural school divisions. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Sveinson):** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 34, The Public Schools Amendment Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

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

#### **Bill 13—The Prescription Drugs Cost Assistance Amendment Act**

**Hon. James Downey (Acting Government House Leader):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 13, The Prescription Drugs Cost Assistance Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aide à l'achat de médicaments sur ordonnance), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I just want to indicate for the record that we are not

going to oppose passage of this bill. We did have some concerns, as I indicated in my second reading speech, about some of the provisions of the bill which we have checked with individuals and other organizations in the community. We are happy to see the movement towards allowing midwives to have the capacity and the power under this act to prescribe. We wanted to check out in the context of this bill specifically what the government intended to do by way of delegation. We are concerned about some of the delegation considerations of this bill, and of course we are very concerned about the lack of Pharmacare and prescription drug coverage in Manitoba and the serious effect and the serious impact it is having on Manitobans.

Having said that, we are not opposed to the passage of this bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Sveinson):** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

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

#### **Bill 20—The Medical Amendment Act**

**Hon. James Downey (Acting Government House Leader):** Mr. Acting Speaker, with leave, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns), that Bill 20, The Medical Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi médicale), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Acting Speaker, in general, it is a bill that, in fact, we can be supportive of. It makes a number of housekeeping changes to the act, among them are things such as to give the College of Physicians and Surgeons the ability to put into place regulations pertaining to matters such as liability insurance.

*Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair*



Also, the college will now have the status of trustee, a designation under The Personal Health Information Act, in the interest of patient privacy. I think that whatever we can do in terms of ensuring the privacy of patients and the rights is very important. As I say, in general, it is a bill which we can be supportive of.

\* (2000)

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had occasion, as well, to follow through with respect to this bill. We were concerned about the use of the word "doctor" in the definition section of this bill, and we had followed a lot of our queries in a favourable sense and do not have a problem with that. We have reviewed with the College of Physicians and Surgeons many of the changes in this bill, which has been predicated on previous amendments to The Medical Amendment Act, as adopted last year in this Chamber.

Having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can indicate that we have no difficulty with the passage of this bill at this time.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading Bill 20, The Medical Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi médicale. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

### **Bill 30—The Pharmaceutical Amendment Act**

**Hon. James Downey (Acting Government House Leader):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay), that Bill 30, The Pharmaceutical Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les pharmacies), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, as we indicated during second reading passage of this

bill, there were concerns we had with respect to some of the considerations entered under this bill.

We had occasion during the course of committee debates to query one of the presenters as it relates to these amendments, and we are satisfied by the responses that, in fact, this bill—and we are approving this bill on the basis that the assurances given to us by the expert are such that the specific provisions of the bill really provide for the categorization of drugs into categories one, two and three as part of a national rationalization scheme that is taking place in the country, and that by reference—that is not by reference as a term of art as is often used in drug classifications, but by reference as a term of law as used—these particular drug schedules can be adopted and these codes can be adopted into the provincial drug scheme.

We have been given assurances that this does not relate to the natural and the herbal remedy debate that is going on in this country. That had been one of our initial concerns with respect to this bill, but we are given assurances that is, in fact, not the case, which we are pleased to see that it is not the case.

As indicated earlier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with respect to the other matters relating to this bill, they are strictly of administrative nature. We are very concerned about drug coverage in this province. We are very concerned about national drug coverage.

We have made the point on numerous occasions that as one moves from a reliance on acute care and institutionalization, as one moves to a more preventative form and system of health care, one must recognize that there are certain areas where you must expand coverage in areas of prevention and in other areas of alternative approaches to medicine. Certainly, prescription drugs and pharmaceuticals are one way of ensuring that people do not necessarily have to take advantage of the institutional or more intensive acute care sector.

So I think one of the condemnations of the current health care reform that is going on both in this province and across the country is that it is an overall rationing of health care rather than a systematic review of rationing at one end or downsizing at one end and augmenting at another end.

When everything gets cut, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it certainly opens government and certainly has opened this government up to criticism that the end game is not reform, but, in fact, the end game is a total net decrease and a cutting of health care. That has certainly been the experience in this province, and that has been one of our major concerns, that you have eliminated two-thirds of people from prescription drug coverage, two-third of people. The two-thirds number is not our number. It is, in fact, the number provided by the minister.

When one considers that you have closed 1,400 acute care beds, when one considers that you have nowhere near the number of long-term care beds that are required in this province, when one sees that happening in the system and then one sees the elimination of two-thirds of Manitobans' ability to recover funding from Pharmacare, is it any wonder that there is a deep suspicion and deep concerns amongst the public with respect to health care and how it is operated in this province?

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, having said those few words, I can indicate that we are not opposed at this point to third reading passage of this particular bill.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading Bill 30, The Pharmaceutical Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les pharmacies. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

### **Bill 31—The Regulated Health Professions Statutes Amendment Act**

**Hon. James Downey (Acting Government House Leader):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Radcliffe), that Bill 31, The Regulated Health Professions Statutes Amendment Act (Loi modifiant diverses lois sur les professions de la santé réglementées), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Well, what does one say about an administrative act that regulates and

changes in an administrative sense provisions in The Chiropractors Act, The Chiropractic Act, The Dental Association Act, The Denturists Act, The Registered Dietitians Act, The Midwifery Act and The Naturopathic Act, The Occupational Therapists Act, The Ophthalmic Dispensers Act, The Optometry Act, The Physiotherapists Act, The Licensed Practical Nurses Act, The Registered Psychiatric Nurses Act, The Psychologists Registration Act, The Registered Nurses Act and The Registered Respiratory Therapists Act.

This is basically an act that brings into force provisions and changes that, as we understand it, have been necessitated by the provisions in the government's Personal Information Act and Freedom of Information Act and protection of privacy act.

So in a very real sense, this is a classic bill that is brought before us that is often referred to by ministers as an administrative bill dealing with administrative changes. I might add that very often, very frequently, changes of this nature in an omnibus sense are brought before us as legislators and the argument is made that the minister is changing the bill on an administrative basis.

But we find, slipped into certain provisions and sections of the bill—what we really see are significant changes to acts that have slipped through. But in this sense, I can certainly indicate that this is in a classic sense an administrative change to a bill, and that is truly what it is.

We do not have a problem. Albeit we did have concerns with the original act. We made many suggestions to the government as to how the act should be changed. Those were refused by the government, and at this point, we are not prepared to oppose passage on third reading of this particular act.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading Bill 31, The Regulated Health Professions Statutes Amendment Act; Loi modifiant diverses lois sur les professions de la santé réglementées.

Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

**Bill 35—The Mental Health and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Hon. James Downey (Acting Government House Leader):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Pitura), that Bill 35, The Mental Health and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur la santé mentale et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

\* (2010)

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have before us a bill that, in my eight years in this Chamber, has probably been the most difficult to weigh and to determine and to review in terms of how one should vote and how one should deal with this particular bill.

Very often, the most difficult decisions are those where both sides have merit and on both sides one can see the value of changes. In this particular case, in this particular bill, although there are many changes to The Mental Health Act—indeed, The Mental Health Act has been rewritten as a result of this bill—the entire focus of the debate basically centred on changes on the provision that the minister has brought in dealing with changes to the provisions providing for certificate of leave.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are other significant changes in this bill. There are changes, for example, where we see that the age of competency for an individual moves from 18 to 16. That is significant. That is significant vis-a-vis the effects it has on treatment decisions and effects it has on Manitobans, and on the effects it has on the relationship to other bills and other acts. We see changes to proxies, we see changes to trustee relationships, we see changes to other relationships, but most of the debate and most of the concern in this bill and most of the public presentations focused on changes to the certificate-of-leave provisions.

Now, as I indicated, this is a bill where both sides of the argument appeared and both sides of the argument

suggested that their side was best for the public good. I know we have had those arguments, and in fact, that argument is present in most debates in this Chamber, but I have not quite seen a bill where the decision was as quite as acute as this one. In fact, literally, during the public hearing presentations of this bill, we had presentations that said if you passed the provisions that contain the certificate of leave, people will die as a result. In fact, we had individuals who said if you do not pass the certificate of leave provisions, and you must not pass the certificate of leave provisions because people will die as a result.

We literally had presentations, and I have said publicly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in all of the hundreds of hours of committee hearing debate that I have seen, I literally saw members from the government side of the House and our side of the House crying during the course of presentations for this bill. That certainly indicated to me the acuity and the difficulties that were represented in the presentations for this bill.

Now, in fact, I had contemplated during the course of these comments and the final reading reflecting back into the record some of the highlights, if one could call it that, of the comments that occurred during committee debate, but, frankly, it is all on the record, and I think it is better that it remains on the record spoken through the mouths of those individuals who made those presentations. Suffice to say that the presentations were emotional, the presentations were persuasive, and the presentations were powerful on both sides of the issue.

Several other issues came out during the course of presentations that I wish to make reference to, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Firstly, there was, I would suggest, almost universal recommendation that the minister and the government put in place an advocacy office for individuals involved with The Mental Health Act. That was one of the recommendations that had been rejected by the government that had been made by the steering committee that reviewed the bill that had initially been established by the previous Minister of Health. They had strongly recommended, in fact, the inclusion of an advocacy office.

We really support—in fact, we attempted to amend the bill, which was defeated during committee debate, to

put in place an advocacy office. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a valid idea, and it has tremendous merit. Indeed, advocacy has merit throughout the health care system at every level because it is changing so dramatically. Unless one has access to friends or relatives who are determined to assist someone who is involved in any aspect of the health care system, and, in particular, the mental health care system, there may not be someone there to speak up for the rights of that individual. It has become more important than ever for that kind of assistance and that kind of help to be provided to individuals in the health care system.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is clear to us that the government should take another look, and this is a totally nonpartisan issue. I want to say the entire debate during the course of this bill has been on a nonpartisan basis, and it has been one of the—and I must admit, we had a very interesting dialogue and discussion during the course of the clause-by-clause review of this bill. In fact, I had proposed a particular amendment, and the minister had proposed an almost identical amendment to one aspect of the bill, which was adopted. The minister at one time even offered to me that I could have the opportunity to introduce that amendment, and I give the minister credit for that. I certainly recognize that this bill was debated and it was reviewed on strictly the nature of trying to do what is best for Manitobans and of trying to do what is best—I was going to say try to do the best for Manitobans in the mental health field, but, frankly, by doing what is best for Manitobans, we are assisting in the mental health field overall.

So we did advocate an advocacy office, and this particular amendment was rejected. We also suggested something that had come out of the hearings, as well, that we thought had merit, and that was that the bill be reviewed in a year to gauge the effect of the some of these more difficult provisions in applications. We asked the government to, in fact, do that. The government voted down that particular amendment, and the minister suggested that there was ample opportunity for review of this act and the provisions of this act during the course of Estimates debates.

I recognize that we certainly have an opportunity to review these aspects during the Estimates debate. The downside of that particular response and that particular

review is that the public and many of those other individuals who are involved in the system do not have an opportunity to put forward their viewpoints and their positions.

While we on the opposition side, and I am certain the government members and the minister will try during the course of reviewing the Estimates and the other legislative reviews that take place, we cannot canvass all the individuals involved and we cannot totally canvass during the course of debate, and they do not have an opportunity to offer their particular viewpoints. There is a lot of merit to that kind of a provision in the legislation, and we suggest that in fact it be done.

Now, I want to get to the core of our discussion and our review of this bill at this point, and I want to lay a little background out for the government and for the minister. Since the government's so-called health care reform in 1992, the one area that we desisted and did not overly criticize the government on was the area of mental health reform. We recognize that it was an area that required change and we made, as an opposition, a conscious decision not to be overly critical of the government. That is not to say we were not critical in other areas. Heaven knows how we have been very helpful with suggestions in the health care field in the past six or seven years, but we made a conscious decision not to be overly critical in the mental health area, because at the time we recognized that perhaps our criticism would be counterproductive.

\* (2020)

Having said that, we must recognize in the last several years the government's reforms in this area have stalled badly, and there are huge gaps, there are gaping holes in the mental health field. Now, I do not want to commence again the arguments both for and against certificate of leave based on the gaps in the mental health system. There are those that argue that if we put in place certificate of leave there will be less incentive on the government to put in place community-based programs, and that will let the government off the hook.

There are those that argue that if we had put in place community-based programs, there would be no need for certificate of leave. Those arguments were put before us during committee. I want to discuss briefly the

unanimous arguments, and I say unanimously, made by every presenter at committee, and that is the lack in Manitoba of community-based mental health programs. That was a unanimous recommendation and unanimously brought forward, acknowledged by every presenter before us in committee.

Now, I believe that the government should today, in the passage of this bill, commit 100 percent to put in place the most aggressive, the most expansive community mental health program in North America, and it is not that there is not models in place. I believe, in the passage of this bill, the government should commit itself to that kind of a program. I want to suggest and pledge that we in the opposition are 100 percent in favour of such a program and of such an expansion in the mental health field, and it should be done as quickly as possible.

During the course of committee debate, I put it to one of the spokespersons for one of the organizations, how difficult would it be to put in place an aggressive community-based health care program, and used an example the Wisconsin model, because that is the one that is most often cited. I was very pleased and surprised to find out that it would not be a difficult process to put it in place, nor would it be an expensive program to put in place. It was felt that relatively quickly the existing system and some of the new needs could be weaved into place and a program could be put in place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot urge more strongly that this be done. I cannot urge more strongly that this be done. If we are proceeding on a nonpartisan basis to deal with this bill as we have done, then please heed the call of all of the presenters, put in place a community-based mental health program. There are models in existence. You do not have to reinvent the wheel. It is there for review. It is there to put in place.

During the course of our debate on second reading of this bill, we outlined some of the systems that could be put in place that would meet the needs in a community-health sense of those that are involved in the system. It is really not something that is overly complex, and it is not something that has to be reinvented. It is something that is in existence. All that it will take, and this is speaking from the voices of those who presented at

committee, all it would take is the political will on the part of the government to put it in place, and I cannot urge it more strongly. I do not even know, and I do not think I could summon up the words to try to convince the government that this is necessary. In fact, I have heard acknowledgement from members on the opposite side of the House that they recognize the need.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I call on the government to not just pass through Bill 35. If we are entering a new era of mental health reform, if we are passing Bill 35, heed the wishes of those presenters who presented both in favour of certificate of leave and heed the wishes of those who presented against certificate of leave. Both groups urged the government to put in place a proper community-based mental health program similar to PACT with all of the basic elements in place.

We do not need people wandering the streets of Winnipeg with nowhere to go. We do not need, as happened in my constituency, an individual living for months in a parked car on one of the streets in my community. The individual, who over and over and over again attended at Health Sciences Centre, was released and went back to live in the car on a street in my constituency, and whose mother spent hours and hours with me as we tried to find help for that individual. A proper community-based program would monitor, would assist him, would give him help and ensure that he did not have to sleep in a parked car on a side street.

I am not raising that particular case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a condemnation of anybody or anything. I raise it as an illustrative example of the dozens and dozens of stories that we heard during the course of the committee hearings for Bill 35. As it was put to us, this could be our children, could be our parents.

Indeed, statistically, if one looks around this Chamber, it will be some of us and it will be some of our children. We owe it to them to put in place an aggressive, community-based program, one that combines contact with assistance, with caring, with housing, with retraining, with all of the elements that assist an individual from the time they move from institutional care—or indeed to prevent them from proceeding to institutional care—to the community that follows them, that is there as a resource.

I do not think the breakdown in the system has been deliberate, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I think there was a time when families provided that kind of support and when the community, through the churches, through the synagogues, through the organizations, provided that support. It is not there anymore. Our society is diverse. Our society is mobile. People fall through the cracks. We have no choice. Indeed it is our duty in this country and it is our duty as citizens and as governments to provide that kind of assistance to individuals. We would go a long way toward assisting the families who appeared before us in committee and those very individuals who could not appear before us in committee to put in place that kind of a program.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that any individual or any government that follows this government, be it this government or be it a new government, ought to have it as a top priority to put in place that kind of programming—and it is our commitment—and failure to do so will be a failure to live up to the voices of those individuals who presented to us at committee, who literally cried out for assistance.

\* (2030)

I was very pleased, as I indicated earlier during the course of clause-by-clause debate on this bill, that the minister did put in place some amendments. One amendment, as I had indicated earlier, dealt with the certificate of leave provision specifically and put in place a provision that provided that an individual would not be released on a certificate of leave unless it was assured to the supervising medical officer and/or psychiatrist that, in fact, programs outlined and required by that individual were, in fact, in place, and there is a duty placed on the supervising psychiatrist to ensure that those programs are in place.

So that provision went through, and we think that was an improvement. In addition, I was pleased that the minister took a suggestion that we raised with respect to amendments of certificate of leave and put in place an amendment to the certificate of leave process. Now, we did it on the fly, as it were, because the minister accepted our suggestion, and we sat down with legislative counsel and drafted the amendment. I think we achieved what we attempted to achieve, but I did

put on the record during committee and I want to put on the record during third reading what our intentions were.

Let me digress for a second, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Very often when judges and others are looking toward what a bill represents, they say what was the intention of the legislators? I do not think it is always so clear, but I want to put on the record what our intention was with respect to that amendment.

One of the concerns raised by those who were concerned about certificate of leave was the inflexibility of the system to variations on the certificate of leave specifically dealing with medication changes. We were advised that in many cases an individual is sent back into the community with a prescription that does not change, and it is just assumed that prescription is ongoing and that the individual adjusts and there is no problem. Well, we know from experience and we know from representation that was made at committee that that is not the case and that often there are side effects or other occurrences from the drug regime or no need for the drug regime, et cetera, that occur, and there is no provision in the legislation for a change in the conditions under the certificate of leave except the review and the expiry after six months.

So we put in place a subamendment that permits the issuer of the certificate of leave to change the conditions of the certificate of leave. On reflection, I thought that this change could be interpreted in a negative sense, that, in fact, it might be seen as an onerous burden. That was not the intention. The intention in the change that was made to the provisions on the certificate of leave was put in place to ensure that if an individual's needs or requirements changed vis-a-vis the prescription or the regime that had been outlined for them with respect to the certificate of leave, that it can be changed and that the individual is not locked into a six-month inflexible provision that allows for no change. That is why we made the change; that was the amendment that was put in. I am hopeful that that change put in will be helpful to those individuals who are put in a position where the certificate of leave has been necessitated.

We will be looking under this legislation—and I hope the government is very cognizant, because it is clear

this is a government bill and this bill is going to pass. We are hopeful that the government will very carefully analyze the effects of this bill and, in particular, the effects of the certificate of leave provisions, and that we have an opportunity to review at some point what has happened with certificates of leave, because there is a grave concern by many individuals that the certificate of leave will become a catchall and will be far, far, far too much utilized, and we have to guard against that.

This is not a substitute for other forms of care. This is not a substitute for community-based care. This provision, if at all used, should be rarely used, and it should only be used in situations—in fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in a proper system there would be a situation where a certificate of leave would not have to be used. In fact, there would be the community supports and the community programs in place that would ensure that one does not have to use this provision. But having said that, we must be very vigilant as to the occasions and the number of occasions when this provision is utilized.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I made an attempt during the course of second reading to outline, as clearly as I could, the arguments on both sides of this debate as it applies to a certificate of leave. I am not going to repeat those arguments. I am going to make the commitment for the third time during the course of my comments because I want to make it clear that we would put in place and we urge the government to put in place the most comprehensive community-based program anywhere in North America, a PACT model, P-A-C-T, in fact a PACT model plus.

We have an opportunity with the passage of a new bill and the introduction of a new regime to put this in place. We have the opportunity to be a leader in this field. Much like people look to the Wisconsin model, we have the opportunity for people to look to the Manitoba model. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, by virtue of doing that, we could help a lot of people. We could make life a lot smoother, a lot more comfortable, not just for those afflicted by the infliction of mental health, but the families and their loved ones around them.

I want to repeat again something that—I want to close, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with a couple of stories—well, not

stories, we have had enough stories, I think, that have been done sufficiently—but just a long-felt belief of mine that if one has a broken arm or broken leg you can walk around with a cast or a bandage and you are recognized as having an illness and one's fellow members of society deal with it accordingly, but when you have that problem in your brain, when you have a chemical imbalance in your brain, when your thought processes are scrambled or you have difficulty with them, one does not get the same sympathy or understanding from one's fellow citizens. In fact, there is still very much a stigma.

\* (2040)

I went into classrooms two weeks ago, and I was explaining to students how the legislative process works. I used the example of The Mental Health Act as the dilemma and some of the difficulties that we as legislators have with respect to legislation. The students were very understanding and kind, but it was not surprising to me that as soon as I mentioned The Mental Health Act a lot of the students broke out in laughter. I guess we have to overcome that, and I guess we have to—[interjection] Pardon? The member makes a comment that I suppose one can interpret as nervousness as well as ridicule, so I guess that is possible. But we have to do more in this area. We have to do more in recognition. I can assure you that moves towards community-based health care, mental health care, will receive our support, and we are strongly in favour of it and we are going to do everything in our power to urge the government to do so and to move in that area, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Having said that, those conclude my comments as they relate to Bill 35.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading, Bill 35, The Mental Health and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur la santé mentale et modifications corrélatives. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

### **Bill 52—The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act**

**Hon. James Downey (Acting Government House Leader):** I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 52, The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie), be now read a third time and passed.

#### **Motion presented.**

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is one of these bills that I referred to in my previous comments relating to the previous bill, I believe Bill 30, and this is one of those bills that when one looks in opposition, there are some provisions that we strongly approve, and there are some provisions of this bill that we have a good deal of difficulty with. One would prefer if the changes to this kind of legislation would come down through separate amendments and one can suspect that, in fact, it is packaged like this to make the dilemma for the opposition such. Nonetheless, we are faced with passage of Bill 52.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me talk about the basic three provisions of this bill. We have called for some time, as all members of this Chamber know, for regulations and changes to take place in the personal home care system. This bill provides for a regime of regulations to be introduced into the personal care home sector. We welcome that. We approve that. We support that. We have advocated that, and that is what we have been looking for, for some time.

One could argue, well, why have those regulations not been put in place over year after year after year. Things have changed dramatically in the health care field, it goes without saying, and these regulations are long overdue. As we have moved to changes in health care, do you know that at one time 80 percent of patients in personal care homes were ambulatory and 20 were nonambulatory? Now, it is exactly reversed. The level of care, the acuity of care is so much greater.

There have been cutbacks to the funding of personal care homes. Yes, last year, there was an increase; this year, there was a slight increase. We still have not

achieved the levels in 1992-93 from the provincial government of personal care homes, and what has happened is care has deteriorated despite the best efforts of those involved. It is unfortunate, but necessary, that regulations be put in place to monitor and to set standards for personal care homes. I do not need to go down the road of discussing what happened in a particular personal care home in this province in the last year, so we approve those particular changes.

The second major aspect of change in this particular bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the ban on extra billing to patients for outpatient services performed in a hospital or surgical facility. Again, we have advocated and called for this change for years, not f-o-u-r years, but for years. We have constantly called on the government to stop the establishment of a two-tiered health care system. If I heard it once, I have heard it a thousand times, as I am sure members opposite, how often have we heard the individual come into our constituency office or phone us on our phone and say I went to the doctor to get my cataracts removed, and the doctor said, yes, I will do your cataracts. I will put you on the waiting list, and you can have it done in eight to 12 months, but you can come back next Friday, and I will do it to you. You can have it done for a thousand dollars. We have had that. That is so typical that it is trite to even repeat. We have called on the government to prohibit such extra billing for some time, so of course it is without question we welcome the provision in this legislation.

The third area of change, and it is tied up with the provision dealing with extra billing, is the determination of a surgical facility. Now the means by which the government chose—and I admit it is not an easy process to do insofar as we attempted to amend this bill, and we do know and are aware how difficult it is to amend these provisions to actually achieve your goals—to define surgical facility for purposes of this act and consequently to actually permit funding to nonhospital settings that qualify surgical facilities under this definition.

We have asked the government to consider, and we proposed and attempted an amendment that would say funding would be permitted only to nonprofit facilities, and that was rejected by the government on a curious argument, in fact, not a very good argument. The



minister has made better arguments, but on this one, he was, frankly, inaccurate. His argument was, well, we cannot do that because we want to get these waiting lists down and we do not want to prohibit it. That is malarkey. We all know that there are quotas on surgeries right now in the health care system. There are quotas on surgery to Victoria; there are quotas at Grace; there are quotas at Seven Oaks; there are quotas at Health Sciences Centre, outright quotas on the number of surgeries done. So you do not have to argue, well, surgery line-ups are going to get longer because we are not going to be able to give the surgery to those private, for-profit facilities; that does not cut it. The fact is, ideologically, the government—the minister said otherwise but his argument betrayed him—wants to permit private, for-profit surgical facilities.

We proposed private, for-profit, for nonprofit surgical facilities limited to that. The government rejected our amendment. We are not going to vote against the bill as a consequence. We do not agree with it, but we are not going to vote against the bill because the bill has provisions in it that we agree with. But I will tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a slippery path you are going down.

I pointed out at committee debate to the minister, and I am going to reiterate those comments again today. We are going to see what has happened in the lab sector where private labs—and I am quoting from a government report issued, delivered, by the government, private labs, private for-profit labs cream the easiest and cream the best kind of services, and the most difficult, the most complex, the most expensive are left to the public system. That will happen and that is a concern of ours and that will happen. That is one of the reasons we are against the for-profit facilities.

We are also concerned that we will take all of this infrastructure that we have built up in our public system and move it to the private system, and we are against that phenomenon as well, Mr. Deputy Speaker. We are against that phenomenon as well. The member curiously asks why. We know that money is scarce in the health care system. Why should the money go to the pockets of for-profit owners when it should go directly into the health care system? And even members making the conservative argument ought to recognize that the administrative costs of a system like

the United States that is based on profit is far more expensive. And even if the members were not ideologically bound to a private, for-profit health care system, they would recognize, for efficiency and dollars' sake, that it is more expedient and it is cheaper and it saves you more money in the long run to have one run, one centrally funded and administered system. We make far more money off of that and save far more money than we did if we privatized.

Members do not recognize that, but there are efficiencies in the health care sector by providing it centrally through a publicly owned system. Even Conservative economics recognized that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that is the reason, frankly, that for the most part Conservatives that fundamentally never believed in a universal health care system agreed to the introduction of a universal health care system because they recognized the efficiencies on that basis. But by moving to a private system, or even an amalgamation of the two in a two-tiered system, you are working against that system. So that is why we are against profit in the public health care system.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, having put a few comments on the record with regard to passage to the particular provision of this bill, I would be the last speaker from our side of the House relating to this particular legislation. Thank you.

\* (2050)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading, Bill 52, The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act, Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

#### House Business

**Mr. Downey:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask that you would call the following bills: 8, 11, 38, 47 and 55, please.

**An Honourable Member:** What did you do, Jim?

**Mr. Downey:** I asked him to call these bills, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

#### Point of Order

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Okay, but on a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The honourable government House leader, on a point of order?

**Mr. McCrae:** I believe there might be agreement not to see the clock till 10.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave not to see the clock till 10? [agreed]

Bills 8, 11, 38, 47, 55.

**Mr. McCrae:** Just for greater certainty, Mr. Deputy Speaker, after Bill 52, which we just completed, we are going to deal with Bills 8, 11, 38, 47, 55.

#### Bill 8—The Real Property Amendment Act

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** With the leave of the House, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay), that Bill 8, The Real Property Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les biens réels), be now read a third time and passed.

#### Motion presented.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, this particular bill, as has been pointed out through the minister's office and in going over the legislation, points out the technical conflict, if you like, or a perceived legal problem in which it is felt by adding in upon the registration that one should check with Section 141 of the act that, in fact, it would alleviate some of the perceived concern that is there. I think that in essence is a positive. It is dealing strictly with foreclosures, with respect to deals with the sale of land. So it is fairly a housekeeping amendment, and we do not see any problem with it passing through third reading.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

#### Bill 11—The Treasury Branches Repeal Act

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Housing and Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), (by leave) that Bill 11, The Treasury Branches Repeal Act (Loi abrogeant la Loi sur les caisses d'épargne), be now read a third time and passed.

#### Motion presented.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is an interesting bill in the sense that many, many years ago it passed from what I understand but was never ever proclaimed. At one time there was a lot of concern with respect to the financial climate, if we can put it in that phraseology, within the province, and many were giving thought to the idea of the province getting more directly involved in the banking industry. There were concerns with respect to outflow of capital from the province of Manitoba of which there still is a great deal of concern.

#### *Madam Speaker in the Chair*

I know former Leader Paul Edwards often made reference to the millions and millions of dollars leaving the province on an annual basis and going, in particular, to eastern Canada and the stock exchange, and the need for us to do more at providing mechanisms to ensure that we marginalize that dollar, while at the same time getting that money invested in good projects within the province of Manitoba. It also was to deal with the potential domination of the foreign banks and interests at the time.

Today we do not necessarily believe that the legislation is necessary. In fact, many would have

argued that the legislation was not necessary back then. I think what we need to do is to provide more confidence in things such as our credit unions which can ensure that we get more Manitobans not only investing but also provide excellent competition for our chartered banks, especially when we see the demand to amalgamate at that particular level. It is no problem in terms of seeing this bill going through third reading.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading, Bill 11, The Treasury Branches Repeal Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

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

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

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, (by leave), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Newman), that Bill 38, The Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'évaluation municipale et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

**An Honourable Member:** Leave.

**Madam Speaker:** Leave.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, this is one of those bills which can have a fairly dramatic impact on the way in which our communities develop. I look at individuals and organizations, whether it is our planning commissions, our town councils, local community groups, individuals that are concerned about the overall development and how it is being developed, should be fairly concerned with bills of this nature. It is one of those bills in which we will see, for example, the streamlining of the development plan process. We are going to see more public disclosure regarding development plans. Things of this nature generally are fairly positive. I am sure as time continues we will see more amendments to this

particular legislation. It is something that a great deal of concern always has to be with respect to future developments and how things transpire because of the impact that it has not only on the economy but also the environment and in fact our social fabric. With those few words, we are glad to see the bill pass.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading Bill 38, The Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

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

\* (2100)

#### **Bill 47—The Brandon University Act**

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Radcliffe), that Bill 47, The Brandon University Act (Loi sur l'Université de Brandon), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, this is one of those bills, in fact there has been a group of them, 47, 48, 49, 50, which all kind of go together. I know I spoke earlier on those bills this morning, and I guess it is just under 12 hours later we now have Bill 47 before us. In essence, this bill removes Brandon University from the auspices of The Universities Establishment Act and incorporates it under its own act.

This bill outlines the structure of the university under the terms of a separate updated act. This proposed act will be similar to The University of Manitoba Act and will reduce some of the restrictions in place on the Brandon University from matters related to investing on its own. Also Brandon University will have the ability to bargain for the mandatory retirement age with staff, which is somewhat of a disconcerting thought. Student representation on the board of governors will also be mandated in this legislation, which is a very positive

thing, recognizing the increased role students have to play in post-secondary institutions. All in all, as the previous bills, it is a bill which can receive, I am sure, widespread support.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Madam Speaker, I just want to add a few words to the debate on The Brandon University Act. As I recall full well because I was on the faculty at that time, Brandon University was made a university by the government of the day, Mr. Duff Roblin being the Premier, I think as an anniversary gift, 100 years of Confederation of our great nation, 1867 to 1967. At that time, the Premier, the government of the day, believed that they should spin off Brandon College as an independent university and United College as an independent university to be called the University of Winnipeg. It was done, I gather, relatively expeditiously by means of an Order-in-Council, which, of course, as we all know in here, is much easier to pass and get through sometimes than legislation.

But, for better or for worse, that is the way it has stayed all through these years, and both the University of Winnipeg and Brandon University have been able to operate under those conditions. I do not really think that being established by an Order-in-Council was that detrimental.

On the other hand, as the minister has stated and as others have recognized, this act itself does allow the university a bit more flexibility, a bit more scope in whichever way, perhaps a better ability to raise funds and so on. I note the other day, when we—well, I guess earlier today we passed The Brandon University Foundation Act, which was very good. I brought it in as a private member's bill, and this was an organization which, of course, is helping to fund the university, but we did not need a Brandon University act for that foundation to exist or to do its work.

So we are supportive of the act. I know the Faculty Association has some concerns that came in rather late, and I believe our Education critic tried to put some of those on the record, as well, and they are concerns regarding such things as retirement.

At any rate, Madam Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to state, and I have not had any association

as a faculty member with the university for many years now, decades, I guess, so I do not believe I am in any conflict-of-interest situation when I say that the universities in Manitoba, including Brandon University, should be given more financial support by this particular government. In my view, the universities have been starved. As a result, there has been curtailment of programs, curtailment of courses. We have not been able to attract some of the best people that we would like to. It is a very competitive world out there for top quality academic personnel, and, in my judgment, to maintain these standards and to improve our academic standards, we have to be prepared to pay the price.

It is so easy for us to give lip service to education as being a key to economic progress, the key to an improved standard of living, but it is true. This world, this civilization of ours is going to go forward hopefully as it has in the past based on having educated people, people who develop as scientists, people who develop as artists, people who develop various skills that they are able to contribute and to ensure that we live the good life, to ensure that our civilization progresses rather than stagnates.

It is so important that we in Manitoba have sound academic institutions, that we have good solid universities and that we can do with them as we will in terms of teaching and in terms of research. In my view, Madam Speaker, our universities deserve a better shake. They deserve more funding, better funding than they have. I would hope that now that the government, if we listen to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), has more revenues than it has had for some years, and that is the case, that some of those additional revenues would be shared with our institutions of higher learning, including Brandon University.

We cannot look at this in the short term. We have to look at the support for our academic institutions, for our institutions of higher learning, in the long term. We have to understand the critical role that they do play in our society, in enriching our society. I can say categorically, and I know the Minister of Environment (Mr. McCrae) will agree with me 100 percent, that Brandon University is like a jewel within the Brandon community, a jewel within the Brandon community. It is a very excellent—

**An Honourable Member:** A treasure.

**Mr. L. Evans:** A treasure, the minister says. I agree. It is so valuable an institution. It is an incredibly valuable institution within that community, a relatively small city compared to Winnipeg or Vancouver, Toronto or whatever, and it plays a very, very significant role in the local community, but as a true university, it has a scope beyond the city of Brandon, beyond the province, beyond Canada. It has an impact throughout the world. It has students who have come to it from other countries, and indeed some of the professors have gone to Third World countries, particularly Africa, I understand, to assist there in upgrading their institutions and generally disseminating knowledge and learning.

So, Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to put in a plug for our universities, particularly Brandon University. Let us not forget how important they are, and let us ensure that they obtain financial resources that they richly deserve in the years ahead.

Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading, Bill 47, The Brandon University Act; Loi sur l'Université de Brandon. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

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

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

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I move (by leave), seconded by the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 55, The Certified Applied Science Technologists Act (Loi sur les technologues agréés des sciences appliquées), be now read a third time and passed.

\* (2110)

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Speaker, the other day I had the opportunity to speak on Bill 54, and many of the comments that I put on the record then could also be applied for Bill 55.

So as opposed to repeating some of those comments, I will leave it at that but add to it, because it is unique in the sense that it does give more independence to the Certified Technicians and Technologists Association of Manitoba, which is a positive thing, as a whole, things such as allowing it to make its by-laws for themselves. It would allow them to use punitive measures in disciplining persons who, for example, would go against the by-laws. All in all, it is a step in, in fact—it is a forward step. I was about to say a step in the right direction, but I do not want to use the word “right.” I will say it is a step forward.

With those few words, I will leave it at that. Thank you.

**Madam Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading, Bill 55, The Certified Applied Science Technologists Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

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

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

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I move, with the leave of the House, seconded by the honourable Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'évaluation municipale et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

I apologize to the honourable members. After Bill 55, it had been my intention to ask you to call Bills 33, 54 and 36.

**Madam Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable government House leader, with leave, seconded by the honourable Minister of Education and

Training (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 33, The Municipal Assessment Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'évaluation municipale et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

**Motion agreed to.**

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

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Government Services (Mr. Pitura), that Bill 54, The Engineering and Geoscientific Professions and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur les ingénieurs et les géoscientifiques et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed, and that would be with the leave of the House.

**Motion agreed to.**

**DEBATE ON THIRD READINGS**

**Bill 36—The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

**Madam Speaker:** Adjourned debate on third reading, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs and Housing (Mr. Reimer), Bill 36, The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg et modifications corrélatives), standing in the name of the honourable member for Transcona (Mr. Reid). Is there leave to permit the bill to remain standing? Leave? [agreed]

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** I do not know if members opposite remember, but I am sure some of them do, that I spoke at length on second reading on this piece of legislation. I am sure that all honourable members have committed my concerns and the concerns of my caucus to memory, if not to heart. Madam Speaker, in all seriousness, this is one of the most important bills of this session. I know that the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), when he presented this bill for first reading and second reading, recognized that fact, and I think the Minister of Urban Affairs and the government members also recognized

at that time that this was not going to be a bill that was going to pass without lots and lots and lots of extensive debate and discussion.

**An Honourable Member:** And thoughtful input.

**Ms. Barrett:** As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Toews) says, thoughtful input, and I am glad the Minister of Justice spoke about thoughtful input because I am going to save that phrase for a little bit later in my speech, in my discussion.

Madam Speaker, on second reading I went quite extensively into the history of the City of Winnipeg and into, most particularly, several very extensive, very thorough reports that were done on the City of Winnipeg. Those reports started with the report that led to the creation of Unicity in 1971-72. I will admit to not having a very great grasp on many elements of Canadian history, having come to this country quite late in my life. [interjection] I am asked how late. In answer to that question, well beyond the Grade 11 or Grade 12 that, thank goodness, students in Manitoba are still required to have Canadian history.

So consequently I do not have a history of Winnipeg prior to Unicity. I came to Winnipeg in 1975, and I have been aware of many of the remnants, if you will, of prior to Unicity Winnipeg. I mentioned this in my second reading speech that the neighbourhoods that are in the city of Winnipeg that are reflective of the small communities that were there prior to Unicity still retain a great deal of the character that they had 25 years ago. People still remember and recall and speak of those neighbourhoods, even young people who were not born 25 years ago.

I am sure all cities have neighbourhoods and they have areas that are defined, but I think Winnipeg is, if not unique, probably very unusual in that for a city its size, it has such distinct and characteristic and historic neighbourhoods that still, even 25 years after Unicity, have retained a flavour in the city. If you know the city at all well, and you hear St. James or you hear the west end or you hear North Kildonan or East Kildonan or West Kildonan or St. Boniface or Charleswood or any one of the other I believe it was 12 communities that amalgamated with the City of Winnipeg Metro to form Unicity—

**An Honourable Member:** Transcona.

**Ms. Barrett:** Transcona. Oh, how could I have forgotten Transcona. Well, I guess part of me still considers that—Transcona is probably still the most—has the potential for being the most separate of all of the old neighbourhoods, if not for anything other than—well, maybe Transcona and St. Boniface.

\* (2120)

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the ad hoc or impromptu history lesson that is being given to me from across the way, but I will try and keep to my points. I think one of the things about the neighbourhoods in—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

**Ms. Barrett:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know that one of the most troublesome elements of Bill 36 reflects directly back to the unique nature of the city of Winnipeg, and that is its neighbourhoods. The troublesome part of Bill 36, as it reflects on the neighbourhoods in the city of Winnipeg, is that no longer will those neighbourhoods be secure in the knowledge that there will be a community committee that will be a spot for them to come and raise their neighbourhood issues. The community committee concept developed as part of the legislation that created Unicity, and it was a recognition of the fact that you are taking 12 small communities and putting them together with a 13th very large, comparatively speaking, community and making one Unicity out of that. But the recognition was that this does not happen overnight. You cannot, just by redrawing a map and changing legislation and putting words on paper, make everybody just wave the wand and become a resident and a citizen of the city of Winnipeg in their minds and their hearts. It is hard for people to change. We all know that. It is even harder for systems to change.

So looking at it from 25 years away, I think it was quite a remarkable achievement that the drafters of the legislation and the legislators in the Chamber who passed this legislation, I do not recall, but I would assume that it was probably passed with unanimity, I do not know. But whatever happened, Madam Speaker,

the drafters and the passers of that legislation recognized the unique characteristics of these neighbourhoods and these communities and they said on the one hand, we need to have an overarching City Council. There is no question about that. That is one of the reasons we created Unicity in the first place was for efficiency, effectiveness and economies of scale.

Madam Speaker, the brilliance of the creation of the community committees in 1972 with the creation of Unicity was that it recognized the need for communities and neighbourhoods to maintain their uniqueness. It recognized the need, on one hand, for there to be a City Council that reflected the wards, and there were 50 of them at the beginning—or a hundred? I am trying to remember. No, there were a hundred at the beginning, then it went down to 50. A hundred city councillors from the various municipalities went to 50 in Unicity, more or less.

But the recognition was that while you needed city councillors who represented wards, their own wards, and then as a group made laws and decisions for the entire city, the community committee concept recognized that those city councillors also needed to have a vehicle for them to relate to and learn from and hear from and communicate to their local citizens. Now 50 city councillors is four and a half times, or over four times as many city councillors as we have now, not quite four times, three and a half times. I could get into that whole issue about the number of city councillors we have, but even with 50 the people who drafted The City of Winnipeg Act recognized that that was a large number of people the city councillors were going to have represent and they needed to have something in place that linked their neighbourhoods and their communities and their groups in their wards with the rest of City Council.

So they created the community committee. They also created, and it was modified over time, an arrangement whereby a number of community committees met together. Currently, I believe, there are four groupings of community committees, four or five groupings of wards that connect with their local community committees. So, for example, City Centre-Fort Rouge has three wards within it, and each of those wards has a community committee currently and will have until Bill 36 is passed, if it is passed, in this Legislature.

Those community committees at the one end are wonderful venues for local residents to make their views known not only to their own city councillor but also to city councillors in the other groups in that grouping, the other two city councillors in City Centre-Fort Rouge.

Without the community committee structure, Madam Speaker, there will be nothing in place that requires councillors to talk to each other about issues of concern in their larger geographical area. There will be nothing that will require city councillors to talk to their constituents. There will be only a permissive piece of legislation that says that you need to look at the possibility of putting something in place. What I find interesting is that the minister and people who have spoken in support of this component of Bill 36 have said, well, you know, they need flexibility. City councillors need flexibility in order to be able to deal with the complexities of a modern city in late 20th Century Canada.

Well, Madam Speaker, there is nothing to preclude in the current City of Winnipeg Act, a city councillor or a community committee or a group of city councillors from talking with their constituents, from dealing with their constituents in any kind of a range of matters that they want to. They can send out newsletters, they can have phone trees, they can have weekly coffee meetings, they can go to the local Salisbury House and have Saturday morning get-togethers. Nothing precludes that in the current City of Winnipeg Act.

But it is very interesting that this city of Winnipeg that we will be seeing in Bill 36, if it passes, is a city of Winnipeg that does not, it would appear, want to require its councillors to have some form of communication, not only with their constituents but between themselves. That was the other part of the community committee structure that said in the case of the City Centre-Fort Rouge Community Committee structure, that those city councillors who represented the inner city and some suburban areas would get together regularly and talk about issues or hear from people within their wards about issues of concern.

When you now have 15 city councillors, each representing 40,000 people, each city councillor in the city of Winnipeg representing as many people as there

are in the city of Brandon and representing more people than there are in any other municipality or town or city in the province of Manitoba, you need to strengthen, not weaken the connections between those 40,000 citizens and their city councillors.

\* (2130)

Madam Speaker, the community committee changes are a dreadful part of this legislation, and of the 23 presenters at public hearings only three spoke against—[interjection] When you have each city councillor representing, as I said, 40,000 people, when you have a city that has as many challenges as the city of Winnipeg does in the 1990s and looking ahead to the millennium, when you have a city of Winnipeg that fulfills a unique position to any other city in the country, then you have a situation where you need to have more communication rather than less communication.

You put all of those things together, the fact that we are dealing with a city that has 67 percent of the population of the province of Manitoba within its boundaries, and we are going on to 75 or 80 percent—well, at least 75 percent, I believe, in the Capital Region—of the population in the province of Manitoba increasing every day, creative tension at the best between those exurban municipalities that make up the Capital Region and the city of Winnipeg, tensions between the older parts of the city and the newer parts of the city, tensions between elements on City Council, when you have all of these tensions, all of these challenges facing you, you need to have a City Council that has the most possible number of resources available to it in order to ensure that it represents the residents not only of its ward, each councillor represents the interests not only of their ward, but also understands the issues of concern in other wards.

Now with the change to The City of Winnipeg Act with community committees not being required, you could very easily have 15 isolated individuals, 15 separate entities, not speaking to each other, not connecting, not being forced to relate at all. These 15 people are being asked to make decisions, are being required to make decisions that affect all of the other people in the city of Winnipeg, that affect all of the other people in the Capital Region, and that affect all of



the other people in the province of Manitoba due to the unique positioning geographically and demographically of the City of Winnipeg within the province of Manitoba. It is essential that those 15 people have as many resources at their hand as they can. The elimination of the residents advisory groups and the elimination of the requirement for community committees does not strengthen the hand of city councillors, it weakens it substantially.

Another area of deep concern to virtually all of the presenters at public hearings and City Council are the powers of the mayor, and I have spoken extensively on this. To be fair, the minister did make one change. The minister made one change. The minister moved an amendment which we supported deleting the second vote of the mayor in case of a tie. Now, many people spoke out against this particular clause in the bill, the original bill, and the minister said in moving his amendment that he listened to those public speakers.

I think, Madam Speaker, that if he had really listened to those presentations he would have made some other major changes in the powers of the mayor as well, but this was an easy one to do, because it did not require a lot of changes, a lot of amendments to different sections in the act. So it was a simple one to bring technically. It was also a simple one to do because it isolated one of those extra powers.

To be honest, Madam Speaker, I am speculating here, but I think it is probably not that far out of line. I think there is a logic here that many people would see, that the minister and the government took a look at what was going to potentially happen in late October in the City of Winnipeg as a result of the civic elections. They looked at the fact that a mayor who had had difficulties with the province, as all mayors do, given the creative tensions between the province and the city, but who had often voted and led the city in ways that were more alike than opposite to the provincial government, and looked at the fact that this mayor, who, when the bill was brought in, still had not decided whether she running for a third term or not publicly.

Then by the time it comes to committee, not only do we hear that the mayor is not running for a third term, but, oh, my goodness, you look at the list of potential candidates for mayor and you look at the polling

results, you look at all the media and, oh, my goodness, what could possibly happen?

#### Point of Order

**Hon. Jack Reimer (Minister of Urban Affairs):** I realize that the member is being highly speculative as to why amendments were brought in for the purpose of giving the mayor extra power, but I can only relate back to when the former member for Concordia was the Minister of Urban Affairs. In fact, back in '87, the Urban Affairs minister at that time even proposed more power for the City of Winnipeg.

The then Minister of Urban Affairs proposed, and I quote from the Free Press, that Doer said the proposals are aimed at giving the mayor a more central role in developing city policy and making him more accountable for what the city does. Doer proposes more power for city mayor, when that member was the Minister of Urban Affairs. So let it not be said that we on this side are proposing things that are out of order. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. The honourable Minister of Urban Affairs and Housing (Mr. Reimer) did not have a point of order.

\* \* \*

**Ms. Barrett:** Madam Speaker, the tie-breaking vote for the mayor, I still think, and it is only thinking on my part. I have no proof of this, but I do think that the government looked at who potentially, probably, very likely could be mayor at the end of October and said: oh, oh, this is not the person we had in mind when we drafted this legislation. Do we really want the councillor for Fort Rouge ward to have that kind of power? On the other hand, if carrying my assumption to its logical conclusion, the government would have made a number of other changes, reducing the additional powers to the mayor. So I am not sure what was going on there, but we appreciate the elimination of the second vote for the mayor, but—

#### Point of Order

**Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training):** You will have to guide me and tell me if

this is a point of order or not. I think it is, but I am not sure. The fact is Councillor Murray said he would not use any of those powers if he became mayor, so it is irrelevant to the member's point. I do not think she is on topic. He said if there was a tie-breaking vote, if he became mayor, he would never use it. So that could not possibly be a concern attributed to a rationale for changing this, unless she feels he would break his word if he became mayor, does not trust that he would keep his word if he became mayor, but her being such a fan of his, I do not think she would think he would break his word on something that vital. Is that a point of order, Madam Speaker?

**Madam Speaker:** No. The honourable Minister of Education and Training definitely does not have a point of order.

\* \* \*

**Ms. Barrett:** The additional powers for the mayor, even without the second vote or tie-breaking vote, gives this mayor or any mayor more power overall than any other mayor in Canada, and perhaps in North America, in a City Council that is only 15 people. This does not make sense. This is not balancing things off.

\* (2140)

We do not have a parliamentary system at City Hall, but we have, under Bill 36, the executive part of a parliamentary system, but we do not have the balancing part of a parliamentary system which is a unified opposition. The whole point of a parliamentary system is you have a governing party and you have an opposition party or parties. They provide a check and balance, and this is missing in municipal government in Canada. That is not to say that it is wrong to have this form of government in municipalities, but what is wrong is when you do not have that balance, you need to ensure that not one part of the equation has too much power. This bill gives too much power to the mayor and gives too much power to the Executive Policy Committee.

There are other people who wish to speak on this bill, and I have certainly had my share of time—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. [interjection] Precisely why I am on my feet. I think most members are experiencing great difficulty hearing the honourable member for Wellington.

**Ms. Barrett:** Madam Speaker, I am preparing now to let other of my caucus colleagues address this issue because they have not yet had an opportunity to do so. I think they all feel that it is a very important and very disturbing piece of legislation, not only for what it does but for what it says about the people who proposed it.

With those few words, I am finishing my discussion.

**Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to add my comments on Bill 36, The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act.

I had the opportunity to add my comments on second reading of this bill, and after this bill had gone to committee, I had the chance in committee to sit in on almost all of the presentations that were made and listen to the comments that were made by members of the public who came before us in committee. I find that a fairly large number, if not the majority—in fact, I believe it is the majority of presenters who came out—indicated that what we thought were going to be the consequences of this particular piece of legislation are the same impressions that members of the public had when they came out to present to this bill in standing committee.

Madam Speaker, I listened to members opposite talk about comments that were made by some of the presenters, and I believe the comment by the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) and the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Reimer) indicated that there were certain statements that were made by Mayor Thompson and by Councillor Murray with respect to their support for this legislation or amending this legislation, as Councillor Murray thought, I believe, would be more appropriate.

Yes, indeed, Councillor Murray did indicate that any person worth their salt becoming the mayor of the City of Winnipeg, if they thought that they had the support and the will of the people, they would not need those extra powers.

Yet it is interesting to note and juxtapose those two positions where the current mayor and council representative—I think it was Councillor Eadie who came with the mayor. Mayor Thompson indicated that she felt that she needed to have those extra powers. In fact, she was, I believe, the major push behind this particular change, this piece of legislation that has occurred here. I know the minister responsible for municipal affairs had the courage to thank the mayor, I guess, for that position, considering the mayor was pushing him all the way along to make this particular change.

The interesting part, I note that Councillor Murray said that any mayor worth his or her salt did not and should not need this extra vote or these extra powers. Yet Mayor Thompson came into the committee room and said, oh, no, I represent all of the people of Winnipeg and I was voted in by all of the people in the city of Winnipeg, therefore I should have two votes.

So does the same apply to the Premier of this House, because the Premier is a member of a particular party that gets elected to government? Is that what Mayor Thompson was proposing? The mayor is not elected as a councillor of a ward in the city of Winnipeg, but she wants to have the vote as a councillor in a ward. The mayor is elected as the mayor for all of Winnipeg and should only receive one vote. I was happy to see that the minister responsible amended the legislation to take away that particular section, even though it was the mayor and current council, certain members of council, who were calling for that particular change.  
[interjection]

Mr. Cuff, I might add, too—in listening to another presentation by Mr. Kubi, who is the chair, I believe, of the RAG, the residents advisory group for the Kildonan-Transcona area, he came to committee and said that he did not support the legislation that the minister has brought forward here and spoke quite eloquently about the minister's proposal on Bill 36 and the impact it was going to have on our communities and, no doubt, the whole of the city of Winnipeg. He told us how important the resident advisory groups are. Yes, there has been a degradation of that particular process because some of the councillors who are in office now do not listen and do not consult with those resident advisory groups and therefore undervalue the

opinions of those members of the community who sit there and provide the service on behalf of our communities. So there is an undervaluing of the work that is done by the resident advisory groups.

In addition to that, Mr. Kubi went on to tell us about how the Cuff report came about. It is also interesting to note that Mr. Cuff had absolutely no experience in dealing with these types of investigations or hearings whatsoever, had never participated in a process like that before, in fact, had been, I believe, a small town mayor in rural Alberta and just decided after he left that particular elected office to open a consulting company and was hired by the City of Winnipeg to do an investigation, a closed-door in camera investigation, and report back to the City Council. In fact, Mr. Kubi indicates to the committee that Mr. Cuff was very selective and that the members of the Executive Policy Committee would not even give the terms of reference for the Cuff report.

So how are members of the public supposed to understand what Mr. Cuff is investigating here? He did not hold public hearings; he did a select consultation. In fact, I think Mr. Kubi referenced the fact that he had less than two hours to prepare and make a presentation to the Cuff committee representative or he would forever lose his opportunity to represent our community. Now how is that, I ask, in the public interest? Is that what you would consider to be open consultation, an open consultative process?

I do not understand how any council in their right mind would want to move such a whitewash report through without giving the greater public, the greater community, the city of Winnipeg as a whole and all the residents therein, the opportunity to comment on what they think is required at City Council and the powers that council should have, if there should have been any amendments at all. So it is quite interesting to note that there was no consultation that took place here. In fact, it was very, very selective.

I do note that there was one presenter that came before committee for which I know the member for The Maples (Mr. Kowalski) and other members of the committees took great offence. I am happy to hear the comments that were made by the member for The Maples with respect to that presentation wherein that

presenter said that everybody that came before him and everybody that was coming after him were special interest groups and nobody else's opinion counted but his own. Yet he represented what I consider to be, by his own definition, a special interest group from the Chamber of Commerce representing business interests in the city.

I am not saying they are not entitled to their opinion, but you do not call other groups that come forward and other individuals that come forward from our community special interest groups because you disagree with their opinion as that one presenter did. I thank the member for The Maples for raising that point in the committee. I took great offence to the comments that were made. I note that there were other presenters that came after in that committee that referenced the reasons why they were there, because they were concerned private citizens coming before committee to let the committee hear their thoughts. I know there were other members that were in the committee at that time and heard those comments, so I think it was inappropriate for that particular presenter to have made those comments.

\* (2150)

The changes that are going to happen to The City of Winnipeg Act that the government is proposing here, I do not believe you anticipated at the time things that were going to happen, because as my colleague the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) has pointed out here, the current mayor had not decided at that time whether she was going to be running for office again for a third term or whether she was going to be stepping aside. I believe the legislative changes that came about as a result of her and some councillors' decision was as a result of her not having made that decision yet. Now when you see that there is a potential for other changes in there, you recognize that you have the possibility of isolating councillors. [interjection]

You can say that you support Peter Kaufmann all you want. I know he ran against the Minister of Energy and Mines for the nomination in Riel. I mean, that is no secret, that is a public event. It is quite clear and apparent that Mr. Kaufmann, the grocer here, is a member of the Conservative Party and had ran for the nomination. That is no secret. You understand that.

At the same time I ask you, if Peter Kaufmann was so concerned about the City of Winnipeg, why did he not come and make a presentation on Bill 36?

**An Honourable Member:** He is busy.

**Mr. Reid:** Oh, I am sure he is busy. Where was your other supporter, John Angus? John Angus did not come out.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh.

### Point of Order

**Mrs. McIntosh:** I believe we are off topic a little bit talking about people rather than process, so talking about personalities rather than the act. I think we should get back to it, Madam. Yes. Thank you. I think he is out of order.

**Madam Speaker:** I believe the point of order that the honourable Minister of Education and Training was attempting to say was definitely relevancy. Indeed, if that is what the honourable Minister of Education and Training was indeed implying, then I would agree that she definitely did have a point of order.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Reid:** Madam Speaker, thank you for drawing me back to Bill 36, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act, but I was referencing—because it is my understanding that the Conservative Party here is pushing Peter Kaufmann to become, or is announced as the mayoralty candidate for the city of Winnipeg here and, therefore, should have, if he was interested in how The City of Winnipeg Act is going to affect us, had the courage of his convictions to come in committee and make a presentation on what his beliefs were on Bill 36.

Councillor Murray was the only councillor from the City of Winnipeg that came forward as a mayoralty candidate and put his thoughts and his beliefs on the record. Neither Mr. Kaufmann nor Mr. Angus had the courage or the convictions to do so, on telling us how Bill 36, in their belief, was going to affect us. So I am glad to see that Councillor Murray had the courage to come here when his other opponents, obviously, did not take that opportunity, and I am sure that is something

that will not be lost on the residents of the city of Winnipeg.

I also note, Madam Speaker, that during committee hearings on Bill 36, Mr. Paul Nielson, a private citizen, came forward and talked about changes to The City of Winnipeg Act as changing the constitution for the city of Winnipeg. You do not change the constitution of our country, and you do not change the constitution of our city unless you consult with the people that are affected, and that did not happen here in the city of Winnipeg. You did not consult on this bill. The Cuff report did not consult the citizens of Winnipeg before they made their recommendation to City Council, and council did not go out and consult the citizens of Winnipeg before they passed this recommendation that was forwarded to the minister of municipal affairs. We end up with Bill 36 that had absolutely no public consultation before it was introduced to this House.

Now, if Mr. Nielson is accurate and it is a constitutional document, and I believe he is on point, you have made those changes without consulting members of the public, the same secret back-room deals that the people of Canada rejected by the other constitutional agreements that were negotiated in backrooms, and that is what is happening here again. You have a constitutional agreement formulated by your government in consultation, no doubt behind closed doors with the current mayor for the City of Winnipeg taking away any opportunity for members of the public to present on the Cuff report and council's recommendations before it came to this Chamber.

Yes, and it is no doubt that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has some experience in dealing with constitutions and knows quite well that you consult with the people first, as I am sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) knows well too. You give members of the public the opportunity to comment on the changes that are being proposed so that they have the opportunity to comment and buy into the process and tell us their thoughts, but that is not occurring in situations like we have here with Bill 36.

Under this particular proposal you have here, the mayor will appoint members of the EPC, the Executive Policy Committee. The mayor, I believe, will have the powers, through the EPC, to appoint the Speaker and

the Deputy Speaker. The mayor, through the EPC, will also have the powers to appoint standing committee chairpeople and members of those committees. So we could technically have the mayor appointing all her closest, or his closest, confidants to those committees and excluding a large number of councillors.

Now, I hope that never happens because I would not want to have my councillor representing my community left out of the debate that takes place here in the city of Winnipeg, and how it affects the residents that we represent, so I think it is improper for the mayor to have the total say on how those committees are appointed. I think councillors that are elected by the representatives of the community should be involved in at least one committee and perhaps many more that affects—

**An Honourable Member:** Okay, consider it done.

**Mr. Reid:** If that were the case, I am sure the Minister of Agriculture would have convinced his colleague the minister responsible for municipal affairs to introduce an amendment already, but I have not seen that amendment come forward, and we have not had the chance. In fact, I believe there is only one amendment, and that was taking away the second vote from the mayor, something that the presenters, all the presenters—I believe, excluding the Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and Mayor Thompson were the only ones that supported having two votes for the mayor. All of the other presenters, I believe, suggested and recommended to government that that second vote be taken away.

So that was the only amendment that the council recommended, that was recommended to the members of the committee, that the minister acted on. Everything else was left aside. He discounted everything else that they said. It was insignificant, as far as you were concerned. You did not value their opinions.

Your provisions that you have put in place by this do not put in place the checks and balances that we have in this Legislative Assembly. We have the ability to have an opposition that will hold governments accountable, whatever government, the political stripe of the government of the day. When we are in

government, if you are still around in opposition, you would have the opportunity to hold us accountable as we are holding you accountable now. But what you are proposing in Bill 36 will not have that ability. You will not have the checks and balances in place.

If you give the mayor the ability to have those powers, and even though Councillor Murray, I believe, likes to operate on a consensus basis, you will give the mayor those powers. Councillor Murray and other councillors that would run for mayor's office will have those powers available unless this act is changed or amended.

Even though Councillor Murray has indicated that he would not use these powers and does not require them because, if I understand his presentation correctly, he believes in building consensus amongst the players and has an inclusionary process where you bring the people to the table to talk about the changes that are required, that will not be the case, that this legislation perhaps will not take effect should Councillor Murray or someone with the same opinion as Councillor Murray become the mayor.

But what happens in the future with other councillors or other members of the public that run for mayor?

They may not want to build a consensus and may want to have a top-down or a top-driven process.

But in that particular case, then, it will disadvantage my councillor if my councillor that represents the community that I represent is not on the inside of the decision-making process and is left out. Then my community and those other communities are disadvantaged as a result of that.

Madam Speaker, I think that this legislation is the wrong piece of legislation to bring before us here in this Legislative Assembly. I listened very carefully to the public presentations that were made over the period when those presentations occurred, and the public told us quite clearly that they did not want to have this legislation in its current form and recommended that the government withdraw this particular bill.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for Transcona will have 22 minutes remaining.

As previously agreed, the hour being 10 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. Monday next.

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 25, 1998

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Presenting Petitions</b>		Elections Manitoba Barrett; Filmon	4873
Mining Reserve Fund Jennissen	4865	Chief Electoral Officer Lamoureux; Filmon Lamoureux; McCrae	4874 4875
Community VLT Plebiscites Martindale	4865	Premier's Chief of Staff Chomiak; Filmon Sale; Filmon	4876 4878
<b>Reading and Receiving Petitions</b>		<b>Members' Statements</b>	
Community VLT Plebiscites Mihychuk Martindale	4865 4865	Balmoral Elementary School Helwer	4878
Independent Judicial Review Committee Lamoureux	4866	Commission of Inquiry Santos Lamoureux	4879 4880
<b>Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees</b>		Seniors Month M. Driedger	4879
Standing Committee on Law Amendments, 7th Report Penner	4866	Joan Wiebe Reid	4879
<b>Ministerial Statements</b>		<b>Matter of Grievance</b>	
Commission of Inquiry Toews	4869	Comprehensive Physicians Resource Plan L. Evans	4880
<b>Tabling of Reports</b>			
1997 Annual Report, Manitoba Municipal Employees Benefits Board McCrae (for Derkach)	4870		
<b>Oral Questions</b>			
Commission of Inquiry Doer; Filmon Ashton; Filmon Sale; Filmon Chomiak; Filmon Mackintosh; Filmon	4870 4872 4873 4875 4876	<b>ORDERS OF THE DAY</b> <b>Committee of Supply</b> Consideration of Concurrence Motion Lamoureux Radcliffe McIntosh Struthers Cummings Martindale Praznik Reimer Wowchuk	4883 4884 4890 4890 4890 4900 4901 4901 4901

Enns	4902	Bill 20, Medical Amendment Act	
Pitura	4917	Lamoureux	4934
		Chomiak	4935
<b>Motions of Condolence</b>			
William Homer Hamilton		Bill 30, Pharmaceutical Amendment Act	
Enns	4906	Chomiak	4935
Doer	4906	Bill 31, Regulated Health Professions Statutes Amendment Act	
David Orlikow		Chomiak	4936
Enns	4907	Bill 35, Mental Health and Consequential Amendments Act	
Doer	4907	Chomiak	4937
Chomiak	4909	Bill 52, Health Services Insurance Amendment Act	
Martindale	4910	Chomiak	4942
Santos	4912	Bill 8, Real Property Amendment Act	
Mackintosh	4912	Lamoureux	4944
Filmon	4913	Bill 11, Treasury Branches Repeal Act	
Newman	4914	Lamoureux	4944
Carolyne Morrison		Bill 38, Planning Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	
Filmon	4914	Lamoureux	4945
Doer	4915	Bill 47, Brandon University Act	
Dyck	4916	Lamoureux	4945
Enns	4916	L. Evans	4946
<b>Report Stage</b>			
Bill 2, Elections Amendment Act		Bill 55, Certified Applied Science Technologists Act	
Filmon	4923	Lamoureux	4947
<b>Third Readings</b>			
Bill 2, Elections Amendment Act		Bill 33, Municipal Assessment Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	
Lamoureux	4925	Amendments Act	4947
Bill 10, Mining Tax Amendment Act		Bill 54, Engineering and Geoscientific Professions and Consequential Amendments Act	
Mihychuk	4925	Amendments Act	4948
Bill 32, Municipal Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act		<b>Debate on Third Readings</b>	
L. Evans	4931	Bill 36, City of Winnipeg Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	
Lamoureux	4932	Barrett	4948
Bill 34, Public Schools Amendment Act		Reid	4952
L. Evans	4933		
Mihychuk	4933		
Bill 13, Prescription Drugs Cost Assistance Amendment Act			
Chomiak	4934		