



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 89 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, JULY 19, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

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

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, July 19, 1991

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Neil Cohen, Donne Flanagan, Nancy Hilliard and others requesting withdrawal of funding and the prevention of construction of The Pines project, and to prevent projects similar in nature from destroying the community.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Randy Lemoine, Terry Wallin, Jeff Klyne and others requesting the provincial government to withdraw provincial funding from The Pines project.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale). It conforms with the privileges and practices of the House and complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): To the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba

The petition of the undersigned citizens, of the province of Manitoba, humbly sheweth:

THAT the Winnipeg International Airport is vital to the economic health of the city of Winnipeg, and the project known as "The Pines," in its current location, will jeopardize the future of Winnipeg International Airport.

THAT to risk the jobs of the hundreds of people who are employed at the airport is not in the best interests of the community.

THAT "The Pines" project will inhibit riverbank access to the general public.

THAT the strip mall portion of "The Pines" project will give a foothold to commercial development which is incompatible with the residential nature of the neighbourhood.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba may be pleased to respect the wishes of the neighbourhood by requesting the provincial government to withdraw provincial funding of "The Pines" project.

AND as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen). It complies with the privileges and practices of the House, and it complies with the rules. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

Mr. Clerk: To the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba

The petition of the undersigned citizens, of the province of Manitoba, humbly sheweth:

THAT the Winnipeg International Airport is vital to the economic health of the city of Winnipeg, and the project known as "The Pines," in its current location, will jeopardize the future of Winnipeg International Airport.

THAT to risk the jobs of the hundreds of people who are employed at the airport is not in the best interests of the community.

THAT "The Pines" project will inhibit riverbank access to the general public.

THAT the strip mall portion of "The Pines" project will give a foothold to commercial development which is incompatible with the residential nature of the neighbourhood.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba may be pleased to respect the wishes of the neighbourhood by requesting the provincial government to withdraw provincial funding of "The Pines" project.

AND as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Jack Reimer (Chairman of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments): I beg, Mr.

Speaker, to present the Fifth Report on the Committee on Law Amendments.

* (1005)

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as their Fifth Report.

Your committee met on Wednesday, July 17, 1991, at 7 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 4—The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie

Mr. Mark Gabbert - Citizens for Quality Mental Health Care

Mr. Anthony Dalmyn - Advocate Society of Manitoba

Mr. Keith Dubick - The Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Mr. Randy Komishon - Canadian Paraplegic Association

Bill 50—The Liquor Control Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools

Mr. John Read - President, Manitoba Hotel Association

Mr. Dennis Smith - Manitoba Restaurant & Food Services Association

Mr. Leo Ledohowski - The Hospitality Corporation of Manitoba

Bill 51—The Pharmaceutical Act; Loi sur les pharmacies

Mr. Duane Nieman & Mr. Stewart Wilcox - Manitoba Pharmaceutical Association

Bill 69—The Manitoba Medical Association Fees Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant la Loi sur les droits de l'Association médicale du Manitoba

Dr. Jim Ross - Manitoba Medical Association

Your committee has considered:

Bill 51—The Pharmaceutical Act; Loi sur les pharmacies

Bill 69—The Manitoba Medical Association Fees Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant la Loi sur les droits de l'Association médicale du Manitoba

and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 4—The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie

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

MOTION:

THAT section 5 of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted:

Section 17 repealed and substituted

5 Section 17 is repealed and the following is substituted:

Duties of chairman

17(1) The chairman shall preside at meetings of the commission, but if the chairman is unable to act or the office of chairman is vacant, the vice-chairman, or if he or she is unable to act or the office of vice-chairman is vacant, a member of the commission elected by the members, shall act as and have the powers of the chairman.

Chief executive officer

17(2) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint an executive director who shall be the chief executive officer of the commission.

MOTION:

THAT the following be added after section 6 of the Bill:

Sections 42 and 43 amended

6.1 Sections 42 and 43 are amended by striking out "\$200." wherever it appears and substituting "\$5,000."

MOTION:

THAT the proposed section 82, as set out in section 17 of the Bill, be amended

(a) by adding the following after subsection 82(3):

Exception for patients

82(4) A patient who is given a notice under subsection (3) is excused from testifying before the formal inquiry committee if he or she provides a certificate of a medical practitioner certifying that testifying would likely jeopardize the patient's health.

(b) by renumbering subsection 82(4) as subsection 82(5).

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 85.1(1), as set out in section 17 of the Bill, be amended by adding "is

confidential and" before "shall not be communicated".

MOTION:

THAT section 21 of the Bill be amended by adding the following after subsection 99.2(1):

Exception for undue hardship

99.2(1.1) Subsection (1) does not apply where a division between the commission and the insured person of money recovered would result in undue hardship to the insured person.

MOTION:

THAT subsection 31(1) be amended by striking out "on royal assent" and substituting "on September 30, 1991".

MOTION:

THAT Legislative Counsel be authorized to change all section numbers and internal references necessary to carry out the amendments adopted by this committee.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 50—The Liquor Control Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools

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

MOTION:

THAT the Bill be amended by adding the following after subsection 21(2):

Section 100 repealed and substituted

21.1 Section 100 is repealed and the following is substituted:

Special events

100 Where licensed premises are situated in an area where in the opinion of the commission an event of community, municipal, provincial or national significance is to take place, the commission may, for the purpose of the event, in writing and subject to such terms, conditions and hours of operation as it may prescribe, allow the sale, service or consumption of liquor, or extend the period during which liquor may be sold, served or consumed, in the premises.

Your committee also voted to defeat Clause 19 of the bill.

MOTION:

THAT Legislative Counsel be authorized to change all section numbers and internal references

necessary to carry out the amendments adopted by this committee.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 75—The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives

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

MOTION:

THAT clause (c) of the definition of "entity" in subsection 1(1) be amended by adding "that is resident in Canada" after "trust".

MOTION:

THAT subsection 15(5) be amended by striking out "subsection (3)" and substituting "subsection (4)".

MOTION:

THAT subsection 18(2) be amended

(a) by striking out "or" at the end of clause (a),

(b) by adding ", or" at the end of clause (b); and

(c) by adding the following after clause (b):

(c) that arises by reason only of a director or officer or a dependent of a director or officer having a deposit in, or a consumer loan or residential mortgage with, a bank of credit union in which the Fund has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest.

MOTION:

THAT subsection 1(3) of the Schedule is amended by striking out "Class "G" Special Shares" and substituting "Class "I" Special Shares".

MOTION:

THAT subsection 2(1) of the Schedule be amended

(a) by striking out "the holders of Class "A" Common Shares" after "Fund", and

(b) by striking out "of the stated capital of the Class "A" Common Shares," and by substituting "paid by them for the".

Mr. Reimer: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mrs. Shirley Render (Chairman of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections): Mr.

Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Clerk: Your Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections presents the following as their First Report.

Your committee met on Thursday, July 18, 1991, at 10 a.m. in Room 230 of the Legislative Building to consider the Report and Recommendations of the Judicial Compensation Committee 1991. Mrs. Render was elected Chairperson.

Your committee recommends to the House that the Report and Recommendations of the Judicial Compensation Committee 1991 be referred to a Standing Committee of the House at the beginning of the 3rd Session of the 35th Legislature for consideration and report.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): On the motion to report the recommendation from the committee, I would like to begin the debate—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There has been no motion put at this time. I am just going to recognize the honourable member for St. Vital. It is not a debatable motion to receive the report.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would appreciate a ruling, in terms of checking. I know our rules indicate in terms of concurrence in a report of standing and special committees that is indeed a debatable motion. It is a practice that has not been followed in recent years by custom merely not to debate.

In this particular case, we do have specific concerns about the report of the committee related to its dealings in terms of judges' salaries. That was why we had intended to place those comments on the record in this Legislature, where indeed we feel that type of comment should be made. In fact, as I said, 36.(1)(b) does indicate in terms of concurrence a report of a standing or special committee, and that was what the Leader of the Opposition was doing, was debating on that.

I would appreciate your ruling generally in this matter, because there have been a number of committees this session where indeed we have considered debating on other matters. In this particular case, we felt it was so important to debate it right here in the Legislature. That is why the Leader of the Opposition had risen in his place.

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised, the honourable member makes reference to 36.(1)(b): "for the concurrence in a report of a Standing or Special Committee." This is not a concurrence motion. This which will be moved will be a motion to receive, which is not a debatable motion.

Mrs. Render: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that the report of the committee be received.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable member for St. Vital, seconded by the honourable member for Fort Garry, that the report of the committee be received. Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No. The question before the House is: Shall the report of the committee be received?

All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it. The report is accordingly received.

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the honourable member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

* (1010)

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief statement for the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform honourable members that on July 21, this Sunday, we wish to acknowledge Canada Parks Day. Visitors to Manitoba provincial parks will enjoy free entry this Sunday in recognition of Canada's Parks Day.

Manitoba has over 140 provincial parks offering an abundance of natural treasures, and we want to encourage all Manitobans to get out on Parks Day to enjoy these. Park entry will be free for the day in those provincial parks which normally charge entry fees, but this does not include camping fees to celebrate this Parks Day.

Provincial parks throughout Manitoba will be holding special events for visitors during the entire weekend. Canada Parks Day is an annual event sponsored by the Federal Provincial Parks Council which is comprised of park representatives from the federal government, the 10 provinces and two territories. The event was held for the first time last year to promote the public awareness of our nation's parks. There follows, Mr. Speaker, a number of activities that are available for both adults and children throughout our provincial parks systems.

I encourage Manitobans to avail themselves of this occasion to make them more fully aware and appreciative of our parks. Thank you.

Ms. Marianne Cerlill (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at this minister's statement. I had an opportunity to visit Hecla for the first time. I talked to some of the employees there, and they were demoralized at what is happening with a number of areas and responsibilities in this department. This government and this minister have demolished the Natural Resources department, and one of the branches that suffered the most has been the Parks Branch. We might start calling this minister the minister without portfolio because of the number of cuts to this department.

I have heard that there are services being eliminated. There are services to the parks, for example, like the development of cross country ski trails which are no longer going to be developed in co-operation with the skiing association, because the staff can no longer handle it from Parks Branch. I would say that there are a number of services that have been very important to people in Manitoba that are no longer going to be provided by this department and by this branch because of this government's shortsighted agenda, I would say, and I just hope that no one suffers an injury or is hurt because of the lack of staff who are now working in areas like parks. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we are delighted that there is such a day in Canada to reflect the strength

of both our national and provincial parks. Unfortunately, the parks system that exists in this province, which is extensive and which the government in its last campaign quite frankly committed to expanding through its Endangered Spaces Program, has been allowed to deteriorate under the present budget of this government.

We know that lifeguards who were readily available at a number of park sites are no longer available in the province of Manitoba, with very few exceptions. We know that the cleanup program which was a natural part, one hoped, of preserving the natural appearance of parks, has suffered as a result of cutbacks. We know that there are far fewer people, some 61, employed in rural Manitoba because of the cuts to the Natural Resources branch which is promoting this parks day.

We think that it is a tragedy that the government has chosen under the glitz of being in favour of sustainable development, has hit at that one area of sustainable development which we in this province can really do something about, and that is the protection of the natural resource which is our parks system in this province.

So while we rejoice in the day, we do it with some sadness and recognition of the fact that parks in Manitoba are not as good as parks in Manitoba used to be.

* (1015)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

CN Rail Relocations Premier's Action

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on April 23, the Premier and I had another disagreement about the cabinet appointments that the Prime Minister made. Filmon coos over the appointments of the cabinet, appointments from the federal government. The NDP was quite concerned about the appointment and the promotions of Mr. Mazankowski and Mr. Clark because we recognized that those two individuals had consistently throughout the last two years been taking jobs from Manitoba and moving them consistently to Edmonton and Alberta.

Yesterday, there were two small but consistent trends and announcements with real estate jobs being moved from Winnipeg by CN, a federal Crown corporation and, of course, the immigration information centre also moving to Calgary.

Mr. Speaker, we have been raising these issues for the last two years, and instead of the government coming out and taking on the federal government ahead of time with the CN job transfers, we get feigned indignation after the jobs are changed and after the ministers from Alberta are taking vital, high-paying jobs on a weekly basis to the province of Alberta. Real estate, accounting, public relations, signals, engineering, payroll, freight service office, transport control, services, all being moved, week after week, month after month, while this government sits idly by, in our opinion, in terms of those changes.

The member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) asked the Premier yesterday, and it is a question all Manitobans are asking, what is this Premier going to do about the federal Conservative government and the federal Conservative ministers, whom this Premier praised, taking jobs from Manitoba to Alberta on a weekly and monthly basis? What are you going to do about it?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the member seems to think this is something new. I recall, because I was asked to participate, which I did, with the New Democratic government in the '80s when this whole trend began, when, in fact, the regional office for western Canada was moved from Winnipeg to Edmonton during the course of the administration of Howard Pawley.

All of these moves have flowed from that major decision when the New Democrats brought in the payroll tax, when they brought in the corporations capital tax, when they raised substantially the taxes on fuel, specifically on motive transport fuel for trains.

I recall arguing in this House with the then Minister of Finance Mr. Schroeder and telling him what would happen. He said the railways cannot pull up the tracks; they are here; we have them as a captive market. We are now reaping the harvest of what was sowed by the New Democrats. They said that the railways could not move out of this province because they had the tracks here, they had the infrastructure here. They began with the major move of all of the decision making out of Winnipeg to Edmonton. That has nothing to do with cabinet ministers. The decision makers in the CNR for this region were moved out of Winnipeg to Edmonton under the Howard Pawley administration, which is reflected and represented by all of the members in

the New Democratic Party still sitting on that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we are not happy about it, and I have asked for a meeting of the regional vice-president and the various relevant senior executives. This flows upon decision after decision after decision that began under the NDP government because of specific policy initiatives of that NDP government.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, the Premier better read back his words from 1985 and '86, because the Premier, when he was then Leader of the Opposition said, and I quote: that CN made it clear that any reduction in Winnipeg's role that might have been in the works has been frozen as a result of the NDP fight-back campaign ahead of those changes.

Those are the words of the Premier then. We used to fight these cutbacks and reductions with Mazankowski and Clark before they happened, not feigned indignation in this House after they happened, like this Premier. That is the fundamental difference.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier said he is going to meet with the same people that he met with a month ago who told him there was nothing to worry about. That is what we have from the Premier. He says that the ministers of Alberta have nothing to do with these changes. Well, you know, I cannot believe the naiveté of the Premier of this province, who says that Don Mazankowski, Joe Clark and Harvie Andre have nothing to do with the changes, and he is going to meet with the same people who gave us peace in our time a month ago to the Premier. Is he not concerned enough to pick up that phone to the Prime Minister, that he promised the people in 1988, because all these changes were frozen in 1985 and '86, as confirmed by the Premier's own words, and they have taken place in 1989, 1990 and 1991 while this Premier has been the Premier of this province?

Will he now phone the Prime Minister, as he promised the people of Manitoba in 1988? All he had to do was pick up the phone he said. Will he now do that on behalf of all those workers and jobs?

* (1020)

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the major difference in decision making took place when the regional headquarters for this region were moved from Winnipeg to Edmonton under Howard Pawley and the NDP.

Those moves took place, Mr. Speaker, because they brought in a payroll tax here that made it

prohibitive for them to have their employment levels here rather than in Alberta. They brought in a corporation capital tax that made it far more expensive for them to be located here in Winnipeg than in Edmonton, and they brought in, of course, the second highest motive fuel tax in the country on specifically diesel fuel for railways.

They bragged at that time that this would not affect anything because the railways could not pull up the tracks. Their infrastructure was invested. That is the major change that has taken place, and every single move has flowed from that change because the decisions are taking place in Edmonton.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to talking to the senior executives, I will talk to the chairman of the CNR and to the board members of the CNR, particularly the one from Manitoba, because I believe that the decisions will, indeed, be flowing from there, and we will have our input to them.

Mr. Doer: We are getting this courage of the Premier up a little bit higher with every question, Mr. Speaker. He has gone from the regional people to the chair of the board of CN now.

Now we just want to get him up a little bit higher, Mr. Speaker, and go to the top person. He is the top person of this government. We want him to go to the head of the Canadian government because we know these decisions are being made in a very consistent and political way to restore the fortunes of the Conservative Party in Quebec and restore the fortunes of the Conservative Party in the province of Alberta.

Now, the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) had it right on Shilo yesterday when he talked about going to Marcel Masse. We have suggested he go a little bit higher, to the Prime Minister, but he had it right when he said we should be going to Marcel Masse.

Can the Premier now get it right and go to the Prime Minister of this country, go above the board chair and the board of directors and go to the CEO of this country, because there is a political strategy in place, whether the Premier recognizes it or not, to take jobs into Alberta and jobs into Quebec. They are shafting Manitoba, and you better go to the Prime Minister on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the Leader of the New Democratic Party would like to puff himself up and make himself to be the tough guy that he could not be when the NDP were in

office, and they moved the regional office with all the decision makers, all the senior executives who make the decisions from Winnipeg to Edmonton. I can understand why he wants to hide behind all that rhetoric and all that hot air, because the New Democrats were, in fact, the beginnings, the genesis and the origin of our problems.

We will speak to whomever we have to in order to ensure that Manitoba's voice is heard in Ottawa.

Child and Family Services Volunteer-Generated Revenue

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in the past, the six independent Child and Family Services agencies raised hundreds of thousands of dollars through volunteer fundraising activities, such as the Fight Back Against Child Abuse campaign.

This year, due to the government's dismantling of local community-based agencies, revenue from these volunteer-driven fundraising activities is being substantially reduced.

Has the government established how much revenue will be lost, and how is the government's superagency planning to make up the funds previously generated through volunteer activities?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): I have indicated to the member before that the volunteer component working with the new agency is one that is very important. We have indicated that our new president of the agency, Ms. Helen Hayles, has worked with the volunteer sector for many, many years.

The board of the new agency is very interested in keeping the volunteer component with the board and will be working with the communities to have volunteers continue with the agency and the work that they did in the past and that new initiatives will be taken to attract volunteers to the new board to continue that service.

* (1025)

United Way Grant

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): We have learned that the \$250,000 United Way grant given in the past to support the volunteer co-ordinator positions in the six independent Child and Family Services agencies may be in jeopardy. Since this new agency is a government body and not a series of six independent community-based grassroots-oriented volunteer-driven agencies.

Was the government aware when they announced the restructuring of the Child and Family Services system that this \$250,000 United Way grant might not be forthcoming, that there might be some problem with that money?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the member that I met with the United Way people this week along with the Winnipeg Foundation to discuss a co-ordinated approach to the provision of services in the city of Winnipeg. I received a letter this morning from Penny Bowles, the president of the United Way, in which there is recognition that the Winnipeg Child and Family Services and United Way of Winnipeg are wholly committed to the effective provision of services to children and families. We are meeting with them and looking at ways that we can work together in a co-ordinated approach to enhance the services for children and families in the city of Winnipeg.

Restructuring Costs

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, given that the start-up costs for this new superagency, by the government's own admission, will be between \$300,000 and \$400,000, given that the board of this new superagency will not be volunteer boards, unpaid, but will be paid a fairly substantial amount of money for meetings, and given that there is a severe decrease in the money raised by the volunteers and that we do not have a firm commitment on the part of the United Way to fund the volunteer co-ordinator positions, will the minister tell the House how much more money this government's restructuring is going to effectively remove from the direct community-based programming for children and families in this community?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, in terms of the start-up costs, we gave a figure in the House and in public some weeks ago. I am pleased to report that it appears that was higher than the start-up costs actually are and that because of the involvement of former staff in supervisory positions, that we anticipate those start-up costs will be lower than the figure that I announced before.

I can tell you, in meeting with the Winnipeg Foundation and the United Way, we had a very productive meeting the other day and came to the conclusion that we do have common goals,

common goals to provide service to vulnerable people, to vulnerable families and children in the city of Winnipeg. We feel that we would like to enter into more dialogue and more meetings with those organizations that do a considerable funding in the city of Winnipeg.

I would invite the member to share that vision and that common goal and to bring productive ideas forward instead of the rhetoric and the speculation and the fearmongering that goes on—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Rh Institute Ownership

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, last October ABI technology signed an agreement to purchase the Rh Institute. At the same time, the government of the province of Manitoba agreed to pay off the \$6-million debt of the Rh Institute. In April, we learned that ABI was in financial trouble and that the Manitoba chief executive officer who had established and developed ABI had been fired, and control of the company had been taken over by a Toronto-based company called Apotex. We then learned that ABI had been placed into receivership by Apotex, and we are concerned that a Manitoba company is on the line. We are further concerned that the chairperson of the Rh Institute nor the office of the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) knows who owns the Rh Institute at the present time, because it would appear that the government has not signed the deal.

Can the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism tell the House today in definitive terms who owns the Rh Institute? Is it still owned by the people of the province of Manitoba? Is it owned by ABI? Is it owned by Apotex? Who owns it?

* (1030)

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member has outlined, the original sale of the Rh Institute was in fact made back on October 1, 1990, but was subject to three conditions. I can certainly outline those three conditions for the House, but what ended up happening was the three conditions have not been met to date. So, effectively, the disposition of the Rh Institute has not been finalized and has not been formalized, because the three conditions as per that original agreement have not been met.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, we are well aware that the three conditions have not been met. I would like to table an article from the Toronto Star dated yesterday in which the Toronto-based company says that they indeed own the Rh Institute in Winnipeg.

Can the minister tell us today if the Rh Institute is not owned by the company, have they been informed and why has the Minister of Health's department, through their deputy minister, Mr. Frank Maynard, informed other potential investors that the Rh Institute is no longer owned by the government and is not up for sale?

Mr. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, certainly in terms of the comments attributed to Apotex, I believe, I was not aware of them being made today. We are into discussions and negotiations with Apotex on future expansions and other opportunities in our province in terms of pilot project and a fermentation facility development. Certainly in terms of resolving that issue, we will talk to them in terms of clearing up their confusion on the disposition of the Rh Institute.

ABI Biotechnology Research Commitment

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Finally, Mr. Speaker, to the same minister.

The agreement signed last October had in it a commitment by the company to invest in research in the province of Manitoba. In contact with the University of Manitoba yesterday we learned that the agreement with the University of Manitoba, which would have seen a chair established by ABI at the university, has been withdrawn.

Can the minister tell us if all of the other monies committed by this company to research in the province of Manitoba and the promised 70 new jobs have also been withdrawn?

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, in light of the whole situation involving at ABI and Apotex, we are in extensive negotiations with them in terms of future opportunities in our province, some very exciting opportunities in terms of job creation, facility development and so on. We will be resolving and addressing the issue raised by the honourable member and future opportunities that do exist here in our province. I think there will be some very

exciting and very positive announcements made in light of this opportunity in the near future.

Social Assistance Work Incentive Increase

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, this week I was distressed to learn that recent statistics on median income in Canada showed that the second lowest area by postal code for income in all of Canada are in the constituencies of Point Douglas and Burrows. That median income figure is \$6,600 a year. In spite of this high concentration of very poor people, many of my constituents want to work and they want to supplement their income. The problem is that the current policy is that people on social assistance can only earn \$50 a month, and it is known as a work incentive.

Since this is woefully inadequate and much lower than the City of Winnipeg which is \$115 a month, will the Minister of Family Services give serious consideration to increasing the work incentive to at least the level of the City of Winnipeg, if not higher?

Hon. Harold Gillshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the member has spoken to me about his concerns on a number of occasions. We have taken a number of steps to improve the situation for social allowance recipients in the province of Manitoba, and I would reference the GST rebate as one of them where that is not regarded as additional income. We have put in place a number of plans, and I spoke to them the other day, to allow recipients to enter job training programs.

There was concern raised by many members about the HROCs and HROPs earlier in the year. These have been maintained to provide the opportunity for individuals on social allowance to get some training to get into the work force. We have also had a fair degree of success with the job training programs, the Gateway program, that allows people to get the training that would have them find employment in the near future.

Goods and Services Tax Rebate

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for discussing the work incentive with his staff and look forward to hearing about some progressive changes there in the future.

There is a problem, however, with the GST rebate and that is that people who earn under \$6,100 a year are not eligible to apply for it. I would like to ask the minister: Would he convey our concern to the minister responsible in the federal government and change this so that people earning very low incomes are eligible to have the GST rebate sent to them?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, we have given federal officials advice and guidance on the GST before and, of course, they have not accepted that.

We are always looking for ways in which we can improve the situation with social allowance recipients and, as I referenced, the GST rebate was one way in which that funding would not be regarded as additional income for social allowance purposes. That, with a number of other tax credits, allows social allowance recipients to access more income and improve their situation.

Security Deposit Deductions

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, we have heard about this before. When the government makes a change that they like, they always announce it by press release, but regressive changes, they do not tell anybody about publicly.

Why has this minister made a major change in policy from deducting security deposits from recipients' cheques in one lump sum, rather than the former policy of deducting it at 5 percent a month?

Does the minister not realize that this new policy is creating extreme hardship on extremely poor people whose income is being eroded by an increase in the consumer price index, year over year, in June of this year 5.4 percent, and 7 percent for food purchases? Will he now reverse this regressive policy on deducting security deposits?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): I would point out to the member that we do pay the security deposit for social allowance recipients when they do go into rental accommodations. What we are talking about is the second security deposit, and we have found in the past that often a security deposit that was paid on rental accommodation was not used as the security deposit when that individual moved to another accommodation. That was money that simply was not recovered sometimes by the recipient because of the fact that they did not approach the landlord to receive it.

The security deposit provision within the social allowances is still there. The reference is to a second security deposit, and we would encourage recipients to recover that deposit when they change accommodations and use it with the new accommodations they go into.

Goods and Services Tax Sales Tax Harmonization

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I have a question for the Minister of Finance—I certainly would not want to disappoint the House, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier in this session, the Minister of Finance expressed some concern about the burden that was being placed on the business community by having two separate sales taxes, namely the provincial sales tax and the goods and services tax. The province of Saskatchewan announced its intention to introduce a harmonized system beginning April 1 of this year, and in doing so, the Saskatchewan Minister of Finance said that a simplified administration of the two taxes would enable the business community to be more competitive.

Mr. Speaker, given this government's intention to ease costs on business, is the Minister of Finance of this province now exploring the possibility of harmonizing the Manitoba sales tax with the GST, and is this being done with the co-operation of officials from Revenue Canada?

*(1040)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as of this point, there is no discussion occurring as between officials. The budget indicated that the government of Manitoba was going to analyze the whole harmonization question.

It is in the process of doing that. It is in the process of hearing representation from the community, both formally and informally, on both sides of the issue, I might add, and ultimately, the government will make its choice. The indication being, though, that officials are not talking, I think would give some hint to the member as to how urgent the government considers the issue at this point in time.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, has the minister any estimates of much additional revenue the Treasury of Manitoba would obtain through harmonization?

I know, Mr. Speaker, that Saskatchewan, after providing a refundable tax credit, that its revenues would increase by \$181 million after the system became fully operational after 1992. It would therefore be a very major regressive tax increase hitting consumers in this province.

I ask the minister, how much revenue would Manitoba receive through harmonization?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, \$28.76. Not to be facetious, it is very difficult to tell, but the early analysis would show that if we were to harmonize, the increase would not be significant. That is because, of course, we have a very broad base right now within the province of Manitoba.

I know there are some in the community who feel that the government would reap a tremendous windfall if we were to harmonize. That is not the case. As a matter of fact, it is my view that it would be measured maybe in a few millions of dollars either way. It is not a significant amount of money because of the input system, the tax credit input system, that would be in place and would necessitate major credits, particularly to businesses.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Well, I thank the minister for that information.

Has the minister referred to some studies? Has the minister's staff conducted research into the impact of harmonization on the rate of economic growth?

I ask this because the Saskatchewan Minister of Finance stated that Saskatchewan's real gross domestic product would grow by an additional 1.8 percent due to harmonization. I find that a very strange conclusion, so I ask the minister whether he can advise, whether he has any reports on the impact of harmonization on the rate of economic growth in the province.

Mr. Manness: Well, not beyond those that were prepared for us by the national model some year and a half ago. Of course, they were not province of Manitoba per se; they were the western region per se. I think they showed a 1 percent, 1.5 percent increase in the economy, but that was under normal circumstances. Certainly we are not in normal times and normal circumstances now, and I cannot see how harmonization today in any province in Canada would promote economic growth.

Deputy Minister of Finance Manitoba Energy Authority Appointment

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): My question is to the minister of Energy and Mines.

Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister of Finance has also served the Manitoba government as chief executive officer of the Manitoba Energy Authority. Was he paid for that responsibility, and if so, how much?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): The Deputy Minister of Finance was appointed executive director of the Manitoba Energy Authority on or about June 1 of 1988 at a salary of \$30,000 per year.

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

Since The Civil Service Act prohibits government employees from receiving any additional monies from the Consolidated Fund, and since Section 36 of The Manitoba Energy Authority Act requires that monies be paid out of the Consolidated Fund, did the deputy minister receive a waiver from the Civil Service Commission, and if so, when?

Mr. Neufeld: Mr. Speaker, the appointment as executive director by the Deputy Minister of Finance was by Order-in-Council, dated June 1, 1988, I believe. The salary was set by Order-in-Council.

Mr. Speaker, the former executive director of the Manitoba Energy Authority who was also the—this is in a previous government—chairman of Manitoba Hydro Electric Board, he had a dual appointment. Upon taking office, it was decided that it should not be a dual appointment because the chairman of Hydro should not be the executive director of the Manitoba Energy Authority. The chairman of Manitoba Hydro, under our administration, received substantially less in salary than the chairman of the board of Manitoba Hydro-Electric of the previous administration.

In total, the salaries paid for the executive director of the Manitoba Energy Authority and the chairman of Manitoba Hydro was still less than what the chairman of Manitoba Hydro made under the previous administration.

It was also decided, Mr. Speaker, that probably the work involved as chairman of Manitoba Hydro would not be a full-time job, and as soon as time permitted, as soon as the work that was necessary

was completed, that would become a part-time job. It then became a part-time job, and the salary of the Manitoba Energy Authority chairman was reduced again.

Deputy Minister of Finance Manitoba Energy Authority Appointment

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fullness of the answer from the minister, but what is most significant is what he did not say, and that is that there was no waiver granted by the Civil Service Commission.

My supplementary question is for the Minister of Finance. Since Mr. Curtis' duties as the Deputy Minister of Finance are at the most senior level of the public service in Manitoba and undeniably full time at a salary this year that will be in excess of \$100,000, can the Minister of Finance tell us if his duties as chief executive officer of the Manitoba Energy Authority are spent on government time or on his own time?

* (1050)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the tone of the question. What the member is talking about now is the most senior civil servant in government, an individual who probably works between 70 and 80 hours a week. That is a minimum, I might say. Included within those 70 or 80 hours are the dual responsibilities of the Deputy Minister of Finance and formerly in his capacity with Energy Authority.

Fishing Industry Northern Freight Allowance

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, yesterday one of my colleagues met with fishermen in Fisher Branch. The fishermen in Fisher Branch who met there are very angry and are united in their opposition to this government's cutbacks to the Northern Freight Allowance. Even Felix Holtmann, representing the federal Conservatives, denounced the Minister of Natural Resources and the Premier for this devastating blow to the Manitoba fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. In light of this total opposition from the fishermen to the cutback, will he now restore funding to the Northern Freight Allowance for the fishermen?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am very much aware

of some of the difficulties that the fishermen in Manitoba are experiencing in terms of pricing, I might say, no different than, of course, our other primary producers, our grain producers, in the province who have, for some years—it had been my hope, and it is my continuing hope that perhaps my colleagues in the federal government would help share some of the burden in terms of support for the fishermen, as they are in fact for the grain producers in the province of Manitoba, with such support programs as GRIP and NISA.

It has been a position that the federal government is well aware of. I have attempted on several occasions to make contact with Mr. Crosbie, the honourable minister responsible for Fisheries in the federal government office, to effect a meeting. I have, to date, been unsuccessful but will continue my attempts at arriving at some opportunity to discuss the matter with the federal authorities.

My request is a very simple one, that they share the costs of providing the freight assistance program that suffered a general reduction or a capping along with other budgetary restrictions during the current budget. That is known to the fishermen on Lake Winnipeg and throughout Manitoba, and I will continue in my efforts to try to achieve some redress to this problem.

Loan Interest Rates

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas): Besides the cut to the Northern Freight Allowance, fishermen are also upset about this government's decision to move loans for fishermen from MACC to CEDF. Further yesterday, they discovered that they will now be charged an extra 1.5 percent interest on their loans.

My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. How much will the average fisherman have to pay now for this increase, and why were the fishermen not involved earlier?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to take that question as notice with respect to the specific details as to what interest rates would be applicable under the arrangements that are being made possible through the Communities Economic Development Fund.

Conference Attendance

Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, my final question is again to the Minister of Natural Resources.

The fishermen are organizing a conference to deal with the disastrous effects of this government's cutbacks on fishermen.

My question is for the minister. Will he invite his colleague the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) to attend that conference, meet with the fishermen and respond to their concerns?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to meet with Manitobans throughout the province of Manitoba and certainly, schedule permitting, would make every effort to be present at such a conference.

Taxicab Industry Luxury Cab Proposal

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, these are tough times for many Manitobans, including for taxicab drivers who have seen fares steadily drop the last number of years. Despite this fact the Taxicab Board, over the objections of many taxicab drivers, is planning on issuing 60 new licences for an elite executive premium taxi service.

My question for the Minister of Highways and Transportation: Does he support issuing additional licences at a time when many taxicab drivers are faced with reduced fares and some pretty tough times?

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Speaker, let me first of all indicate to the member that the taxicab operates independently from the department. My office appoints the people to the Taxicab Board. The Taxicab Board has had extensive hearings throughout Winnipeg with the industry over a period of a long time and the decisions that have been made have basically, according to information, been made based on those hearings.

Mr. Ashton: The taxicab drivers have said no, Mr. Speaker. They have filed court action. Despite that, the Taxicab Board is proceeding with this.

Will the minister intervene in this matter to ensure that there are not an excessive number of additional cab licences issued that will jeopardize the livelihoods of the many people in the city of Winnipeg who rely on taxicabs for their way of life?

Mr. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, once again I want to indicate to the member that the decisions that the Taxicab Board have made and are making were based on the hearings that they had throughout the

industry. I will make a point to try and check exactly the rationale for that. I have asked for that but they are still an independent body that make that decision.

Mr. Ashton: My final question, Mr. Speaker: Since these matters were not supported at the hearings, can the minister indicate why the board is apparently changing its original position from requiring a licence fee equivalent to the cost of which people are purchasing taxis, now indicating that they will only charge a nominal fee, a move that will threaten the investment, the hard-earned investment, of many taxicab drivers who have had to essentially purchase a job through the purchase of a taxicab licence? Would he at least do that on behalf of the taxicab drivers whose livelihood is threatened right now?

Mr. Driedger: I am aware that there has a change in that aspect of it. My preliminary information indicates that the licences will be issued based on a business plan. However, I have asked for the rationale to be brought forward to me, and I hope to have that within a short period of time.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Committee Changes

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs be amended as follows: St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) for Lakeside (Mr. Enns); Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson); Riel (Mr. Ducharme) for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose) and Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson) for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey).

I move, seconded by the member for Fort Garry, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Gimli (Mr. Helwer) for St. Vital (Mrs. Render); Turtle Mountain (Mr. Rose) for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey) and La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson) for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery).

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call Report Stage, Bills 20 and 53?

REPORT STAGE

Bill 20—The Animal Husbandry Amendment Act

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach), an amendment to Bill 20, (The Animal Husbandry Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élevage) as agreed to in committee stage:

THAT Bill 20 be amended by striking out clause 2(a) and substituting the following:

(a) by repealing the definition of "animal" and substituting the following:

"animal" means an animal kept in domestication or captivity, including any part of an animal whether it is dead or alive, but not including

- (a) a cat, or
- (b) a dog other than a dog that is used to herd livestock; ("animal")

(French version)

Motion de M. le ministre Findlay

Il est proposé que l'alinéa 2a) du projet de loi 20 soit remplacé par ce qui suit:

a) par substitution, à la définition de "animal" de ce qui suit:

"animal" Animal domestiqué ou vivant en captivité. Y est assimilée toute partie d'un animal mort ou vivant. La présente définition exclut:

- a) les chats;
- b) les chiens qui ne servent pas à conduire les animaux de ferme. ("animal");

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education and Training, that Bill 20, The Animal Husbandry Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élevage, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 53—The Natural Products Marketing Amendment Act

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of

Education and Training (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 53, The Natural Products Marketing Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la commercialisation des produits naturels), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, be concurred in.

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

Motion agreed to.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I am wondering if you would begin to call Third Readings starting at Bill 6. I should indicate that as we proceed along towards Bill 70, which I hope to call within the next half hour, three-quarters of an hour, that we might also break into second reading of some other bills. So I will give direction at that time.

* (1100)

THIRD READINGS

Bill 6—The Mines and Minerals and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Bill 6, The Mines and Minerals and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur les mines et les minéraux et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Madam Deputy Speaker, I just want to indicate that there has been fairly extensive discussion on this bill in the second reading stage. I indeed had the opportunity to speak on it. It is a comprehensive reorganization of the act. It has been subject to extensive discussions at committee stage, and we are now prepared to pass it through its final stage on third reading.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 8—The Vital Statistics Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 8, The Vital

Statistics Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 12—The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 12, The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 18—The Municipal Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 18, The Municipal Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 19—The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 19, The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élection des autorités locales), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 36—The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that Bill 36, The Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société d'aide juridique du Manitoba), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Madam Deputy Speaker, once again, this is a bill that has been subject to a considerable amount of debate and we are prepared to allow its passage at this point.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 38—The Wildlife Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that Bill 38, The Wildlife Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 39—The Summary Convictions Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 39, The Summary Convictions Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Yes, this is another bill we are prepared to pass, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 40—The Education Administration Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 40, The Education Administration Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration scolaire), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

* (1110)

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 41—The Public Schools Amendment Act (2)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education and Training, that Bill 41, The Public Schools Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 42—The Public Schools Finance Board Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education and Training, that Bill 42, The Public Schools Finance Board Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur a Commission des finances des écoles publiques), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 46—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation, that Bill 46, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Loi modifiant le Code de la route), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 48—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 48, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route) be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 49—The Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 49, The Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur les collèges et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives) be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 52—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move,

seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 52, The Family Maintenance Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire) be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Madam Deputy Speaker, we are prepared to pass this for third reading.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 55—The Employment Standards Amendment Act (2)

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Madam Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 55, The Employment Standards Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les normes d'emploi) be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I debated this on second reading fairly extensively. I want to note that this bill was the result of agreement between the labour and management representatives who have reviewed these matters. I wish the government in other areas was paying as much attention, at least in this relatively small area. I wish that had happened, for example, in regard to some of the other bills we will be debating later, Bill 70 in particular and Bill 59.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I would note for the government that when it does take the time to consult, in this case with not just management but also labour, the result can be bills that are reasonable compromises such as this bill, bills that can in fact, Mr. Speaker, be supported by all members of this House. I note that because that will certainly not be the case when we get to other bills which were not subject to this process of consultation and consensus.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is that Bill 55, The Employment Standards Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les normes d'emploi, be now read a third time and passed. Agreed?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 56—The Payment of Wages Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), that Bill 56, The Payment of Wages Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le paiement des salaires, be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, this is another bill that was the result of consultation and consensus by the representatives of both management and labour on the committee that deals with such matters, Labour Management Review Committee. I would say, once again, as I indicated previously, this is the type of approach the government could learn from, because once again this will be passed with support from all three parties in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is that Bill No. 56, The Payment of Wages Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le paiement des salaires, be now read a third time and passed. Agreed?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 57—The Horse Racing Commission Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 57, The Horse Racing Commission Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission hippique, be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, this may come as a surprise to the minister, but this has not exactly been the most controversial bill of the session and will probably not be remembered that much after its passage, no offence to the minister or the importance of the Horse Racing Commission. That is why, although we had not initially indicated to the government House leader that we would pass it today, on sober second thought, we have decided that perhaps this is one bill that might be passed today.

* (1120)

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is Bill 57, The Horse Racing Commission Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission hippique, be now read a third time and passed. Agreed?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 58—The Development Corporation Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 58, The Development Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société de développement, be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 60—The Law Society Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), that Bill 60, The Law Society Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau) be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 70—The Public Sector Compensation Management Act

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), that Bill 70, The Public Sector Compensation Management Act (Loi sur la gestion des salaires du secteur public) be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): It is a pleasure to take part in debate again on Bill 70. However, I

think there has been a fundamental shift in public attitudes toward this bill. When we spoke on it at second reading we said that this was a Draconian bill, and it was met with outrage by everyone who believed in free collective bargaining except, of course, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) whose views on free collective bargaining changed in a major way from last November to the introduction of Bill 70.

Mr. Speaker, the members on the government side know that the Premier's opinions changed, and they have a rationale for it. If they were to speak on this bill, they could tell us why the Premier's views changed. It is just that we do not agree with him.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Like the weather.

Mr. Martindale: Like the weather, my friend from Thompson says.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to dwell on something different and that is the change in opinion by the public since the committee hearings on Bill 70 were shut down. The focus has completely changed. Before public opinion was on the content of Bill 70, and now the public opinion is on the actions of the government in their undemocratic move to shut down the public speakers at Bill 70 in committee stage.

Mr. Speaker, I am very fortunate in that I represent an urban constituency, and every morning I am able to go for coffee with my constituents. I can tell you what people are saying on a number of given issues every day. I am very fortunate that I live 15 minutes away from the Legislature and that I can have coffee at the North Y community centre every day with my constituents. I can tell you that there has been a major change in public opinion. -(interjection)- Well, I would invite the member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) to join me at seven o'clock in the morning for a swim at the North Y and stay for coffee with the coffee gang at the North Y and to listen to what the public is saying about the government's actions in shutting down public presentations on Bill 70 at the committee stage.

Also this week I attended a funeral, and I stayed for lunch after this funeral. In fact, I was in the constituency of Charleswood, and I did not expect that people would approach me after the funeral and want to talk about political issues. I was not interested in talking about political issues at that time, but four people went out of their way to come and talk to me about the Draconian actions of this government in cutting off 400 people at four o'clock

in the morning and denying them their right to speak on Bill 70.

That is what people are talking about now. They are not talking about the content or the intent of Bill 70. They are talking about the actions of this government in denying people their right to speak. What are they saying? They are saying that these people were disenfranchised. Well, why did the government do it? Perhaps they panicked. Perhaps they thought they would be here too long this summer. Perhaps they wanted a summer holiday. I do not know why they did it. Was it necessary? No, I do not think it was necessary.

In fact, I talked to a cabinet minister in the corridor on Saturday night and asked him when he thought that committee hearings would be over. He said he thought they would be over on Tuesday. Well, would it have hurt all of us to sit in committee and to take our turns and sit on Monday morning and on Tuesday morning and Tuesday evening and finish on Tuesday instead of Saturday? No, I do not think it would have hurt us at all, and I do not think it would have changed the date on which this session adjourned.

Well, can the actions of the government be justified? The Charter of Rights and Freedoms talks about what sort of rights and freedoms we have and what can and cannot be justified. There is a test and it is in Clause 1 of Rights and Freedoms in Canada. The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it, subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

So I would like to apply that test to the government's actions at four o'clock on a Sunday morning on committee hearing in Bill 70. Can their actions be justified? Were they reasonable? Well, I do not think so. What they did was they cut off a privilege of people who wanted to speak. Can it be justified? No, I think not.

Would any harm have been done if the committee sat for another week? No harm would have been done. Would any harm have been done if they sat for another two weeks? No, no harm would have been done. In fact, it is unlikely that the committee would have lasted that long; as one of their own cabinet ministers predicted, it would have been probably over on Tuesday.

Could they have met during the day? Yes, they could have. Could the committee have met in the evenings? Yes, they could have. Could they have adjourned at midnight? Yes, they could have if the government chose to do that. Instead, they shut down the committee and they changed the focus entirely on this bill from the content to the actions of the government in disenfranchising people.

We described Bill 70 as Draconian in its contents in our speeches in second reading. Now people are saying that the actions of the government in shutting down the committee are Draconian, and I agree with them. -(interjection)-

The member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) says they do not care about democracy, and I agree.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine if the New Democratic Party had been in government and we had been in charge of the committee and we had a majority on that committee and we did something like that. What would members of the opposition have said about our actions? They would have said they were communist. That is what they would have said. They would have said they were totalitarian, extremely authoritarian. I can just imagine the outrage if they had been in opposition.

Yet, this government does it, but they are not getting away with it because public opinion is condemning them as being undemocratic. I think their actions are consistent with other things that they are doing which are undemocratic. Take, for example, housing authorities in the province of Manitoba. With no consultation, with no public discussion, with no input from appointed boards of directors and elected tenant representatives, by Order-in-Council the Conservative government abolished 98 local public housing authority boards of directors and appointed their own board for all of Manitoba. I can tell you that many of those board people, some of whom I have talked to in rural Manitoba, are very disappointed by this authoritarian, centralizing action of this government.

What did they do with Child and Family Services boards? Did they consult with the boards? Did they consult with people who were elected from the community? Did they consult with volunteers in those community-based agencies? No. Instead there was another midnight massacre whereby all those elected board members were abolished and a new appointed board was put in its place. I think these actions are consistent with the government's

authoritarian decision to suspend people's right to present briefs to the committee that was hearing presentations on Bill 70.

* (1130)

I think another reason for this action being extremely disappointing is that this government was abrogating a very open tradition in the Manitoba Legislature. The tradition is that the list is open and that those who register can speak and an unlimited number of people will be heard. That was the tradition in the past.

How does this differ with the House of Commons and how does it differ from other provincial Legislatures? Well, in the House of Commons, if people want to speak to a committee they register with the Clerk of the Committee. They send in their brief. Then the committee sits and they decide who they are going to hear. The House of Commons' committee chooses the number of presenters and the number of briefs that they will hear.

What about other provincial Legislatures? Well, the vast majority, and I think Manitoba is only one of one or two exceptions, let the public register and then the committee sits and they choose which members of the public they are going to hear.

Now, I think there may be some advantages to that kind of system, in that you may weed out people who want to present briefs that are not on topic. On the other hand, the government majority could eliminate all the people who are opposed to its legislation and only choose those people who are in favour, if they choose. If they had a majority, that is what they could do.

I do not know that that is the practice of other Legislatures or the House of Commons, but that is the kind of abuse that kind of power is open to.

I think the process in Manitoba is a much superior process. It is a very open process. Therefore, I am deeply disturbed when the government, using its majority, wants to put limits on this open and democratic process. I cannot understand why the government would want to move in this direction when public opinion in recent years has significantly changed.

Public opinion is saying: We want more access to our elected representatives. We want our elected representatives to listen to what we are saying. We want our elected officials to be more open and more accountable to the public.

Is cutting off 400 people in the middle of the night more open? No. Is it more democratic? No. -(interjection)-

My honourable friend from Inkster says that is why we need more Liberals in this Legislature. I cannot see why that would be an improvement, Mr. Speaker, unless of course they would promise that they would never do something as Draconian as the Conservatives did in the middle of the night, that they would never cut off -(interjection)- Well, now the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) is putting his remarks on the record through me. He says they promise that they would never cut off public presentations to committee if they were ever in government, an unlikely event in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand why this government would go in the opposite direction of public opinion in two ways, first of all in that people want more openness. They want more access to elected representatives. They want elected representatives to listen more closely to what the public are saying and to cutting off debate arbitrarily in the middle of the night, which is now what the public is talking about. They are talking about this Draconian action of this government in cutting off 400 people at four o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to dwell briefly, and finally, on the issue of fairness and the content of Bill 70 itself. Yesterday I sat in committee while a report on judges' salaries was discussed, and I have actually read this report. I know that we are given all kinds of things to read here and far too many things to read in their entirety. However, from time to time something very interesting comes along and I think it is good that all of us read all of it in its entirety. The report on judges' salaries was one such document, fascinating reading I would say.

What does the report recommend? It recommends certain increases in salary. It recommends significant increases in pension benefits and it also recommends that those increases be made retroactive. It says that Manitoba needs to catch up with other provinces—have-not provinces like Saskatchewan and, I think New Brunswick, were the examples.

What is the problem with this report and the government's action? Well, the problem is that the report was tabled this morning and the government motion was that it not be dealt with until the next

session. We have a concern about that, and that is that when the government does deal with it in the next session, they might make it retroactive as the report recommends and then the judges would get a raise for the year 1990 and then they, along with the doctors, would be an exception to all of the civil servants, the 48,000 civil servants whose wages are being frozen in 1991.

There is a question of fairness here in that one group of civil servants, one very large group of civil servants, is being dealt with in one way through Bill 70 and another group of civil servants is being dealt with in quite a different way by legislation that is not before the House at this time but will be before the House likely during the next session. We think that all civil servants should be dealt with in the same manner although, of course, we do not recommend that all of them be treated in the same way in that all of their salaries be frozen. We, of course, favour free collective bargaining and barring that route, we prefer that arbitration be used. This government has chosen not to do that much to the distress of ourselves and all those who believe in free collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of issues here of which fairness is just one. I think that it does not appear on the surface that judges' salaries are relevant to Bill 70. However, because they are civil servants, I think it is relevant.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have put these remarks on the record, and I know that other members on this side are going to do the same thing. I can almost assure the government that Bill 70 is going to be one of the last pieces of legislation to be passed in this House in this session, and if it was up to us, if there was any way that we could defeat this in the House, we certainly would. We welcome stories that we have heard about lawsuits which are going to challenge the government and its legal right to carry out this Draconian legislation. Thank you.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a contribution in this debate on Bill 70. I did not have an opportunity to speak during the second reading stage, so I do welcome the occasion this morning to speak to the bill on third reading.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that has a great deal of impact on my own constituents, because in Brandon East we have many people who are employed by

the provincial government, people who work, for example, in the Brandon Mental Health Centre. There are several hundreds of people who work there, many of whom do live in my own constituency. There are people who work for Assiniboine Community College. There are people who work for various government departments, Natural Resources, the Department of Agriculture and Highways department. We have a large Highways regional garage, a regional operation located in the city of Brandon, and so on. Indeed, we have a large provincial building that houses, I would suggest, at least 200, over 200 civil servants.

So, by and large, Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of legislation that is offensive to the members of my constituency as indeed it is offensive to the working people of the province of Manitoba. As my colleague, the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), has indicated, I suppose in recent days the issue has shifted on this bill from one of interfering with the collective bargaining process to one that is actually antidemocratic in the sense that the government moved to deny dozens of people an opportunity to be heard on this bill.

It is simply not acceptable to ask people to be available in the wee hours of the morning, particularly if they do not know when they are going to be called, and particularly if they did not know that they might be called at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. or 4 a.m. or whatever. So that whole process was totally unacceptable, and I think the people of Manitoba are disappointed that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) who has been more or less steering this legislation through the House and through the committee has chosen to utilize the technique of striking people from a list after two calls. It is certainly not a democratic way of doing it, particularly when the committee meets at off hours. It would be different, I would suggest, if the committee and the names were called during more normal hours, that is, during the day or in the early evening, and even on a Saturday that is no problem.

* (1140)

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is very unacceptable to members of the opposition for a lot of reasons. One, of course, is that it uses the public sector workers as scapegoats for the mismanagement of this particular government. For whatever reason, the public sector is expected to bear the brunt of the financial problems that this particular government has. Frankly, if we look at the

information provided to us by MGEA research staff, they have shown this in one of their presentations to the committee, Industrial Relations Committee, that indeed public sector wage increases had actually lagged behind inflation for a number of years. This is one major reason that we object to this particular bill.

Another reason is probably more fundamental. That is that it subverts the collective bargaining process and, as such, it is antidemocratic. We talk about free enterprise. We talk about free markets. Included in that are labour markets. For a labour market to operate in a free way demands that collective bargaining be allowed to proceed.

In this instance, we have denied thousands of workers who are employed by the government of Manitoba the opportunity to engage in free collective bargaining. It is not good enough. It is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker, for members opposite to argue on one hand that you should have freedom of enterprise and then in the next breath deny freedom of collective bargaining, because that is an essential part of a free market system that members opposite seem to be very enamoured with.

We have a situation where the government did have 20 bargaining meetings with the MGEA, but not one substantive issue was settled at the table. As a matter of fact, it is alleged that the government appeared to have been bargaining in bad faith as though they had no intent to settle a contract. Certainly, if they did, they had no intention of putting wages on the table. Therefore, you had the situation where the MGEA was dealing with government negotiators who virtually had no mandate to bargain and to settle a contract.

Mr. Speaker, what happened, instead of continuing on with collective bargaining which would have been the correct thing to do, the proper thing to do, the democratic thing to do, we have the government bringing this authoritarian piece of legislation which imposes a zero percent adjustment, which is no adjustment at all, on thousands upon thousands of Manitobans who happen to be working in the public sector. There is no question it is an interference of the collective bargaining process. There is no question that it is an antidemocratic move. There is no question that it is an authoritarian move. To me that is the greatest disappointment with this particular bill. It is the greatest concern that I have with this bill.

It would have been very easy for the government to go beyond that and include a lot of others in the public sector. I note, for example, that the representative of The Manitoba Teachers' Society, I believe the president, appeared before the committee on Industrial Relations and indicated her concern, the concern of her fellow teachers in the MTS about this as well.

The collective bargaining process—the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province has given a lot of lip service to collective bargaining. On October 26, 1989, the Premier is quoted as speaking to the MGEA, and he said: If the union believes it is in its interest to put in antiprivatization or no-layoff clauses, that is part of the whole bargaining process. You believe in it, and we believe in it, and we will carry out our responsibilities under it.

That, Mr. Speaker, was before the election at that time. This was quoted October 26, 1989, and then during the election the Premier stated, and I am quoting: We are committed to repealing final offer selection. We believe this mechanism is inappropriate and can undermine a collective bargaining process. Any further significant changes to Manitoba labour laws or The Civil Service Act would only be undertaken after consultations with the public, business and labour. We believe that negotiated settlements should take into account all legitimate factors that are brought to the bargaining table by both sides. Some bargaining units are including as a request, protection from the goods and services tax for their members. As management, we seek to balance the requests of MGEA negotiators with the fiscal capacity of the province in the protection being afforded other workers within the province.

Again, that was a quote from the Premier during the election. This was in answer to an MGEA questionnaire, and it was submitted in August 1990. What did he say after the election? Again, I am quoting. This is Hansard (October 16, 1990), and I quote the Premier: "the very first thing that I responded to them was, please return to the bargaining table, have your differences worked out through the free collective bargaining process. That is why the process exists. I support it, and I assume that you do. That was my initial response to them."

"I will repeat that the free collective bargaining process ought to prevail and that they ought to go forward and attempt to resolve that at the bargaining table. That is the process that we as a government

support, and I would assume the New Democrats support that process. I cannot understand why they would want to do anything other such as bargaining here on the floor of the Legislature and entering into a labour dispute."

"The fact of the matter is . . . there is no club and there never will be from this Government. We will act in good faith at all times in the open free collective bargaining process with all of the employees with whom we have to negotiate."

This is a statement from Hansard dated November 6, 1990. Again, that day, on page 818 of Hansard, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is quoted as saying, "The fact of the matter is, there is no threat, there is no club and there never will be from this Government. We will act in good faith at all times in the open free collective bargaining process with all of the employees with whom we have to negotiate."

Another quote from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), December 14, 1990: ". . . we have established a target of a 3 percent average wage increase for all those employees paid by Government."

Then again, the Minister of Finance stated in a press conference on June 3, 1991: what is changed is the realization that to throw an additional group of people out of work to maintain the integrity of the budget is not a preferred option, not at all, and services will certainly be significantly reduced and, unquestionably, the economy again will not respond to that type of move.

* (1150)

The point is, Mr. Speaker, you have the Premier (Mr. Filmon) categorically stating his preference with the free collective bargaining process before, during and then after the election. Now we come to this stage, Bill 70, with a total reversal of a stated position by the Premier. It is totally unacceptable to the people of this province.

We have other quotes from the Premier where he stated again his belief in the free collective bargaining process. When he was referring to the casino strike on October 16, 1990, we find in Hansard on page 103, and I am quoting: ". . . the very first thing that I responded to them was, please return to the bargaining table, have your differences worked out through the free collective bargaining process. That is why the process exists. I support it, and I assume that you do. That was my initial response to them."

Mr. Speaker, talk about being inconsistent, talk about being contradictory now with this major piece of antidemocratic legislation.

Then another quote, again, November 5, 1990, again from Hansard, pages 805 and 806, and I am quoting: "We have the same mechanism that every Government has had. It is called the free collective bargaining system."

"We have determined steadfastly that we would let the Crown corporations be operated at arm's length on business principles that would be set by policy of the Government, and the management decisions and ultimate determinations made, under the aegis of the boards of directors, by the management of the corporation."

"For all of those good and valid reasons, there is not an attempt on our part to influence decisions that are management decisions in a free collective bargaining process between management and its employees."

"Those Crown corporations obviously are encouraged to, as much as possible, harmonize their own dealings so that they meet Government policy or that they meet Government objectives. At the same time, we do not go the step of setting firm top-line guidelines.

"If we did, I would suggest that, to avoid the kind of event that the Member is talking about, we would have to apply those guidelines to every public sector agency within the aegis of Government and that would include teachers. There would be no sense in setting a limit for all Crown corporations and not applying that limit for settlement to teachers or to university professors and staff. We would have to go the full bore."

Well, as I said, that is from Hansard by the Premier, November 5. I cannot help but note at this point, Mr. Speaker, that when I attended one of the Industrial Relations committee meetings one late evening, a young gentleman, a young man who worked for the Manitoba Telephone System appeared as an individual worker expressing his frustration with why the government would not carry on with collective bargaining and why he and his union, who had always bargained in good faith in the past, were suddenly having this thrust upon them.

He, as an individual worker who was proud to be working with MTS, who wanted to do a good job, felt that he and his fellow workers were totally demoralized by this type of a move. I would say, Mr.

Speaker, this goes for other employees of Crown corporations as well and in addition of course to the Civil Service as such.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we know that this bill discriminates. It discriminates against certain groups and in favour of certain groups. It discriminates against physicians who work under a collective agreement, for instance. It leaves untouched the rights of salaried physicians who do not have a collective agreement.

Emergency physicians at the Grace, the Concordia and Victoria Hospitals will get no increase this year as a result of Bill 70, while doctors at Misericordia, Seven Oaks, the Health Sciences Centre and St. Boniface Hospital will. What it will amount to, the consequence of that, Mr. Speaker, is that this differentiation will make worse an already poor situation in the Winnipeg hospitals who are already having trouble attracting and retaining staff. I believe the MMA has asked for very specific amendments.

Then, of course, there is the whole question of those unions who had already negotiated in good faith and applied, asked for the application of FOS, the final offer selection mechanism that was still in effect. Even those unions, those contracts that had been settled through FOS, have been cancelled and superseded by this legislation. Mr. Speaker, there is no question, therefore, in my mind, that the government broke its promise on when FOS would end, that FOS would be allowed to continue. That was an understanding, a promise made by the government, but that promise was totally wiped out when this Bill 70 was brought in, this bill that nullified those particular contracts that were settled by FOS, for example, like the engineers, who were out on strike for months. They settled and now they get zero percent.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, the actions of the government, the actions of the minister, are particularly repugnant to the principles of good faith bargaining and certainly to democratic labour negotiations.

Of course, as our Justice critic has stated, the member for -(interjection)- Kildonan—I forgot the particular name of the constituency. The member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), the Justice critic, has well noted that there is discrimination here in terms of what is going to be happening to judges' salaries. Judges are not covered, and they are being treated

differently. As far as we are concerned there seems to be a discrimination in favour of this particular group, judges, and against the bulk of the employees in the public sector. Even though the Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) has said zero for this year, nevertheless, in the long run we believe that there is a discrimination and in fact the judges are not covered by this legislation.

Frankly, although we could ask for amendments to this legislation, and we have suggested them in debate and in committee, I would say that we are totally and absolutely opposed to this legislation and would best see it defeated, best see it not proceeded with.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I had asked some of the delegations that appeared before our committee last week what they thought should happen to the legislation, would they be satisfied with some amendments, for instance, such as an amendment on a sunset clause. This has been mentioned by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that this is a possibility, in other words, a sunset clause that would limit the application of this bill to one year only. The answer I got from many of the delegations, because I posed that question to a number of the delegates, was a straightforward and simple no, they would not be satisfied with that. They would only be satisfied with the bill being defeated in the House, which may not be possible, given the numbers on either side of this Legislature, or if the government finally saw the light and decided to withdraw the bill.

I would suggest that even though it may be argued for financial purposes that a zero increase is the best position for the Province of Manitoba for its particular financial situation, nevertheless, it is not impossible to get a zero increase through the collective bargaining process. That has happened in the past with previous governments and the MGEA, and it has happened in other jurisdictions. I believe that employees generally are not unreasonable and would indeed be prepared, given certain circumstances, to go for a zero increase in a particular year.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the government did engage in proper, totally adequate collective bargaining, that could have been achieved through without interfering with the democratic process. I think it is very sad, as I said before, that we have a move by this government that

is certainly antidemocratic and particularly not only denying workers the opportunity to collective bargain at this point, but as I said, wiping out labour contracts that unions had sought and bargained for and the government had already accepted, such as the casino workers.

This is unfair. This is unnecessary. It is something that I note the Winnipeg Free Press in its editorial—I do not often agree with their editorials, but in the Winnipeg Free Press editorial of June 27, they are very critical of this particular government. The heading of the editorial is "Infected with Arrogance," and they go on to criticize the Filmon government being in the state of suffering from delusions of grandeur. It goes on to say that the Premier should take firm steps to root out the disease before it destroys his relations with the public of Manitoba.

* (1200)

They cite a number of examples. The Rotary Pines is one example stated. Another example is reference to Family Services minister Harold Gilleshammer, as it states in the editorial about how he handled the reorganization of the child welfare system without consulting and imposing it in one dramatic gesture. Now the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) is another example. In spite of his long years of experience in this House, he caught the arrogance infection as well in regard to the Ducks Unlimited office building and tourist attraction at the Oak Hammock Marsh. Whether it is a good project or not, again it is a matter of how a government goes about doing this.

According to the Free Press editorial, they have concluded that the Minister of Natural Resources has stopped listening. It is quite apparent that the Minister of Natural Resources is not listening. He will not hear any review or any discussion. He alone will decide what land uses in the marsh are permitted. He forgets that it is not his marsh, but that it is the marsh of the public of the province of Manitoba.

The editorial zeroes in as well on this bill, Bill 70, and how the Finance minister is afflicted with this disease of arrogance as well. They note that the Finance minister is worried about the cost of labour contracts that the province must pay for, but then he concluded the only way of dealing with it is by suspending the collective bargaining and using the

power of the government through this Legislature to set Civil Service employment terms for the year.

Of course, he can point to other jurisdictions. Other provinces, indeed, have taken similar actions and perhaps tried to defend it on this basis, that he or this government is not alone in this. Really the editorial concludes that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has let power go to his head. He reached back in time and wiped out labour contracts, as I said before. He wiped out labour contracts that unions had tried to obtain and, in fact, bargained for in good faith and did get them through the bargaining process.

Frankly, and I quote this one sentence from the editorial. This is on bringing in Bill 70 and pushing it through Legislature, and this approach: "It was the kind of thing governments and ministers do when they start getting too big for their britches."

As I said, I do not often agree with editorials in the Winnipeg Free Press, but I happen to agree with this one. It is right on target, Mr. Speaker.

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

I know the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) continually refers to the lack of ability by this government to make payments to provide additional monies, to provide to the Civil Service, to provide increases in salaries because of the debt situation. Well, I guess if you keep on repeating the situation enough times, people will begin to believe you, but if you do some analysis of the Manitoba debt situation, Mr. Acting Speaker, you will find that the provincial debt in Manitoba is not out of line. We are not the only provincial government, we are not the only jurisdiction that has debt in this country.

As a matter of fact, our debt per capita—or if you take it as a percentage, I guess, of the gross domestic product, which ever way you might want to look at it because you have to use these types of comparisons in order to compare the province in a relative position with the other jurisdictions, you will find that our debt is not out of line with the other jurisdictions. This minister and some of his colleagues across the way are always fond of blaming the NDP for all the debt that we have acquired, while the fact is, Mr. Acting Speaker, it is not responsible for all the debt that was acquired.

Debt was acquired during the Lyon period. We have debts that go back to the Roblin days. We have debt that has been incurred by this

government. We have had four budgets brought in by this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), even though the first one could have been a surplus because the previous Pawley administration had brought in tax changes, for which they paid the price, to increase revenue so that we would not have had a deficit in that particular year, the first year that this government took office.

As such, instead of utilizing those funds and leaving them as a surplus, because they were a surplus, it is not only because of tax changes that occurred through the previous administration just prior to 1988, but also through windfall transfers, I would admit that, through windfall transfers from the federal government—those funds would have put this province into a surplus position and there would have been tens of millions of dollars, \$40 million, \$50 million, \$60 million, approximately, available to pay off the debt.

Instead of that, this Minister of Finance took those monies and put it into the Fiscal Stabilization Fund and therefore showed another deficit in its first budget. He showed a deficit simply because he took those additional revenues that he had available and put them into the Fiscal Stabilization Fund. I might add, Mr. Acting Speaker, that this is a copy from what happened in the province of British Columbia, because I think they call it a budget stabilization fund. It is called the BS fund in British Columbia.

That is what we have here with this Fiscal Stabilization Fund, because even the Provincial Auditor had a lot of difficulty and expressed this publicly with the setting up of the Fiscal Stabilization Fund and what it did to the accounts. I spoke to him on this matter when it was first brought in and he said well, simply, the monies in that fund are revenues that have not been spent. Those revenues, as I said, would have been applied or could have been applied to the debt and it would have been reduced by that amount.

So I say, Mr. Acting Speaker, I think that it just will not wash for the Minister of Finance to continually say well, we have all this debt. We have a horrendous financial situation. We have no alternative but to deny the public servants of Manitoba a wage increase. The fact is, this minister has had four budgets and he is responsible, this government is responsible, for deficits for four years in a row.

I want to say this too, Mr. Acting Speaker, because it is relevant to Bill 70, because the essence of Bill 70, what drives Bill 70 is the government's argument that it has no money to pay the Civil Service. I would say that the blame and the criticism they have of previous debt accumulation is unfair in the sense that all that money was spent and it was totally wasted. That is obviously garbage, because while we often talk about debts, we never seem to talk about the assets that were put in place.

What about all those physical assets that were put in place through the spending of money over the years in the '80s, whether they be hospitals, schools, whether it be in the construction of roads, whether it be construction of other needed facilities, medical labs, you name it, whether it be special additional grants to municipalities to assist them, or whether indeed it be employment programs and training programs?

We had a major employment and training program called the Manitoba Jobs and Training Program in the '80s. We had an analysis of that program done subsequently by an outside person, an outside researcher, who gave us completely objective analysis of the program and said it was effective, that it indeed took people off unemployment insurance or took them off welfare and provided for being trained not in the government, but in private enterprise. These are jobs that were created in the private sector through the government providing them with the wage subsidies so they would hire people. That is an asset as well that this province can be proud of.

The fact is that when you train people, you have acquired an asset. It is sometimes referred to in economics as human capital as opposed to physical capital. When you have taken a young man or a young woman or a not so young man or woman and you have trained that person, whether you trained them on the job, whether you trained them in a college or in a university or wherever, you have provided an asset that is valuable in terms of economic activity, in terms of economic development.

* (1210)

You cannot have economic development if you do not have a trained work force. You do not have economic development if you do not have men and women who are capable of doing jobs that require skills.

This program, the Manitoba Jobs and Training Program, assisted the private sector in training thousands of people on the job. So it took some money, but, Mr. Acting Speaker, what it did do in the early '80s, because we did have a major recession in '82-83 thereabouts, '81-82-83, it helped offset the recession. As a result we had fewer people on welfare. We had fewer people on unemployment insurance.

I say, I have said before, I agree with the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), I would any day prefer to see the men and women of this province who are capable of working and who want to work to be employed rather than drawing welfare. It is just intolerable that we have had a 15,000-person increase in the number on welfare in the city of Winnipeg alone. These are people on municipal welfare, of which 80 percent to 85 percent is paid for by the province, although we subsequently bill back the federal government. Nevertheless, it is an increased tax burden on the province, that we have 15,000 more people on welfare this June as opposed to last year and we are paying for it.

I say far better to set up an employment and training program like we had, give some subsidies to the private sector, mainly to small business, hire people who are unemployed, take them off of welfare and let them produce some goods and services. Let them get the training so that when a recession eases up that person is able to hopefully get a job and, particularly with the training, is able to get a permanent job and to contribute to the economic wealth in this province. That is the way to go.

I say that the argument used, the rationale behind Bill 70—yes, we have no money so we have to go with a zero increase—I say that, and the criticism of the debt, just does not wash because our debt is not out of line. Furthermore, I would argue, as I have done, that the debt we have acquired has provided us with assets. It has provided us with physical assets and it has provided us with human capital which was in the economic interests and the social interests of this province.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there were a number of excellent presentations made at the committee hearings over the past week from various union organizations, from CUPE, from MGEA, from various unions, from the Manitoba Federation of Labour, The Manitoba Teachers' Society, and so on.

I note in particular the brief presented to the committee by the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Manitoba Division, which makes the case that underfunding of programs by the federal government has put pressure on the provincial governments of this country since, therefore, understandable that provincial governments have to find more funds to ensure that social programs are adequately funded. The provinces had to take a hard look at their own priorities and a hard look at how taxation can be made fairer to ensure that the social programs do not suffer and those who can afford to pay taxes, do.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

They made the point, and I agree, that governments have obligations to their citizens that go far beyond looking for the narrow economic interests of their corporate friends. They have an obligation to ensure that there is adequate funding paid through equitable sharing of the tax burden available for social programs, which should make this province a more desirable place to live and prosper.

In order to do that, you have to have a top-rate public service and a group of civil servants who are not demoralized, who can provide that service to the public of Manitoba. They also point out, Mr. Speaker, in terms of economic activity, that the wage freeze does nothing to assist this province to get out of the recession at this time. As a matter of fact, what it does is take money, in effect, out of the economy at a time when the economy desperately needs a boost, where the economy needs a boost of confidence. It also needs an increase in consumer purchasing power.

Mr. Speaker, by denying this particular wage increase, even a modest wage increase, we are reducing the ability of thousands of people in this province to consume as much as they would otherwise. What we have done through this bill is reduce the real standard of living of all those employees affected because, as someone indicated today, we have inflation very much with us.

There is a report out today, and it varies from city to city, but we are looking in the order of 5 percent to 6 percent inflation. Whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, if you have 5 percent or 6 percent inflation points and a zero percentage increase in your wages, your real standard of living suffers. So I would say that

the economy of Manitoba, if anything, is suffering not because of a lack of investment, not because of a lack of ability to produce, but because of a lack of markets, because of the inability of our consumers to purchase and to buy what we can produce. This bill, therefore, and this move by the government, therefore, worsens the situation. It does not help.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know my time is limited or it is now concluded or about to be concluded, and therefore I say again to the minister, I challenge the minister to come to his senses and to withdraw the bill and to go back to the bargaining table and in good faith negotiate with the MGEA. As I got the message through the workers—who knows?—you may be able to negotiate a zero percent increase.

With those words, I would indicate quite clearly again that this side of the House will oppose to the bitter end the passage of this antidemocratic piece of legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcia-Leis), that debate on Bill 70 be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I propose that we go to debate on second readings of private bills, firstly Bill 32, then Bill 66, and then after that time I will call a third private bill. I will ask the leave of the House at that time to consider Bill 67.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS—PRIVATE BILLS

Bill 32—The Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcia-Leis), Bill 32, The Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la "Mount Carmel Clinic," standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). Stand?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: No. Leave is denied.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): The government has reviewed this bill in

some detail over the course of two years now. I have had a discussion with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) as recently as a day or two ago, and he indicates to me that certainly we are prepared to see this bill go to committee, and he will make further points at that time. On the surface, Mr. Speaker, the government would appear to have no difficulty in supporting this bill, but I will leave our final position to the Minister of Health at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 32, The Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la "Mount Carmel Clinic." Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

* (1220)

Bill 66—The Winnipeg Canoe Club Incorporation Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. Vital, Bill 66, The Winnipeg Canoe Club Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Winnipeg Canoe Club," standing in the name of the honourable member for Inkster.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the bill go into the committee at this point, so I will forgo the rest of my speech in that we can call the question for it.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on the proposed motion from the member for St. Vital and certainly indicate that we are willing to have this bill go before committee.

I would note that the Canoe Club is a long-established organization in the province of Manitoba. The interesting part about the Winnipeg Canoe Club, and I would make this note very carefully to all members here, that it is a club in Winnipeg that allows people from both sexes to actually be members and full participants in the club. Not all clubs in the city of Winnipeg, as we have noted in the past, have that criteria.

For those members of this Chamber who only participate in clubs that allow only one sex in that club, perhaps they should be talking to the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render). Perhaps a change of venue would be more consistent with a society and a province that believes that both sexes in our

province are equal and therefore should have equal access to facilities in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we would love to hear the debate and we would like to see the leadership for the member for St. Vital reflected in all the actions of MLAs in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member for St. Vital, closing debate.

Mrs. Shirley Render (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, the amendment to the Winnipeg Canoe Club will serve to assist the Winnipeg Canoe Club's growth well into the 21st Century.

I would ask that all honourable members support the amendment and, indeed, I thank them now in anticipation of their support. I would ask that this bill be recommended to committee.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 66, The Winnipeg Canoe Club Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Winnipeg Canoe Club." Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 67—The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave of the House to introduce for second reading Bill 67. I will not move it. It is not my motion, but I ask the leave of the House that it now consider Bill 67.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to allow Bill 67 to come forward at this time? Leave? It is agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), that Bill 67, The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital," be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, let me indicate at the outset my appreciation to the government House leader and to other members of this House for allowing this matter to come forward on a by leave basis. I will, of course, accept the minister's statements, which I assume he will place on this bill as he has with respect to Mount Carmel, that he will want his Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to review it in some detail. I accept that. I am sure that it will be acceptable to the government.

Mr. Speaker, I will be prepared obviously at the committee stage to go into the detail clause by clause and explain in detail to all members exactly what is being done. It is in my view a nonpartisan, noncontroversial matter. We are attempting to assist The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital better do their job, which is as a hospital which has served this city for many, many years. In fact, I feel it is important to point out that this hospital was first incorporated in 1904. For 87 years this hospital has served this community and, of course, in particular the residents of the community I represent, the St. James-Assiniboia area.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go further into detail of the bill. I do reiterate that I look forward to a full explanation, debate and questioning from the government on what is achieved. Let me just say, generally it is a matter of a technical nature. It is corporate changes, how their board works with respect to who is on the board, how many members and how they go about appointing a chairman and vice-chairman. Those are the nature of the changes, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe they will be controversial, and I look forward to the support of all members of this House. Thank you.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a few words on the record in terms of the bill. We look forward to the public debate on the bill. I just want to pay tribute to the Salvation Army in this bill debate.

The Salvation Army I think is an organization worthy of praise from all members of this Legislature. It works tirelessly on behalf of the people of this province and the people who are most disadvantaged in our society.

A former member of this Chamber was a former minister of the Salvation Army, the former member for Ellice at the time, Bud Boyce, a person I knew and respected very much for his work in the inner

city with people and his work in Corrections, which is also work that the Salvation Army conducts.

Mr. Speaker, the Salvation Army is also in the All Charities campaign of the provincial government. It was interesting, when we went to multiple choice instead of a prescriptive measure of allotting finances, many provincial government employees, especially people in jails and others, recognize the Salvation Army as one of the top charities, and their contributions by voluntary choice quadrupled. I believe in the first year it was given an opportunity to be recognized as a separate entity in terms of the All Charities campaign.

So we just want to pay tribute to the tremendous dedication of the volunteers and staff of the Salvation Army and also pay tribute to the excellent hospital they run in the St. James-Assiniboia area, a hospital that was originally in the inner city and served those citizens well and now continues to serve the citizens of St. James and Assiniboia very well. Thank you very much.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, let me echo the words of the Leader of the Opposition. Certainly we would want to associate ourselves with all of them, and this incredible community organization which, with so little fanfare for the most part, provides such care and service to those disadvantaged in our society, has to be laid on the record.

Let me say with respect to the bill, I would like to accept at face value the member's comments that this is a technical bill and as such will be nonpolitical. I have to, though, reserve the right for the government that we will ask the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) during the committee stage to—obviously, Mr. Speaker, he would normally be present—carefully weigh the technical amendments, and in no way at this time by passing

it into committee are we making a commitment to pass it all the way to law.

Nevertheless, from what the member has said to this point in time and in keeping with his comments that these are technical changes, we certainly are prepared to see it move to committee at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 67, The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Salvation Army Grace General Hospital."

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

House Business

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I will not make the formal call for a Standing Committee on Private Bills at this time, but I will let members in with my thinking at this time, and that is that on Monday afternoon, I probably will formally announce that the Standing Committee on Private Bills will sit at three o'clock Tuesday. That will require, of course, the leave of the House to do so.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore, just to review, the Standing Committees on Industrial Relations and also Municipal Affairs will consider clause by clause Bills 35 and 68, and also 59 should presentations have been heard by either late today or, if needed, tomorrow, clause by clause Monday morning.

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

The hour being 12:30, this House now adjourns and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Monday.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, July 19, 1991

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
		Taxicab Industry Ashton; Driedger	4918
Presenting Petitions			
The Pines Project			
Martindale	4906		
Barrett	4906		
Reading and Receiving Petitions			
The Pines Project	4906		
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees			
Law Amendments			
Reimer	4906		
Privileges and Elections			
Render	4908		
Committee of Supply			
Dacquay	4909		
Ministerial Statements			
Canada's Parks Day			
Enns	4909		
Cerilli	4910		
Carstairs	4910		
Oral Questions			
CN Rail Relocations			
Doer; Filmon	4910		
Child and Family Services			
Barrett; Gilleshammer	4912		
Rh Institute			
Carstairs; Stefanson	4913		
ABI Biotechnology			
Carstairs; Stefanson	4914		
Social Assistance			
Martindale; Gilleshammer	4914		
Goods and Services Tax			
L. Evans; Manness	4915		
Deputy Minister of Finance			
Carr; Neufeld; Manness	4916		
Fishing Industry			
Lathlin; Enns	4917		
		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
		Report Stage	
		Bill 20, Animal Husbandry Amendment Act	4919
		Bill 53, Natural Products Marketing Amendment Act	4919
		Third Readings	
		Bill 6, Mines and Minerals and Consequential Amendments Act Ashton	4919
		Bill 8, Vital Statistics Amendment Act	4919
		Bill 12, Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act	4920
		Bill 18, Municipal Amendment Act	4920
		Bill 19, Local Authorities Election Amendment Act	4920
		Bill 36, Legal Aid Services Society of Manitoba Amendment Act Ashton	4920
		Bill 38, Wildlife Amendment Act	4920
		Bill 39, Summary Convictions Amendment Act Ashton	4920
		Bill 40, Education Administration Amendment Act	4921
		Bill 41, Public Schools Amendment Act (2)	4921
		Bill 42, Public Schools Finance Board Amendment Act	4921
		Bill 46, Highway Traffic Amendment Act	4921

Bill 48, Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2)	4921	Bill 70, Public Sector Compensation Management Act	4923
Bill 49, Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act	4921	Martindale	4926
Bill 52, Family Maintenance Amendment Act	4921	L. Evans	
Bill 55, Employment Standards Amendment Act (2)	4922	Debate on Second Readings	
Ashton	4922	Private Bills	
Bill 56, Payment of Wages Amendment Act	4922	Bill 32, Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act	
Ashton	4922	Manness	4933
Bill 57, Horse Racing Commission Amendment Act	4922	Bill 66, Winnipeg Canoe Club Incorporation Amendment Act	
Ashton	4922	Lamoureux	4933
Bill 58, Development Corporation Amendment Act	4923	Doer	4933
Bill 60, Law Society Amendment Act	4923	Render	4934
		Second Readings	
		Bill 67, Salvation Army Grace General Hospital Incorporation Amendment Act	
		Edwards	4934
		Doer	4934
		Manness	4935