



Third Session - Thirty-Sixth Legislature

of the

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

**Official Report
(Hansard)**

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



Vol. XLVII No. 68B - 1:30 p.m., Thursday, June 26, 1997

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Sixth Legislature

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 26, 1997

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

CRTC Presentation

Mr. Stan Struthers (Dauphin): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Rosemary Friesen, Mario DaRosa, John Ochitwe and others praying that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the minister of telecommunications make presentations before the CRTC opposing such hikes in local rates.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Obstetrics Closure—Grace General Hospital

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

An Honourable Member: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes. The Clerk will read.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth:

THAT the obstetrics program has always been an important part of the Grace Hospital's mandate; and

THAT both people in the community and a number of government studies have recommended against the further closure of community hospitals' obstetrics programs; and

THAT as a result of federal and provincial cuts in the health budget, hospitals are being forced to eliminate programs in order to balance their own budgets; and

THAT the closure of the Grace Hospital obstetrics ward will mean laying off 54 health care professionals, many of whom have years of experience and dedicated service in obstetrics; and

THAT moving to a model where more and more births are centred in the tertiary care hospitals will be more costly and decreases the choices for women about where they can give birth.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik) consider stopping the closure of the obstetrics program at Winnipeg's Grace Hospital.

CRTC Presentation

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have reviewed the petition of the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers), and it complies with the rules and practices of the House. Is it the will of the House to have the petition read?

Yes. The Clerk will read.

Mr. Clerk: The petition of the undersigned citizens of the province of Manitoba humbly sheweth:

THAT the Manitoba Telephone System as a public asset served this province well for over 80 years providing province-wide service, some of the lowest local rates in North America, thousands of jobs and keeping profits in Manitoba; and

THAT contrary to promises made in 1996 by the provincial government, the majority of shares of the privatized MTS are controlled outside the province of Manitoba; and

THAT on June 16, 1997, MTS requested from the CRTC a \$5 increase per month for 1998, one of the highest increases in the country; and

THAT this follows previous increases ordered by the provincial government in 1995, 1996 and 1997; and

THAT these increases mean that for some communities in the Parklands will have almost doubled since 1995, with Dauphin alone having an increase of 87 percent when the rate for Yorkton, Saskatchewan, under the publicly owned Saskatchewan Telephone System is \$5 per month less; and

THAT MTS is requesting a rate of return of 13 percent per year from CRTC and to do this wants to raise local rates further above the rate cap in the 1998 going-in rates; and

THAT, contrary to promises made by the provincial government, MTS under private ownership is moving rapidly to raise local rates in rural and northern Manitoba.

WHEREFORE your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the minister of telecommunications make presentations before the CRTC opposing such hikes in local rates.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Economic Development Fifth Report

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Economic Development): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to present the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave? [agreed]

Mr. Tweed: I wish to present the Fifth Report of the Committee on Economic Development.

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Economic Development presents the following as its Fifth Report.

Your committee met on Monday, June 23, 1997, at 7 p.m., Tuesday, June 24, 1997, at 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 24, 1997, at 3 p.m. and Wednesday, June 25, 1997, at 3 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Assembly to consider bills referred.

At the meeting on June 25, 1997, your committee elected Mr. McAlpine as its Vice-Chairperson.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 41—The Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi concernant les offices régionaux de la santé et modifications corrélatives

*Shirley Timm-Rudolph - City of Winnipeg
Ernest Wehrle - Manitoba Interfaith Health Association*

Bill 50—The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur l'accès à l'information et la protection de la vie privée et modifications corrélatives

*Jan Bailey and Mary Scott - The Counsel of Women of Winnipeg
Rudy Comeault - Carpathia and Westboine Park Housing Co-op
Peter Sim - The Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties
Paul Nielson - Manitoba Library Association
Virginia Menzie - Ombudsman, The City of Winnipeg
Fred Vallance-Jones - Canadian Association of Journalists
Ian MacIntyre - Manitoba Teachers' Society
Brian Kelcey - Manitoba Taxpayers Association*

Written Submission:

Robert Andrew Drummond - Private Citizen

Bill 51—The Personal Health Information Act; Loi sur les renseignements médicaux personnels

Marilyn Goodyear Whiteley - President, Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses

Peter Sim - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties

Dr. Brian Ritchie - Manitoba Medical Association

Margaret Soper - Consumers Association of Canada (Manitoba Branch)

Bill Martin - Canadian Mental Health Association

Dr. Ken Brown - Registrar, College of Physicians and Surgeons

Maureen Hancharyk - Manitoba Nurses Union

Your committee has considered:

Bill 41—The Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi concernant les offices régionaux de la santé et modifications corrélatives

and has agreed, on division, to report the same with the following amendments:

Your committee voted to defeat Clauses 7 and 11(3) of the bill.

MOTION:

THAT the proposed subsection 28(2), as set out in subsection 8(2) of the Bill, be amended by striking out “, encumber or” and substituting “or otherwise”.

MOTION:

THAT the proposed clause 46(3)(a), as set out in section 9 of the Bill, be amended by striking out “section 35” and substituting “section 35.1”.

MOTION:

THAT subsection 56.1(5), as set out in section 13 of the Bill, be struck out.

MOTION:

THAT subsection 19(6) of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted:

19(6) Clause 70(1)(b) is amended by adding “which has the responsibility to provide the hospital services, personal care services or other health services that were last provided by the hospital, personal care home or other health facility” after “that health region”.

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 Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur l'accès à l'information et la protection de la vie privée et modifications corrélatives

and has agreed, on division, to report the same with the following amendments:

MOTION:

THAT clause 10(1)(b) of the Bill be amended by striking out “the head is of the opinion that”.

MOTION:

THAT subsection 13(1) of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted:

Repetitive or incomprehensible request

13(1) A head of a public body may refuse to give access to a record or a part of a record if the request is repetitive or incomprehensible or is for information already provided to the applicant or that is publicly available.

MOTION:

THAT clauses 19(1)(d) and (e) be amended by adding “directly” after “relating”.

MOTION:

THAT subsection 23(1) be amended (a) by adding “or” at the end of clause (e); (b) by striking out clause (f); and

(c) by relettering clause (g) as clause (f).

MOTION:

THAT clause 23(2)(d) be amended by striking out everything after "conducted by or for the public body".

MOTION:

THAT subsection 28(2) be amended by striking out clauses (a) and (b) and substituting "for the purpose of developing methods of testing or for the purpose of testing products for possible purchase".

MOTION:

THAT subsection 70(2) of the Bill be amended by adding "give or" before "refuse to give".

MOTION:

THAT subsection 85(1) be amended by striking out "\$20,000." in that part of the subsection following clause (d) and substituting "\$50,000."

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 51—The Personal Health Information Act; Loi sur les renseignements médicaux personnels

and has agreed, on division, to report the same with the following amendments:

MOTION:

THAT clause 21(d) of the Bill be amended by adding "by the trustee" after "payment for health care" in subclause (i) and (ii).

MOTION:

THAT subsection 23(1) be amended by striking out everything after "if" and substituting the following:

(a) the disclosure is about health care currently being provided;

(b) the disclosure is made in accordance with good medical or other professional practice; and

(c) the trustee reasonably believes the disclosure to be acceptable to the individual or his or her representative.

MOTION:

THAT clause 63(3)(a) of the Bill be amended by striking out "or discloses" and substituting ", sells or discloses".

MOTION:

THAT subsections 64(1) and (2) be amended by striking out "\$20,000." and substituting "\$50,000."

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 61—The Sustainable Development and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur le développement durable et modifications corrélatives

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

MOTION:

THAT clause 14(c) be struck out and the following substituted:

(c) establish procurement goals in support of the established provincial goals, and prepare an action plan to meet its established goals;

Mr. Tweed: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

* (1335)

**Standing Committee on Law Amendments
Seventh Report**

Mr. Jack Penner (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments): I wonder, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether I would have leave to present the Seventh Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave? [agreed]

Mr. Penner: I would like to present then the Seventh Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Dispense.

Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments presents the following as its Seventh Report.

Your committee met on Tuesday, June 24, 1997, at 10 a.m. and Wednesday, June 25, 1997, at 3 p.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider bills referred.

Your committee heard representation on bills as follows:

Bill 38—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route

Dianna Bussey - The Salvation Army Correctional and Justice Services

Bill 52—The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1997; Loi de 1997 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives

Dave Lindsay - Private Citizen

Bill 56—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire

Rosella Dyck - Coalition of Custodial Parents

Bill 58—The Law Reform Commission Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit

*Major W. Loveless - Golden West Centennial Lodge
Susan Riley - Manitoba Association of Women and the Law Inc.*

Pat Ritchie - Chair of the Ethics Committee, Grace General Hospital

*Doug Finkbeiner - Law Society of Manitoba
Cliff Edwards - Law Reform Commission*

*Garth Smorang - Manitoba Bar Association
Valerie Price - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties*

Your committee has considered:

Bill 38—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route

Bill 42—The Provincial Court Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale et modifications corrélatives

Bill 43—The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau

Bill 45—The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la preuve au Manitoba

Bill 56—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire

and has agreed to report the same, without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 46—The Criminal Injuries Compensation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'indemnisation des victimes d'actes criminels

and has agreed, on a counted vote of 5 Ayes, 3 Nays to report the same, without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 60—The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le logement des infirmes et des personnes âgées

and has agreed, on division, to report the same, without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 52—The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1997; Loi de 1997 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives

and has agreed, on division, to report the same, with the following amendments:

Your committee voted to defeat Clause 22 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 58—The Law Reform Commission Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit

and has agreed on a counted vote of 6 Ayes and 4 Nays to report the same with the following amendment:

MOTION:

THAT section 3 of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted:

3 Subsection 5(3) is repealed.

Mr. Penner: I move, seconded by the honourable member for Steinbach (Mr. Driedger), that the report of the committee be now received.

Motion agreed to.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Eric Stefanson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to table the Report of Amounts Paid to Members of the Assembly for the year ended March 31, 1997.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to table the Annual Report for 1996-97 for the Manitoba Horse Racing Commission.

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to table the Eleventh Annual Report of the Manitoba Law Foundation.

House Business

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a matter of House business, I would like to announce that, should things work out, at 3:15 p.m. the Standing Committee on Law Amendments will meet to continue its deliberations on Bill 48.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Committee on Law Amendments will reconstitute itself at 3:15 p.m. this afternoon on Bill 48.

Mr. McCrae: And we need leave, of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for that to happen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there leave? [agreed]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Education System Funding—Rural Manitoba

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have been maintaining for a long time on this side that you cannot have an economic strategy without an education strategy, and, of course, the funding cuts, we believe, work against not only the best interests of our students but the best interests of our long-term economic opportunities.

I would like to ask the Acting Premier: Why has this government, through its funding cuts to public education, removed some \$25 million alone from our rural communities in Manitoba?

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me, at the outset, say that this government, under this Premier (Mr. Filmon), and this group of people in this caucus have made education one of the top priorities—health, education, family services, job creation and economic growth. I can tell you it is working.

When we look at the job opportunities for our students, we are looking at job opportunities in all areas of our society. Those opportunities are there. As it relates to funding, we have increased the funding in education by over a hundred million dollars since we have come into office.

Mr. Doer: Thank you for that tirade—[interjection] Well, I have a report from the Rural Institute, which is located in the community of Brandon, which has done a review up till 1996. Of course, 1996 the government cut another 2 percent, and then in 1997 they had a zero percent increase to public education.

But the Rural Institute of Manitoba, an independent body studying the impact of Tory cuts over the last five years on education, has stated that \$25 million has been removed from the rural economy through the cutbacks of this Tory government on public education, and it says it has had two impacts. It has weakened the infrastructure in our communities, and it denies students in their communities the opportunity to get fair and reasonable public education.

I would like to ask this Acting Premier: Why have you removed that \$25 million away from the futures of our communities and the futures of our children in our public education system?

* (1340)

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the member talking about selective years, but the fact is what the Deputy Premier has indicated is absolutely correct. In the time that we have been in office, we have increased funding to public schools by \$115 million, and you saw a slight dip in our funding for a period of three years of 2 percent cuts during the time that our transfer payments really hit us and we had to make adjustments. But a \$115-million increase overall is still an increase, despite the fact that we had a year or two when there were fluctuations.

I have to indicate the very important fact that I think needs to be understood by members opposite, and that is, in the last decade for which we have up-to-date statistics ending at the end of 1995, between 1985 and 1995 provincial funding to education in Manitoba, to public school education stayed in pace with inflation. And so if you look at constant dollars as well, constant dollars will show increased spending power in Manitoba with constant dollars.

Mr. Doer: This is research report No. 8, Research in Rural Education. This is an independent study, not the

minister's political comments that she put on the record. It further states that the \$25-million removal—and we know that public education funding went up in the late '80s because we know there was a more favourable government in the late '80s. You can quote '85 all you want. We also know during the minority government you were forced to raise public education. It has been since then that you have been hacking and slashing public education.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the report goes on to say that it begs the question why this government is taking such a short-term perspective where it is willing to sacrifice the long-term benefits of public education and willing to sacrifice the long-term future of rural communities by their hacking and slashing and cutting for our future. Why are you doing this, Mr. Acting Premier?

Mr. Downey: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can go through every industry in this province that today needs educated people, and there are job opportunities. From the North from the mining sector to the southwest to the oil production area, to the manufacturing centre of the bus industry, to the agriculture sector, to the high-technology industries sector there are tremendous demands. Another piece of information that came from the Department of Education that I believe—and this is a report that is out—80 percent of the graduates of Red River Community College had jobs within six months of their graduation. So the point is that there are jobs, and the education system is responding to educate those people. There has not been a cutback in education, other than from that of the federal government of some 220 to \$40 million in health and education.

Education System Funding

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, when faced with real teachers and parents who paint a true picture of the diminishing classroom resources, the government's response ranges from bewilderment to belligerence, often in the same sentence but certainly within the same government. The problem is that this rigid and ideological government now actually believes its own propaganda that they put more money into education, but the reality is, as any parent or consumer will tell you, it is the purchasing power that matters, it is what it will buy that counts in the classroom.

I would like to ask the Minister of Education to confirm, using 1988 constant dollars, that her government's operating support for public schools in Manitoba is now \$98 million a year less than it was in 1990.

* (1345)

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Speaker, not accepting any of the rather dramatic preamble, which the member is prone to presenting to the House, I have to indicate that in constant dollars the spending power of divisions is as good, better, slightly better than it was when they were in power. I would invite her to attend my office for an in-depth briefing with the financial people in my department so that she can understand what that means.

I also indicate that, due to a change in funding formula long requested by school divisions, the funding formula now will apply to all school divisions and has an equalization factor built into it that was not there before—a distinct improvement.

Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would invite her to come for that. My department would be very pleased to brief her or anybody else that would like to attend with her on how the funding formula works. Bottom line, bottom line that cannot be denied is that, in the last decade for which statistics are available, funding to the province was constant in terms of inflation.

Ms. Friesen: Is the minister prepared now to listen seriously to the views of teachers presented to her today, which confirm what parents, students, trustees have been saying for many years, that not only are the resources in significant areas such as special needs inadequate but also that, as the FRAME reports show, the purchasing power of provincial education support has been so reduced by her government that it is now \$98 million less a year than in 1990, and that is what is having the dramatic effects on the classrooms?

Mrs. McIntosh: Regarding the report card on public schools submitted by the teachers' union this morning, first of all I indicate that two-thirds of teachers in Manitoba did not respond to the survey, for starters. I was presented with my survey, which I then compared to my school division.

The member has mentioned several points in her question. May I respond to one of them? She talked about special needs and so on. On my survey, 67 percent of the teachers who responded from my division, which is about a third if the provincial norm that they have put out is true, said that the assistance for special needs students has decreased, and yet when I checked with my school division, they have indicated that for the last few years they have increased assistance in the classroom by 10 to 15 positions a year and have 15 positions being added yet again this year. So it simply is not true.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Wolseley, with her final supplementary question.

Ms. Friesen: Would the minister confirm that one of the consequences of that reduced purchasing power is that each school division now has \$500 less per-pupil, per-year support from the Filmon government than it did in 1990 and that the lack of classroom resources, the increased class sizes are a direct result of her government's calculated decision to cut the public schools?

Mrs. McIntosh: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will not confirm that, nor will I accept the preamble the member has put on the record full of allegations.

* (1350)

Bill 50 Independent Schools

Ms. Diane McGifford (Osborne): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the new freedom of information and privacy protection legislation certainly protects the secrecy of private schools because the legislation does not apply to them. The Minister of Education knows that private schools' government funding has increased about 300 percent since 1988, and now it is probably a greater percentage of their budgets than it is of most universities, which of course are covered by freedom of information and privacy protection, so I want to ask the Minister of Education why the freedom of information and privacy protection legislation does not apply to private schools when they are so highly funded by government and public monies.

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Again, there were several points in the question, and I presume I will only have a chance to answer a few in the limitations constrained upon those who answer questions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member talks in percentages. The member should like to, as the member, her colleague did, refer to dollars as well. I indicate to the member that students in independent schools in Manitoba receive \$30 million a year versus \$746 million a year for public schools. That is a result of an out-of-court settlement. The members are fully aware of the implications of heading to the Supreme Court on the Manitoba question of the 1870 act. They know then we would have ended up with a hundred percent funding. These people are being funded—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Beuchesne Citation 417 indicates: "Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate."

The Minister of Education was asked a question about the privacy legislation and why freedom of information does not apply to private schools. I would like to ask you to call her to order and answer, for once, a very serious question being raised by the member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable government House leader, on the same point of order.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the same point of order. I am sure that each of us in our own way does our best to try to be responsive to the questions that are put to us, and I know that the Minister of Education and Training is no different from anyone else, and we will take the honourable member's suggestions to heart in our conduct here, and we hope that his colleagues do the same thing in putting their questions in the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Thompson did not have a point of order, but I would

ask that, when responding to questions, we keep them as brief as possible and to the point.

* * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable minister had not reached her allocated time at that time, so I was waiting to see if she had fulfilled it. The honourable minister, to conclude her remarks.

Mrs. McIntosh: I apologize. Every point I was addressing was in the member's preamble or question, and I am within the time limit.

I am trying to do my best to provide a detailed answer, because if I do not provide a detailed answer, they say I am not giving a full answer. If I give a full answer, they say I am taking too long. You just cannot win.

Point of Order

Mr. Ashton: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I raised the point of order, you made a ruling. The ruling in that case was you provided advice to the member, and at that point, the member should be standing on her feet to answer the question, not providing editorial meandering comments on your ruling or anything else she wishes to.

I would ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, ask that minister to answer the question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Thompson does have a point of order. The honourable minister was recognized to answer the final part of her question.

* * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Osborne, with her second supplementary question.

Ms. McGifford: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to reiterate my question and ask the minister why private schools are not covered by freedom of information and privacy protection legislation when public schools are and when private schools receive public monies. Why the two sets of standards? Where is the accountability?

Hon. Rosemary Vodrey (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I answered this question for the member yesterday when our bill was passed through the committee stage. I am happy to put the information on the record again.

Private schools are not, under the legislation, regulated public bodies. They receive grants from public funds like many other organizations and institutions in the provincial private sector, including entities such as agencies which are funded in part, for instance, by Family Services, for example, the Manitoba society for persons with disabilities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, funding was not used as the criterion for inclusion under FIPPA because of the wide variety of levels and formulas and organizations involved, many types of organizations.

The Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh), I know, has clearly explained previously the accountability mechanism for private schools, which is clearly spelled out, and I know she would be prepared to answer that in another question.

* (1355)

Ms. McGifford: That was not an answer, that was a dance around an answer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Osborne was recognized for her final supplementary question. There is no preamble necessary.

Independent Schools Records Management

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Osborne, with her question.

Ms. Diane McGifford (Osborne): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Since, over a year ago, the Minister of Education, with the passage of Bill 48, promised to develop regulations governing record management in private schools, would she either update us on her progress or else assure us that her promise has now been fulfilled?

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will answer within the time limit, and I hope I will be allowed to say what I need to in that time. Please, I hope they will not cut me off if they do not like the answer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mrs. McIntosh: Please do not take the name of the Lord in vain in this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The honourable minister, with her answer.

Mrs. McIntosh: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I indicate to the member that soon we will arrive at the point when the independent schools will receive 50 percent of the cost of educating in the public schools. As we are on our way to that goal, we are undergoing talks at the present time with the independent schools as to the proper way to display the partial funding that they receive from the province. When we have that completed, I will announce it to the public. The member, I am sure, would be interested at that time. I do not have that ready at this date.

Bill 55

Consultations—First Nations

Mr. Eric Robinson (Rupert's Land): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Native Affairs. As minister responsible for that department and also Manitoba Hydro, I would like to ask the minister what consultation mechanisms have been held with First Nations over the proposed Bill 55 that is currently before us. The feeling coming out of the MKO conference in Norway House, currently into its final day, is that they feel that the bill prohibits First Nations and tribal organizations from buying hydro power wholesale for resale to their membership. I would like to ask the minister about his position on that.

Hon. David Newman (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Manitoba citizens who are Status Indians on reserves had the same rights and privileges to participate in the standing committee

process at Law Amendments as every other Manitoban, and apparently they chose not to avail themselves of that opportunity. I am sure honourable members opposite representing those communities and my own colleagues conveyed to the constituents in their areas the information about the process and the opportunity for participating, and if they did not participate directly, I am sure that their views were represented through the official opposition and my own government.

Specifically with respect to the opportunities to become wholesale distributors of power in Manitoba, the legislation expressly limits that to Manitoba Hydro and Winnipeg Hydro.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the same minister: Is he at all concerned that several First Nations now question whether they gave up land under TLE to allow potential Hydro projects which will not benefit them in the long run?

* (1400)

Mr. Newman: What I am very pleased to say is that we have achieved through Northern Flood Agreement a comprehensive settlement that is ensuring that more land and resources are going for the benefit of members of communities than ever before. We have in Norway House an attempt to resolve through ratification the Norway House settlement, and I know the ratification vote is scheduled for January 29. Cross Lake has run into some difficulties, and at the moment it looks like that is put into a state of suspension, their choice. We believe that what has been negotiated is for the benefit of both of those communities, but it is entirely up to the individuals of those communities in the ratification process to make their own decisions based on advice given. My hope is that these matters will be resolved soon and for the long-term benefit of the community members.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Rupertsland, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am referring specifically to the MKO conference happening in Norway House where newly elected Grand Chief Francis Flett said this morning: There are too many potential implications for the MKO First Nations and

Bill 55 for MKO to accept the attempt by Manitoba to unilaterally impose this legislation.

My question to the minister: Since this bill was clearly not discussed with First Nations prior to introduction, will the minister agree to hoist this bill for six months and do the proper consultation mechanism with First Nations in this province?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are always pleased to have discussions with the aboriginal people who are Manitoba citizens like everyone else and have equal rights to all of them and equal privileges. In this particular respect, I am not prepared to hoist that bill. They had the same opportunity as all citizens of Manitoba to participate, as I stated earlier, but like any legislation, we can always monitor and review it and see whether or not it is a benefit or an impediment to the economic development and the social development of those communities which all people in this House do support.

Education System Funding

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): My question is for the Minister of Education. This government through the years has demonstrated an inability to be able to ensure that there is a sense of fairness and a sense of equity amongst the different schools. In fact, in the report card given to public schools it was asked: Availability of technology for students has increased.

How many teachers agreed to that? In one part of the province 85 percent said yes. In another part of the province 26 percent said yes. What that says is that there are a lot of inequities in the province of Manitoba with respect to resources for public education, and that is because of the failure of this government to address that issue. My question is: Why?

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very fond of the member for Inkster, as he knows, and I hate like the dickens, whenever he brings up funding for education, to remind him of that which we on this side of the House are so painfully aware, \$220 million gone that we needed to enhance education in Manitoba. We are still providing the basics and some enhancements—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Point of Order

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a responsibility for the minister to answer the questions that are posed. She consistently says and attempts to blame Ottawa for everything that is going wrong in the province. I think it is time the Minister of Education should take responsibility for what is happening in public education in this province and answer the questions that are being put.

The question was: Why the inequities throughout the province? Admit to your inabilities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member did not have a point of order. It is clearly a dispute over the facts.

* * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable minister, to conclude her remarks.

Mrs. McIntosh: As I indicated, we have continued to provide the basics and some enhancements, but our ability to do all that we would like to do has been severely hampered by that money the federal government has taken away from us and did not provide that we were expecting.

Having said that, we have done a number of things in technology that I would be pleased to go through if he asks another question and gives me time, but I will say that I do agree with him in the sense that, as technology comes on stream, it is not coming on stream as quickly as we would like everywhere we would like it to come on stream. We are taking moves to address that. We have put another million dollars in just recently. We have got MERLIN up and going, and we expect to see that even out. But there are inequities right now that we are working to address, and I will tell you how in another question, if he lets me.

Mr. Lamoureux: Will the Minister of Education acknowledge it is not a question of how quickly the technology is coming, it is how it is being dispersed through the province. You have some areas—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I ask the honourable member to phrase his question. I am not sure if I did not hear the first part or not, but I do not believe there was a question there. We are entering into debate. The honourable member for Inkster, with his question.

Mr. Lamoureux: The question is: Will the minister acknowledge, when you have 26 percent of teachers saying that there are technology advancements and you have 85 percent saying that there is but in two different areas of the province, that there is a problem there? It is a question of equity and fairness to all Manitobans, not to a selected area of the province.

Mrs. McIntosh: As new curriculum comes on stream, and it is coming on stream—we have some new curricular indications out right now—we will be seeing technology in the curriculum used as part of the teaching experience, technology as a tool for learning. When we get to that stage, it will be essential that all school divisions have a certain level of technology expertise in their divisions. Right now, divisions that have sort of gone on their own steam have well advanced. Others who are coming on stream, as we promote this, are coming on behind those that self-started some years ago, and I will give a compliment to the federal government now just to make him happy. The federal government and the provincial government, in their computers for schools programs, have now several thousand schools ready in co-operation with CIBC for the schools in our computers for schools programs.

MERLIN has been helping tremendously to get discounts from suppliers for educational purposes. He and I could talk maybe about how we should do this because if the federal government wants to help, we would be thrilled.

Mr. Lamoureux: What would the Minister of Education like to tell the teachers that teach in our public administration? Ninety-three percent of them say that changes to public schools in the last three years have affected students negatively. What would she say to those teachers?

Mrs. McIntosh: I can say, first of all, I would remind the member that only one-third of the teachers in

Manitoba returned this, and exploring the results from my division, I have found it replete with error. I think these are views, not necessarily facts. They are feelings and perceptions that one-third of the teachers identified.

I am in regular contact with teachers, practicing teachers in the classrooms, and I regularly visit schools, and I regularly socialize with teachers who tell me a very different story than what the union executive tells me. There are some points of common ground but not nearly as many as the union executive would like to have us think. The classroom teachers, with whom I interact on a regular basis, have lots of good ideas and suggestions and are working beautifully with technology, and all of us, I think, are looking forward to the day when every school in Manitoba is as fully equipped as many schools already are.

Bill 50 Independent Schools

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I sent a letter to the minister about a private school where parents are so upset about the management and lack of accountability and lack of parent input that they are no longer sending their children to that school, even though they risk not having a refund of their prepaid tuition.

I want to ask the Minister of Education: Given that Bill 50 and the Freedom of Information provisions do not apply to private schools, what does she have to say to these parents who would not even be allowed to raise questions about the allocation of funds at their school board meeting? Can she explain to them why Bill 50 does not apply to their school?

* (1410)

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I apologize to the member if she sent me the letter. I do not know when she sent it, but I do not recall it. I would appreciate it if she could provide me with a copy—because I think she has one with her—so that I can take a look at the details.

What I can say is that parents of students have freedom of choice soon in the public system as well as

choosing to go to some other school outside the public system or, indeed, to home school. We provide those choices for parents, and they can hold their boards accountable in either the public or the private system and can move away from those schools if they are no longer satisfied.

I have many parents who have written to me who have moved from public schools to private schools for much the same reason that the member has outlined in the specific example of a parent going from an independent to a public school. We have parents who have chosen to remain at home, because they want to be totally accountable themselves for their students.

Ms. Cerilli: Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will table a copy of the letter and provide another copy to the minister, and ask why the minister is ignoring the recommendation of her Advisory Committee on Education Finance which said independent schools receiving funding should be subject to the same accessibility to reporting and accountability of requirements as public schools are.

Why is she ignoring that with respect to Bill 50 and this school, which is causing a lot of distress for families?

Mrs. McIntosh: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe, in an earlier question from the member for Osborne (Ms. McGifford), that I answered the question and said that is under discussion right now in terms of what is the most appropriate way to ask for accountability from schools that are only partly funded. Right now, we have the frame for those that are fully funded. For those that are partly funded, what is the correct way of showing how those partial funds are submitted?

I think the member would find that, even if Bill 50 applied right now today, there are very few teachers in the private system making enough, in terms of salary, to be under the disclosure provisions.

Independent Schools Accountability

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): My final supplementary to the minister is: What accountability will there be for this school and these parents that I

have outlined to her in this letter? Will she do an investigation into the management and accountability and accounting of this school?

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will certainly take a look at the letter the member has sent me. They probably have one in my office, as well, and as soon as I get the copy here, I will look at it here in the House. Whenever we have concerns or complaints about schools, we do check those complaints out when they come from parents because, ultimately, the government is responsible for all education, and we do not let complaints slide.

This is the first letter the member alleges these complaints. I have never received a letter complaining about how money is allocated to independent schools, so it will be interesting to receive it and see what it has to say. I will be certain to look into it within the confines of my abilities, et cetera.

Education System Funding—Special Needs Students

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Deputy Speaker, today I received the report card on public schools in Manitoba. It indicates in here that the teachers in the Transcona-Springfield School Division, three-quarters of them, say that assistance for special needs students has decreased.

Last week I had the opportunity to attend elementary schools in Transcona to see first-hand special needs students in the classroom, and I observed children with Down's syndrome, and in another case, a particular child with severe language and speech delays only receiving Level I support, in fact, some 30 minutes every second day of additional support. One particular family was paying an additional hundred dollars a month through SMD for additional instruction for their child to assist their child to progress, supports that should have been in place in the classroom.

I want to ask the Minister of Education to explain why this child and other children only receive 30 minutes every second day of individual instruction, when both special needs teachers and doctors in the Child Development Clinic agree that this child and

perhaps others should be, at a minimum, receiving Level II funding for individualized programming to allow these children to progress. Why are you not giving that funding to those children?

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to say that this letter from—this is not a letter from an independent school—on my last question. It is a letter from the member Cerilli citing allegations given to her by a third party. Nonetheless, I will look into it, but it is not quite what she said—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Transcona had asked another question. If the honourable minister wants to get back to the member for Transcona, she can do it a little later.

The honourable minister, to answer the question.

Mrs. McIntosh: I should indicate, first of all, that funding for special needs students has doubled since we took office. Under the New Democrats, when they were in power, school divisions were really terrifically burdened. I can recall as a trustee, and I think I have mentioned this in the House before, coming down and pleading with the then minister, I believe it was Mrs. Hemphill at the time—Ms. Hemphill—pleading with her to allow us to have some money from Health to provide for a physiotherapist we had had to hire. She said no.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, funding has doubled for special needs—doubled—more than doubled in fact since we took office. It is \$7 million more right now than it was a year ago, so it is going up.

I also indicate that, if there is a Down's syndrome child in a classroom, there is a wide range of ability. It could be that child is at Level I, but if it is a Level II child, then the Level II child—the school division gets money for Level II children, and they should be identifying that child and sending it in with a special needs Level II application showing verification, and they should then be receiving money for that child.

Now they should be spending that money on that child, if they are receiving it for that child, but money for special needs has more than doubled, so let him not say there is no money there. That is wrong.

Point of Order

Mr. Reid: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I might rise on a point of order. For five students, this minister has received application for Level II funding and has denied all five of those students.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The honourable government House leader, on the same point of order.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): It would be my respectful submission that what we have is a difference of opinion or a debate between a couple of members of this House, and that would be about it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Transcona did not have a point of order. It was clearly a dispute over the facts.

Assessments—Special Needs Students

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable member for Transcona, with his second supplementary question.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): I want to ask the Minister of Education on behalf of these children and their families, and in this case the Cure family in Transcona—will this minister agree to meet with the Cure family to explain to that family why the Education department staff no longer attends schools to observe and assess first-hand the special needs students and now only conducts literature review of that particular child's needs, which excludes both teachers and parents from participating in those decisions?

Will you agree to meet with that family to discuss why you take that action?

Hon. Linda McIntosh (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member said that 93 percent of teachers in Transcona had said this. He should be clear and say that 93 percent of the teachers who responded, and only a third of the teachers responded.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mrs. McIntosh: Can I speak over the yelling? Will it count against me in terms of time?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in terms of the people who filed—school divisions will submit applications for level—[interjection] I will meet with—I always meet with parents. Parents who ask to meet with me get to meet with me, and if parents ask to meet with me, I would be delighted to meet with them. I do that all the time. That is nothing new. I meet with parents regularly. I met with parents this morning. I met with parents yesterday. I meet with parents virtually every day and I am pleased to do that. It often helps clarify for them misperceptions they have been given by the opposition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, school divisions should apply for students whom they suspect are Level II or Level III. They will be given a thorough assessment by the experts in these disorders and if it is ascertained they are Level II students, they receive funding which school divisions should respond on those students.

* (1420)

Disaster Assistance Deductible

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Deputy Speaker, many victims of the spring flood are facing hardship in their lives now, and they are also facing uncertainty because of this government. They were told there was a possibility that their deductibles would be reduced by the Minister of Government Services, and yesterday we were told by the Premier (Mr. Filmon) that there would not be a reduction of the deductible on their claims. Can these people get a clear message from this government and start to get their lives in order? Is the deductible going to be reduced below 20 percent or is it going to be held at the 20 percent?

Hon. Frank Pitura (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are all aware of the fact that many people out in the Red River Valley who have been devastated by the flood are urgently waiting for awards to be sent to them so that they can begin to reconstruct their lives. I do not think there has been any kind of message that has been given to them in the past or now for the fact that the policy we have in place

is not the policy we are going to be employing. Certainly some people have taken some comments that were made and tried to read other things into those comments, but we have been very clear, I think, in what we have been saying to the victims about the policy we have, and if we have ever referred to any kind of situation that might arise, it would be the entire program.

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

* * *

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health): If I may just indulge the House for a moment, I understand, earlier in the day when I was not here, that the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) addressed the House and I think very graciously withdrew his matter of privilege. I just wanted to acknowledge that.

I know in this Chamber many times we banter about, we argue with one another, we make accusations. The member brought forward an inconsistency in information from my department that I had put on the record of committee. We discussed how that happened. I think he graciously withdrew that particular motion, and I wanted to acknowledge that today in this House. It is not too often that we have that kind of relationship and I think it is worthy of noting.

I thank you.

Committee Changes

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): The following committee change was moved by leave during the June 25, 1997, 3 p.m. meeting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development. I am now moving the same change in the House so that the official record will be corrected, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development for Wednesday, June 25, be amended as follows: Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for Osborne (Ms. McGifford).

The following committee change was moved by leave this morning during the June 26, 1997, 10 a.m. meeting of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments. I am now moving the same change in this House so that the

official record of the House will be correct, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

An Honourable Member: Happy birthday to you.

Mr. Hickes: Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker. I move, seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Broadway (Mr. Santos) for Osborne (Ms. McGifford), for Thursday, June 26, '97, for 3:15 p.m.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. We can all go celebrate the member for Point Douglas's birthday later.

It has been moved by the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), seconded by the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), by leave, during the June 25, 1997, 3 p.m. meeting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development. and I am now moving the same change in the House so that the official record will be correct. Agreed?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

The following committee change was moved by leave this morning during the June 26, 1997, 10 a.m. meeting of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments. I am now—I do not have to read that. Hold on. I have got this down now.

It has been moved by the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), seconded by the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for Thursday, June 26, 1997, at 10 a.m.: Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

It has been moved by the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), seconded by the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that

the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Broadway (Mr. Santos) for Osborne (Ms. McGifford), Thursday, June 26, 1997, at 3:15.

It has been moved by the honourable member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickers), seconded by the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development for Wednesday, June 25, 1997, at 3 p.m.: Wellington (Ms. Barrett) for Osborne (Ms. McGifford). Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

NONPOLITICAL STATEMENTS

Energy and Environment Calendar

Hon. David Newman (Minister of Energy and Mines): Could I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement, Mr. Deputy Speaker, please?

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

Mr. Newman: I rise today to congratulate a young lady from Holy Ghost School on Selkirk Avenue, Ms. Mhelanni Gorre. Ms. Gorre's artwork was selected to represent Manitoba in the 1997 Energy and the Environment Calendar contest. She is one of 14 talented young artists from across Canada whose artwork is included in the calendar.

The title Ms. Gorre chose, "Saving the Earth Starts with You," vividly illustrates many small but effective choices people can make to save money, energy and the environment. Ms. Gorre's drawing was featured for the month of May.

It should be noted that Ms. Gorre's winning artwork was selected from over 300 enthusiastic youngsters that participated in the contest. The calendar is produced by Natural Resources Canada in co-operation with the provincial and territorial Energy departments and distributed throughout Canada. Copies of the calendar were made available to all honourable members earlier this year. In Manitoba, approximately 8,000 copies have been distributed to elementary schools, daycare centres and public libraries. Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Committee Changes

Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli): The following committee changes were moved by leave during the June 25, 3 p.m. meeting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development, and I am now moving the same changes in the House so that the official record will be correct.

I move, seconded by the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Tweed), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Economic Development, for Wednesday, June 25 at 3 p.m., be amended as follows: the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner) for the member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach); the member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer) for the member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings); and the member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) for the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey).

I move, seconded by the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Tweed), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: the member for Morris (Mr. Pitura) for the member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

I move, seconded by the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Tweed), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Rules of the House be amended as follows: the member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae) for the member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst); the member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Tweed) for the member for Gladstone (Mr. Rocan); the member for Riel (Mr. Newman) for the member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson).

Motions agreed to.

Concurrence in Reports

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, with leave of the House, I would move, seconded by the honourable Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey), that the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections respecting the report of the subcommittee established to review the sections of The Child and Family Services Act

pertaining to the Office of the Children's Advocate, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

* (1430)

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the condolence motions.

Motions of Condolence

William Kardash

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale),

THAT this House convey to the family of the late William Kardash, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty and the useful life of active community and public service; and

THAT Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

Motion presented.

Mr. Downey: I want to extend to the Kardash family, on behalf of Premier Filmon and my colleagues in our caucus in government, as has been stated in the motion. I want to add a few additional comments, because I believe that, having read the history of Mr. Kardash in the obituary, he truly was a man who was committed to his cause, coming from a farm community to work to better the conditions of those people in the farm community through the co-operative movement. I can certainly associate with that, that there has always been a struggle to make sure that the values and the inputs of the farm people of this country are recognized.

I also want to recognize the fact that he was certainly an active participant in the fight for the causes which he believed in and was not afraid to put himself forward in the kinds of actions that were necessary to enforce his beliefs.

I also want to add another note, because I think, if my memory is correct, that during my term in university, I had the opportunity to be on the fundraising committee for the annual yearbook. I believe Mr. Kardash at that particular time was involved in the Manitoba dairy and poultry co-operatives, which I had the opportunity to meet and solicit some support from, and I have to say that he was very generous in the receiving of myself and another young student who were out promoting the cause of the yearbook and had the opportunity to meet him first-hand. It is not often these kinds of things happen, that I find myself in this situation today in having to introduce and to speak to this.

I know the family members were very close to this individual. It is like any one of us when we lose an individual, regardless of the age. It is a loss to that family and it is a loss to the loved ones, and one can fully appreciate what they are going through. But it is time to give thanks for the contribution of those individuals and to say, without them, we would not have had the kind of country and province that we have had. There was a contribution made which we are all to be thankful for, and so I am pleased, on behalf of my wife and son, to express our sympathy to the family of Mr. Kardash for his contribution to the province.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): It is a pleasure to pay tribute to the late Bill Kardash, former member of the Legislature for Winnipeg North, and I would like to acknowledge the presence in the public gallery of members of his family today.

There has been a very lengthy obituary in the Winnipeg Free Press giving a long biographical history of his very interesting life, and I am not going to repeat what is there. I would rather just add to it. Also, there were many fine speeches at the Labour Temple at the time of the memorial service for Bill Kardash, and I was privileged to be asked to speak on that occasion as well.

As many of us know, Mr. Kardash was a veteran of the Spanish Civil War, and belonged to the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion. He felt throughout his life that this battalion of Canadians who fought in the civil war did not receive the recognition and certainly did not receive any benefits from the Canadian government. However, he was fortunate enough to live long enough that there

was a tribute paid to them by the unveiling of a historic plaque, I believe on the grounds of the Ontario Legislature, and he was healthy enough at that time to be able to attend and to speak and was very pleased to be a part of that occasion. I once mentioned the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion in a speech of mine and sent it to Mr. Kardash, and he was very pleased that I had brought it up in the Legislature.

We know that he was a member of the Legislature from Winnipeg North and was elected in 1941 and re-elected in 1945, 1949, and 1953. He was a member of the Communist Party and unabashedly a Communist. He would make no apology for that. He was proud of his political beliefs and stood by them and defended them throughout his entire life.

I think it must have been particularly difficult to defend those beliefs, particularly during the Cold War. I know that he faced discrimination. I am sure there were many kinds of discrimination that he faced, many of which I am not familiar with. However, I did have the opportunity to visit him in his own home, and I visited him many times when he was in the hospital after a stroke, and I would like to share some of the examples that he and his family shared with me.

Mr. Kardash once told me that a colleague in the Manitoba Legislature told him about a benefit to which he was entitled as a member of the Legislative Assembly. It was actually the responsibility of the Clerk of the House to tell all members about all their benefits, and he believed that it was pure and simple discrimination on the part of the Clerk of that day that he was not told about that benefit.

Some members of the Legislature tried to ignore him, and he coped with this I think in a rather creative way. They would not even acknowledge his presence or say hello to him, so when he encountered them, in spite of being ignored, he would give them a cheerful hello and how are you.

In the last election in which he ran, I believe unsuccessfully, it was when the multimember seats had been abolished, and he believed and he spoke many times to me about this, that it was gerrymandering on the part of the government to get rid of him. He was very successful in terms of popular vote in the

multiparty seats but was unsuccessful, I believe, in a single-member seat.

I visited Mr. Kardash only once in his home before he had a stroke, and I knew that some day I would probably, if I was still in the Legislature, speak on a condolences motion, so I asked him if he had any regrets. He said, yes, he did have a regret. He regretted that he spent so much time in the evening and on weekends attending meetings that he neglected his own family, which I think is something that all of us as members here can identify with. However, I know his son, Ted, and I know his daughter, Nancy, and I do not think they share this regret. All I hear from them is a great deal of pride in their father and what he stood for and the progressive issues that he fought for.

I have often attended the seniors club at the Ukrainian Labor Temple and when I first got elected, there were usually four or five tables of seniors sitting in rows and there was always entertainment, the mandolin orchestra or the choir or both. When I used to attend there six years ago, both Bill and his wife Mary Kardash were there, and they would not sit in the straight rows. They were always circulating and talking to people and asking people about their family and their well-being and their health and always took time to speak to me. Now when I go to the Labor Temple, whether it is a seniors club or other events, it does seem strange that they are not there and circulating with people. I know they are greatly missed, both by the progressive community of which they were a part and by their family and by me. Thank you.

* (1440)

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I, too, want to rise on the condolence motion for William Kardash and offer our condolences to the many friends of Mr. Kardash and to his direct family, his son, Ted, his daughter, Nancy and his granddaughter Dana.

Truly, it can be said that Mary and Bill were political and social powers in the north end of Winnipeg, people that fought tirelessly for working people and their families, together, whether it was on the school boards through Mary, or Bill in this Legislature, they fought on

behalf of people and the poor people every hour of the day.

They are remembered with a lot of fondness, respect by people in the north end. I heard it even in this federal election, comments about both of them, and today we pay tribute to William, or Bill, 17 years in this legislative Chamber, which is a long time by any political measure. Certainly, the values of his upbringing and the values of his life are ones that all of us, I believe, respect and honour here today in this condolence motion to his family through this Legislature.

As the Deputy Premier has pointed out, he had a history of starting in farming and the co-operative movement in farming, the values of co-operation which we believe are so important to western Canadian producers and still remain an important part of our western Canadian prairie culture, each of us working together and banding together for the greater good, for our total producers, rather than going off as individuals in a kind of Darwinian marketplace.

He, of course, as the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) has pointed out, was also a person who volunteered to fight the fascists in Spain in the '30s, a person who was ahead of his time in terms of recognizing the danger that fascism presented to not only Europe directly but also to the free world in the 1930s. He volunteered in that struggle and was a veteran of that war and came back to Canada to warn people of the dangers of the authoritarian nature of fascism and the intolerance of fascism in terms of what it would represent for free people everywhere.

Bill was very involved in the co-operative movement, as the member for Burrows pointed out, in the Ukrainian Canadian organizations, whether they were seniors or the other organizations. I always found my contacts with Mr. Kardash to be a person who had dignity, a quiet strength that came through his personality. His strengths and his contributions to the people of the north end and particularly the poor people, for both him and his wife, Mary, are remembered today in the communities he served long after he was a member of this Legislature. His fight and his struggles on behalf of working people and their families that he and his wife participated in are

remembered and are remembered with great honour and with great respect. That is the greatest testament that all of us can have or give to anybody else, the respect of the people.

Bill Kardash had the respect of the people. We are proud to honour his life here today. Thank you very much.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): I wanted to put a few remarks on the record on an incredible life, an incredible time period in this province. I want to reflect on a couple of points, and that is the uniqueness of Bill Kardash's political life and the unique times. This is somebody that volunteered, along with 1,400 Canadians, to fight against fascism in Germany and in Spain, fighting against the—I say in Germany, but against the Germans, the Italians in the 1930s tested their brute use of force and terrorism and mass murder on the people of Spain, against the democratically elected government of Spain.

Bill lost a leg in that fight. I remember I was very pleased about a decade ago, when we dealt, even in the 1980s, with the continuing fight of the Mac-Paps for recognition, a resolution brought in by the member for Inkster. Bill and others reminded people in the 1980s that despite the fact that they fought against fascism in the 1930s, because they were ahead of their time, there was not only virtually no recognition but, for many people, they came back blacklisted, subject to the kind of discrimination that was talked about before.

What I found particularly fascinating in Mr. Kardash's case was the fact that he went on a few years later, and it is funny how times changed. It would seem remarkable to some today that he served 17 years in this Legislature. When he was first elected in 1941 times had changed. Soviets were allies. At that period of time we were not into the Cold War psychology that came later. But I think what is even more remarkable is that he continued his political career representing the north end, the Labour Progressives, the avowed Communists not only during that period but in the post-war period. This was a period when people could be expelled from political parties, including parties of the left, for doing nothing more than supporting the peace movement because that was seen as being a Communist front. But, when you consider the fact that he was an

avowed Communist and had the courage of his convictions and sat and was re-elected throughout the Cold War, I think that is a testament to his courage but also to the unique diversity of this province.

We have had people in this Legislature that range from Social Credit, which, I think, everyone would say is on the far right, and very few people today even remember, outside of the north end, that we also had representation from the left in terms of elected Communists who were also by the way in Winnipeg. In the north end we had Joe Zuken for many years. For many years this was the only city in North America where you had elected Communists. It is interesting because in the psychology of the Cold War, and it continued later into the '50s and '60s and even '70s and '80s, in some ways, where it was considered the worst epitaph to call someone a Communist. I find it interesting in many countries of the world there are Communists now democratically elected, and this is part of the political culture. One looks at even Spain today. One looks at countries like Greece or Italy or France.

I wanted to comment on that because if there is one thing, I think, that is important for all of us to learn from the life of Bill Kardash and others is, regardless of whether one agrees with somebody else's political philosophy, I think you have to value the courage that he showed. A remarkable life; remarkable times. I do not know if there will ever be the Bill Kardashes again. That kind of courage to volunteer to fight Fascism in the 1930s in Spain. I do not know how many people of today's generation would ever have that courage. A lot of people in the 1930s and 1940s showed that type of courage. He, I think, was probably the most remarkable example. As I said, a remarkable life; remarkable time.

I do not want to just pay tribute for the 17 years in the Legislature because I remember even discussing this the time the Mac-Paps were here. That was simply one chapter in his life, and he left a legacy of fighting for social and economic justice in the north end. I say to a lot of people, I always get enriched when I go to the north end. I get strengthened because that kind of tradition is still very much in existence. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

* (1450)

Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Health): I welcome the opportunity to put a few words on the record. As a student of history in the province of Manitoba, of political history, the name Bill Kardash certainly had a role to play in the political history of our province. I remember having met Mr. Kardash when I was a university student at a particular function and had a chance to speak to him about his time in Spain during that period of the Spanish Civil War, and it was only after I had actually met him that I came to realize that he had served 17 years in this Assembly as a member, I believe, first elected in the days of the 10-member Winnipeg constituency and then later, when that was divided into three three-member constituencies, served as the member for, I believe, Winnipeg North as the third member elected on a number of occasions.

His loss to this Legislature, or defeat, I think, came when we went to single-member constituencies. I think it was the CCF or the New Democrats who replaced him in the Burrows constituency at that time.

On this side of the House and certainly myself, I do not necessarily agree with many of the political philosophies or positions taken by Mr. Kardash, but I certainly want to acknowledge here today a respect for his conviction, a respect for his dedication to what he believed, and I certainly do not want to pass judgment on him in the context of his time. Because it is very easy, looking back today on that period, to speak about the facts, what went on in the Soviet Union and things during this time that were not necessarily common knowledge to many who promoted that particular turn of events. They were very turbulent times, very divided times in terms of philosophy and politics and dogma, in essence, that the division of political philosophy and belief was very, very great and divergent in the world, perhaps a characteristic of this century. As we near the end of it and we look back, perhaps one of the characteristics of the politics of this century will be the great division in political viewpoints and philosophy that determined so much of the history of this century.

Mr. Kardash, with his conviction, his sense of purpose, and his experience growing up in the north end and background, led him to travel across the world to fight in the Spanish Civil War, and I appreciate the comments of the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). That was a war many people do not want to talk about,

but it was, in some ways, given the involvement of fascist Italy and fascist Germany, somewhat a precursor of what we would become involved in a few short years later in fighting those enemies. It became more than just a battle of political philosophy or government in Spain but really became a testing ground for other armies and philosophies that would lead to the World War. Mr. Kardash, like many from Manitoba and from Canada, found a role in that conflict and put his convictions into practice in serving in the international brigades.

He returned to Winnipeg and was elected to the Legislature. He, with great conviction, for those who have studied the record, always advanced the causes that he felt were important. I have come to appreciate in my brief political career the importance of exchange and dialogue, the importance of hearing other points of view, because I think one of the great results or the great characteristics of this latter part of the century is that we have modified our political philosophies considerably because we have listened to each side of the spectrum. We have modified towards the middle, and even though in this Chamber from time to time we get into what appears to be great debates of left and right, the realities compared to the early part of this century is that we are all far more moderate in our beliefs and views than those who have come before us, and perhaps we have learned from that time for the betterment of our citizenry. It might not make for as interesting politics and it may not make for great philosophical debates, but I would like to believe it is meant for better government for all in our population.

In some ways, Mr. Kardash's contribution of representing one part of that spectrum in those periods of the debate, like reference to Social Creditors who have sat in this House, Jake Froese, being the last, have contributed to, I think, moving that debate. Because we had debates of broad view, we ultimately as a province moved to, I think, the more moderate position that has served us well over the years.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, today we recognize and we pay tribute to a former member of this Assembly and an individual from really a very different time, but an individual, nonetheless, who served his province to the best of his ability. I think, as a historian, with his death, it really marks the passing of a period in our history of

great turbulence, of great debate, of great activity on the international scene, of great change.

As the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), I think, so rightly pointed out, this Legislature has always had a history of many points of view. In fact, in the first—the election of 1936, if I am not mistaken, there were five political parties, five or seven political parties represented in this Chamber, the Communist Party, not with Mr. Kardash, but with Mr. Jim Litterick, represented here all the way to a five-member Social Credit caucus. Conservative caucus, a progressive caucus, a labour caucus, I think an independent labour group, a wide variety of opinion.

Manitoba has always been a very diverse place politically. We have always tolerated that diversity, and I think it has strengthened us as a province.

So we say from this side to recognize him and his family, his contribution not only to Manitoba and this Legislature but, certainly, the courage of his convictions in fighting for what he believed. Any individual who does that is worthy of respect, and we offer that here today. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the honourable members please rise and remain standing to indicate their support for the motion?

A moment of silence was observed.

Edward McGill

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Brandon West (Mr. McCrae),

THAT this House convey to the family of the late Edward McGill, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation for his devotion to duty and a useful life of active community and public service; and

THAT Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

Motion presented.

Mr. Downey: Ed McGill was first elected to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on June 25, 1969, for the electoral division of Brandon West for the Progressive Conservative Party. He was re-elected in the general elections of June 28, 1973, and October 11, 1977. He was not a candidate in the November 17, 1981, general election.

Mr. McGill served as Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services, Minister of Co-op Development, responsible for MTS and Communications, and responsible for the administration of The Manitoba Lotteries Act from October 24, 1977, to October 20, 1978; Minister responsible for MTS, Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited and MPIC from October 20, 1978, to November 15, 1979, and as a minister without portfolio from November 15, 1979, to November 30, 1981.

(Mr. Peter Dyck, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

* (1500)

Mr. Acting Speaker, Linda and I were good friends of Ed and Eve McGill and their family. I can say, as well, that Ed was truly a dedicated Manitoban, Canadian and a man who I held in high esteem. I had the opportunity of serving with Mr. McGill as part of the caucus and as part of the cabinet of Sterling Lyon in the 1977 to '81 period. He truly was of tremendous support and assistance. His sage advice and guidance for a young, rookie politician and minister was an example to follow which I tried to in many ways.

I also want to add that Ed had a distinguished military record with the RCAF and, of course, in continuing on with his public service and the recognition of that, McGill Field was named after Ed in Brandon. I also knew Ed before entering politics as the leader or the head of the Brandon Flying School, where I had the privilege of getting my pilot's licence under the guidance of Ed and the team of pilots that he had at McGill Field, and, again, had the privilege of knowing him through that particular part of my life.

On the lighter side, Ed was sometimes referred to as Mad Dog McGill, as truly reflecting in the opposite way his gentle demeanor and his quiet way in life. Of course, quite often that is the way people try to acknowledge an individual. But it was done with the greatest of respect in referring to Ed in that way.

Many community activities, whether it was with the Kinsmen, whether it was the many lodges, many activities that Ed participated in, everything was done to the finest with the finest of detail and making sure that everything was done to the exact way that had to be done. Of course, I am sure that his son and his two daughters and their families are extremely proud of him and his distinguished career as I am of being a friend and certainly knowing the individual in the way in which I have.

So I, Mr. Acting Speaker, want to extend to all the McGill families, on behalf of my family, sincere condolences.

I also want to on behalf of Premier Filmon and the members of our caucus, Mr. Acting Speaker, express all our sympathies to the McGill family as well. Thank you.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I too would like to rise on the condolence motion to honour the life and other contributions to this Legislature and to Manitoba of Ed McGill and to send our words to his family. I know he has three children, Mickey, Douglas and Patricia, and a number of grandchildren that he certainly was very proud of.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I met Mr. McGill on a couple of occasions in my former career as president of the employee organization. I met him in events in Brandon, and I met him as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. I always found him to be, I guess I could use no other word than "gentleman" to describe how he acted and how our meetings took place. He was a person who was respectful of the role you had as representing the employees. He was thoughtful in terms of what you would present to him. He listened. He would sometimes act on the issues that we would raise in terms of employment in Brandon or employment across the province or other issues that we felt could improve

the public service of the corporation to the people of the province of Manitoba. I always found him very good to deal with, a very, as I say, a really dignified individual.

I know in the community of Brandon he is certainly known for his contributions to aviation, whether it was at the flying schools or the clubs or the airport in Brandon, and I am not sure whether the field is named after him or not, but—it is named after him? Certainly that was my connection when I first saw the name of the field; I thought, Ed McGill. He always did get a military story or a flying story into his comments even though it may be only two sentences long, because he was kind of a Gary Cooper kind of character in terms of his language. Perhaps all of us could learn about his economy of words when it came to dealing with particular issues. I would say that he did not waste words. He did not waste sentences. He just merely was kind, dignified, intelligent, and respectful.

I want to pay tribute to his three elected terms here. If I recall correctly, I thought at one point he was the Deputy Premier, when he was minister without portfolio. I believe he was Deputy Premier of the Lyon government. I am not sure, and it is not in the obituary, but I thought he was. Now, maybe it is not listed because it is not an official title, or—he was not? I thought he was. I thought when he was minister without portfolio he was also Deputy Premier, but I am just going by memory.

Members who have served in his caucus would have a much better recollection of that than I would. However, he had a number of cabinet portfolios through the Lyon years, and he obviously had the respect of his constituents. I know he is well respected by people across all party lines in Brandon and in the Brandon West area of the constituency.

I know that there was some controversy about some of the policies about the Lyon government, which, eventually, were dealt with in the '81 election, but I know that people respected Ed McGill throughout the disagreements that they had with the Lyon government, respected his integrity and his strength of character. So I just would like to put those words on the record, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I have known the McGill family since I was 16 years of age. Certainly I have known Mr. McGill since that time over the years. Indeed, initially, when I came calling to the McGill household, calling upon Mr. McGill's younger daughter, Patricia, my recollection is that the economy of words referred to by the Leader of the Opposition was certainly one that struck me at that time, leaving me to wonder just in what esteem I was held by the father of that particular household.

Some of the things I have to say about Mr. McGill this afternoon will strike a particularly responsive chord with Mr. McGill's fraternal associates and my own as well, but these words would also strike a responsive chord for anyone who knew Mr. McGill. Ed McGill was a man who moved quietly and modestly in the sphere of his life without blemish. He fulfilled his duties as a man, a subject, husband, and father. Never ostentatious, he served his fellow citizens without self-interest and without courting applause. Ed McGill was respected by all noble-minded people. He was not the kind of person who would proclaim what he had done, would do or could do, but where there was need, he served with resolve, determination and dedication. After his distinguished life of service to country, province, and community, Ed McGill retired without pretension into the multitude, because all of his good acts were performed not for himself but for the cause of good. Ed McGill was the personification of all of the highest ideals of good citizenship.

Although his life's partner and wife, Eve, predeceased him a few short years ago, Ed McGill is survived by Mickey, Doug, Pat and Betsy and their families, and we join them in remembering fondly the life and the person of Ed McGill. In so doing, we also offer them our condolences on his passing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Dyck): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Dyck): Would the honourable members please rise and remain standing to indicate their support of the motion.

A moment of silence was observed.

James Cowan

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier) I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture (Mrs. Vodrey),

* (1510)

THAT this House convey to the family of the late James Cowan, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty and a useful life of active community and public service; and

THAT Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

Motion presented.

Mr. Downey: Mr. James Cowan, Q.C., elected to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on June 16, 1958, for the Progressive Conservative Party for the electoral division of Winnipeg Centre. He was re-elected in the general elections of May 14, 1959, December 14, 1962, and June 23, 1966. He was defeated in the general election of June 25, 1969.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like to say at this particular time it is clearly evident by the obituary of the commitment of Mr. Cowan not only to his community and a larger part as an elected member of the Legislature, but also in his service in the army, in the Second World War, his continuation and involvement in the legion housing program, plus a life member of the Royal Canadian Legion. He also was elected as city alderman, helping to direct the City of Winnipeg. So I do not think there is any question, Mr. Acting Speaker, of his commitment to the public and to the general good of his province and his community at large. He, as well, was from a family of pioneer stock, truly involved in many activities in life. He also, I understand, was involved in the general insurance business as well as practising law.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I think it points out again, as it has been said many times today, the commitment of

individuals like James Cowan to spend a portion of their life to work, whether it was to be in a Legislative Assembly, City Council or to put themselves forward in the protection of the freedom of our country. Each and every one of us want to say thank you for that contribution.

So at this particular time I want to extend to, particularly Rose and to any of the Cowan family who are still with us, on behalf of the Premier (Mr. Filmon), my colleagues and my family, my sincere condolence to them and say thank you for the life and contribution of Mr. James Cowan. Thank you.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I will say just a few words. The member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) knows Mr. Cowan and the family, and I will leave it to him to make comments about the personal contributions of Mr. Cowan to our community.

I just want to say that we join with the Deputy Premier in the condolence motion here today. We want to honour the life of James Cowan, his contributions to his fellow citizens, to his community, to the people of this province. As the Deputy Premier has noted, Mr. Cowan served, before he was elected, in the armed services. He was elected as an alderman to City Council in the city of Winnipeg and was elected in '58 through the Roblin years through to '69, elected and re-elected a number of times in the Winnipeg Centre constituency. He obviously had the success of his constituents in mind in his continued re-election. Obviously he was an able representative because he was re-elected on a number of occasions to this Chamber. As the Deputy Premier has also noted, he was a participant in housing projects through the legion and a participant with the legion—and he is obviously, reading his history—a person worthy of tremendous respect from his fellow Manitoba citizens to his contributions to our community, to our province. He has obviously been part of making this province of Manitoba one of the best places to live, and I, on behalf of our party, want to honour his life and thank him for his great contributions to his fellow Manitoba citizens and Canadian citizens. Thank you very much.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Acting Speaker, Uncle Jim, as we affectionately called him, came to my home many, many times. Uncle Jim and Auntie Rose,

his wife, were close personal friends of my mother-in-law. I know the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay) had the opportunity to meet my mother-in-law a number years ago in the Toronto airport, and they shared many political thoughts during that brief meeting which I am sure, my mother-in-law said, was a memorable event. Uncle Jim and Auntie Rose were personal friends of my mother-in-law, my wife and myself. Uncle Jim was a lawyer prior to his being elected to the Manitoba Legislature. I believe it was in June 1958, when he was first elected. Of course while he was serving as a lawyer, he was appointed to the Queen's Counsel, something which he cherished. It was a very honourable event for him to become a member named to the Queen's Counsel.

Uncle Jim, unfortunately, lost election in June of 1969, so he served some 11 years in that capacity as MLA representing Winnipeg Centre constituency, and served honourably during those years.

Uncle Jim was a generous, caring and gentle individual. I know that my wife and family members cherish the times that they spent as children, in particular my wife's case, for the years when they went to Delta Beach where Uncle Jim and Auntie Rose had their cabin. Uncle Jim and Auntie Rose had the opportunity on many occasions to invite not only family members but friends to Delta Beach to share their humble summer home and to take part in the many, many barbecues that they shared together.

I know I look back fondly on events where Uncle Jim would invite us, in one particular case, to the Winter Club here in the city of Winnipeg when his daughter came to visit him travelling all the way from Ireland with her family. Uncle Jim gathered up the family members in the province of Manitoba here and close family friends and rented out the facilities at the Winter Club and put on a huge, huge dinner for his daughter and her family that came from Ireland. So we remember that with great fondness for that particular occasion. His daughter, Margaret Gubbins and her children were the ones that we were honouring on that particular occasion.

I look back too on the days when Uncle Jim used to come down the street where we live now, driving down the street, and you could hear that car coming from

some distance away. There was, obviously, some difficulties with the exhaust system underneath it. It was a 1970 vintage Dodge Aspen. I can recall going out and talking to Uncle Jim out in the driveway in front of my home and saying to him, it looks like it might be time to send on this particular automobile to greener pastures. Of course, no, he saw that there were still many more years of useful service that could be gained out of this automobile. In fact, when he used to get the odd fender bender or nick, you know, in and about the yard, moving into the yard—or he had the great habit of getting out the bucket of yellow house paint, going out and touching up the nicks on the fender with the house paint just to make sure that the rust did not set in, that he could preserve the automobile for further use.

* (1520)

I know that members opposite—and I think back to not that long ago when we went to the funeral services for Uncle Jim that the former premiers of Manitoba, Premier Lyon and Roblin, were at the funeral services recognizing Uncle Jim's contribution not only to the province of Manitoba, but to the Conservative Party of Manitoba. I note in their conversations and in their eyes, the surprise that Uncle Jim would have friends that were beyond the Conservative Party, but Uncle Jim was a kind, gentle, and caring person and made time for people from all walks of life. He treated everybody fairly and equally, and for that we are quite thankful to have had the opportunity to know him personally and to have him come to our home and to share in our family times together.

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

So on behalf of my family and my colleagues, we would like to extend to Uncle Jim and to Auntie Rose, who is now in, I think, Central Park Lodge—she has Alzheimer's and is unaware of events that are transpiring around her, but I know our thoughts are with her as well. We extend our sincere condolences to Auntie Rose and to the rest of the Cowan family members, and we wish them well. Thank you.

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Highways and Transportation): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will just put

a few comments. I may be moved because of what the member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) has just said, but I have to reflect on other events of this week in sort of extending condolences to the Cowan family, because Mr. Cowan obviously served in the Duff Roblin government and was part of the government that put the floodway in place that just saved the city of Winnipeg one more time.

I think it is important that we pay recognition to people that contributed in that period of time to that great decision that the Duff Roblin government made. Mr. Cowan was part of it and, indeed, on behalf of myself and the citizens of Manitoba that live east of Winnipeg, I respect the decision he made in terms of protecting citizens from future floods that we have just encountered again.

With those few words, I extend my condolences to the Cowan family for what he has done in that great period of time of decision making in the Duff Roblin government in the 1960s.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

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

A moment of silence was observed.

James Thomas Mills

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay),

THAT this House convey to the family of the late James Mills, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service; and

THAT Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

Motion presented.

Mr. Downey: Mr. James Thomas Mills, or more commonly referred to, as it reads in the obituary, as Jim, Mr. Mills was elected to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on December 14, 1962, for the Progressive Conservative Party for the electoral division of Kildonan. He was defeated in the general election of June 23, 1966. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to as well extend, on behalf of the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and my colleagues, to the family of Mr. Mills, our sincere sympathy.

I can say by reading the obituary, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I guess I should reflect at the last—when was it?—Jim or James, this is a Jim or a James—I have quite a bit in common with that name and, reflecting on the obituary, can clearly get a feel for the kind of individual that Mr. Mills truly was. Truly a family person, he excelled in everything he did.

I think it is also important to point out, and this is true, certainly not necessarily a necessity but an asset in the career which Mr. Mills was involved, he truly loved people. I think that has to be part of not only—it is not essential—but it is certainly an important asset to have in the role that he played not only as a member of the Legislative Assembly, but also holding positions as a city councillor and also involved in the greater Winnipeg election committee, as well as a member of the other activities in this community such as Rotary, the Knights of Columbus, Toastmasters International, which I can associate with, the Progressive Conservative Association of Manitoba and the Winnipeg executives.

Truly a busy person, also a very active business-person not only in his years in business in Manitoba, but when considered moving out west to retire, he did not retire. He continued on to carry out business activities and further fulfilling his ambitions in life.

I think it is also important to note, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reference to “Papa Jim” made it easy for a lot of people to associate with him. Again, his ambition and his hard work truly, I think, is again reflected in the comments that are made in the obituary, that to follow his lead was to help to make the world a happier place. So I want to extend to the family of Mr. Jim Mills the

condolences from myself, my family, and all the members of our party and of this House.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I, too, want to forward our condolences to the Mills family, his wife, Eleanor, his children and his 13 grandchildren, and pay tribute to his contributions to this Legislature and to the people of this province. He sounds like a person who would be a very interesting individual to spend time with. Obviously, a person who loved to sing, who loved to be with people, who passed on words to all of us: Do not despair, we want to all leave this life, leave our communities in a happier condition than when we first came to them. He sounds like a person that lived life to the full in terms of his community contributions and his personal successes.

His personal successes obviously start with his family. Thirteen grandchildren is a tremendous success by anybody's definition in terms of the ability to have a continuance of the family and contribute to the happiness of so many other people. He also was very successful in business, it appears to me by reading his history. It looked like wherever he would start something, he would succeed and succeed well, whether it was here or Victoria or in the winter place in terms of where he spent time with Eleanor.

* (1530)

He certainly was elected—I believe part of his constituency would be now in the constituency of Concordia. It was called then the Kildonan riding. It was East Kildonan. I am sure he would have been very happy to see probably the seniors at the Morse Place Community Centre, that probably was in his riding, where Manitoba Seniors Day was being celebrated, and song and dance was the order of the day for people in that community. It sounds pretty consistent with his love of life.

Certainly he had the respect of his fellow citizens. He was elected to the City Council, and that always meant, in my view, that you were close to the people, close to the grassroots, because councillors are always elected on their connection to the people. They are not elected on party banners. They are elected on their contacts with the people in the area.

He was elected to this Legislature in '62, and would have participated in some of the debates, the early debates, about dealing with the reports dealing with the Winnipeg flood and the recommendations on the floodway and the Shellmouth Dam and the Assiniboine diversion. Obviously, those of us who live in the east side of the city, those of us that are closer to the river, would appreciate the decisions he made with his other colleagues in the Roblin government in those periods of times and, of course, laid the groundwork for the Shellmouth Dam that followed in the Schreyer years in the '70s.

I again want to pay tribute to his life and honour his contributions to this Legislature and to the people of Manitoba. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

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

A moment of silence was observed.

House Business

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Premier): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would ask that you call the bills that are on the Order Paper—I believe was the agreement of the House—calling the bills for the debate, continue third readings as they appear on the Order Paper. I am just getting some signals from above.

Bear with me, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will yield the floor to the House leader who has been in discussion with opposition.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the motion standing in my name on page 5. Last day, this matter stood in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). I believe there will not be leave to allow that to stand in his name any further and that the honourable member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh) has something to contribute.

DEBATE ON GOVERNMENT MOTION

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable government House leader (Mr. McCrae)

THAT, in the case of all bills referred to committees of this House during the present session—dispense.

and proceeding to enactment, Legislative Counsel be given the authority to take the following steps at any point before publication of the Act:

(a) change all section numbers and internal references necessary to give effect to amendments to bills adopted by this House and its committees; and

(b) make editorial changes in bills that in no way alter the intended legal meaning but are necessary to correct errors in spelling, numbering, cross-referencing and capitalization, and to correct punctuation and formatting that is not consistent with Manitoba style.

THAT the Legislative Counsel be required to mark all changes made pursuant to this authority in red ink in the affected blue bills as soon as possible after the end of the Session.

Standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No? Leave has been denied.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Sale),

THAT the motion regarding minor corrections to bills by Legislative Counsel be amended by striking out Clause (b) and substituting the following:

(b) without in any way altering the intended legal meaning make minor changes to bills to correct obvious errors like spelling, numbering, cross-referencing and capitalization errors, and to correct punctuation and formatting that is not consistent with Manitoba style.

Motion presented.

Mr. Mackintosh: This clearly is an unusual motion, and I am not even sure whether one can change a bill without changing a bill specifically. I really have doubts as to whether this is effective or not. But with regard to the intent, it is a housekeeping intent, so our amendment really is addressed at our concern about the words “make editorial changes.” The words “editorial changes” could have different meanings to different people, although it would appear that it is limited by the description of the kinds of changes later in the paragraph. Just to be absolutely certain, given the unusual nature of this motion, the amendment was moved.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the amendment, it is my understanding that routinely at the end of consideration of bills in committees, Legislative Counsel prepares for the minister responsible for the bill a motion to allow for renumbering to take account of the various amendments that get passed and a motion similar to what we are talking about here. What this does is allows that process to go forward up until the time of publication of the bills. Our Legislative Counsel is an extremely competent person, and the people in her office indeed are competent and an office Manitobans ought to be proud of.

I certainly can see the concern expressed by the honourable member for St. Johns, and readily would agree with his amendment this afternoon to make it clear what our intent is, not to allow unelected persons working in the Legislative Counsel office to be making changes that are not in line with the spirit and intent of the Legislature of the province.

So with those words and with our agreement to the amendment put forward by the honourable member, I believe from an administrative and workload standpoint, this will help facilitate the publication of legislation in our province that could probably be described, certainly since the project of bringing our legislation into line with Supreme Court rulings and modern day usage, probably amongst the best body of statutes anywhere in Canada. So I am proud of that, and as a former Attorney General I was pleased to take

part in the process, but I also am glad to see the co-operation shown here today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Amendment—pass. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion as amended? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we could move now to third reading debate on bills. Would you begin calling the bills as we left off earlier today with No. 24.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 24—The Personal Property Security Amendment and Various Acts Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 24, The Personal Property Security Amendment and Various Acts Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les sûretés relatives aux biens personnels et d'autres dispositions législatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

* (1540)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Speaker, to put a few words with respect to Bill 24 on the record, we were somewhat taken aback by the government's passing of amendments to a bill that has yet to be proclaimed by the government, as the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) had mentioned in second reading. This revelation was made by the member for Elmwood, as I indicated, and it is interesting that his comments—and I think he is correct in pointing out what probably is a first in terms of a government action.

That said, having had the opportunity to go over the text of this bill, we find there are no great problems with it. I would remind the government that in the future if they want to pass amendments to legislation, they should proclaim the legislation first. Otherwise, I

have to question why we just do not rename the bill and pass the whole thing at once. I was particularly struck by the number of simple spelling mistakes that seem to have plagued this particular piece of legislation.

With those few words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we do not have any problem with this bill passing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 25—The Proceeds of Crime Registration Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay), that Bill 25, The Proceeds of Crime Registration Act (Loi sur les enregistrements relatifs aux produits de la criminalité), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): We are prepared to see this legislation passed, but we want to again remind the government it is important that they put in place the administrative framework to ensure that they know when orders are made by the court which will allow for the registration of an order under this legislation both at the provincial level and at the federal level.

It is my understanding from the questioning in committee that the government had not turned its attention to how it will actually use and enforce this legislation. Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Speaker, again to put a few words, this is legislation that is in fact long in coming. Those who commit criminal activities should not benefit from the crimes in any way. This legislation prevents a criminal from disposing of property that was otherwise obtained from the proceeds of crime. It definitely assists our Crowns. The Liberal Party has long adopted this view, and this

legislation has come about because of a new section of the Criminal Code enacted by the federal government. This act will extend the striking distance of the long arm of the law, if you like. It will, I hope, cause some difficulty for drug dealers and the like who make their money from the misery of others, and their life a little bit more difficult in terms of receiving proceeds from crime. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 26—The Corporations Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 26, The Corporations Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les corporations), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): We recognize that this bill is dealing with the federal superintendent of trust and loan, dealing with authorized investments, conflict of interest guidelines and filing of reports, and this bill allows us to conform with Canada-wide practices. We will support this bill at third reading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again, Bill 26 will have an impact on approximately 45 extra provincial trust and loan corporations currently doing business. The largest of these is likely Investors Syndicate. The bill arises out of the need for Manitoba to harmonize our regulations with federal rules regarding the operation of branch offices. The \$5 million authorized capital limit, for example, of the parent corporation for any of these branch offices is, in my estimation, a fair dollar amount to allow corporations to operate in Manitoba, and it

reflects, in this case, some federal regulations in which I also would add, I think it is very important that legislation like this is examined closely and passed. I note that there has already been an amendment to the bill made in the committee stage, from what I understand. The failure of any of those 45 trust companies operating in Manitoba would have severe potentially devastating consequences for the people of Manitoba. This is legislation that provides, in this respect, a firm but fair regulatory environment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Could you please call Bill 27.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Bill 27. Just one second.

Mr. McCrae: That is why we need to have leave.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 27—The Public Schools Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the leave of the House, on behalf of the Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. McIntosh), I would move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 27, The Public Schools Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques), reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 27—The Public Schools Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): With leave of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 27,

The Public Schools Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

* (1550)

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): I want to put a few remarks on the record at this point at third reading because we did vote against two sections of this bill. They were the sections dealing, first of all, with the offloading, I would say, of buses, the responsibility for school busing and for the maintenance of school buses on to school divisions, who have been feeling for many years now the burden of the government's offload of education responsibility. So, although this bill, in particular, enables school divisions to sell or to otherwise dispose of buses without going back to the minister for permission, what it does in principle is to codify the offloading of the responsibility for the busing of public school students.

So, in principle, we felt that it was important that we draw to the minister's attention that this is something which is a tremendous burden upon school divisions, that the government has over a number of years been expanding the age, extending the age of school buses leading to increasing costs. We have, and we mentioned this particularly at the committee hearing, increasing concerns about the safety of school buses, about the maintenance of school buses, about the regularity and frequency of inspections. In principle, to draw attention of both the minister and the public to the significant changes that are happening for the most part by regulation and in secrecy about school transport, we wanted to draw attention to that.

The second part that we voted against was the rights of students as they are determined in the bill. The minister, in an attempt to clarify the rights of students to attend school, public schools, from the age of seven to the age of 21 or a diploma, whichever comes sooner, we believe and not inadvertently limited the opportunities for some students in Manitoba.

The minister arranged a briefing on this part of the bill. She was concerned that we had not understood that she intended by regulation to enable a student to

return to high school for four credits beyond the diploma. We acknowledged that and the minister has tabled material on that or at least intended to table material at the committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we say is that these are very important principles. The right to attend school between certain ages, the right to a school education up to the age of 21, we believe was a very, very significant right and that it should not be limited by regulation as the minister intended to do. Though we acknowledge the four credits extra that she intends, although has not yet put into formal regulation, she has indicated it in a formal letter which she tabled to superintendents and to divisions. However, regulations can be altered easily and such issues as rights and the right to attend school we believe should not be dealt with by regulation.

Secondly, the extension to four credits, although welcome in itself, is not one that necessarily meets the needs of many of the students who will be using that opportunity. It is often used for students who are returning to school to get upgrading in certain areas, as well as to get particular, very specialized technical training. So it is very important to schools such as Sturgeon Creek, such as Lord Selkirk, the large regional secondary and technical schools throughout the province.

Many of the teachers, and indeed the principals and superintendents of divisions where those schools exist, will tell you that four credits is not enough, that in order to get the specialized training that will make a difference, that will give students some ladder to other parts of post-secondary education and technical training, they will need to have at least eight credits or possibly six. Again, we feel that that part needs much further discussion and that the limiting of a student's right to attend school is something that should not be done by regulation.

Thirdly, in this same area and under the same section of the rights of students, we know and the minister confirmed, there will be at some time in the near future the definition of a diploma for students of special needs. Again, what this section of the bill will do is, if that diploma is to be awarded before the age 21, then it again limits the opportunities of students who have in the past been unable to go to school until that age.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we hear many times from parents and teachers that the opportunities for students with special needs to be educated, to be trained, to broaden the opportunities that they may or may not already have had is very limited in the ages between 18 and 22. So I think there is, for a number of students throughout Manitoba, significant diminution of their opportunities for education.

All of those we had concerns about and voted against that section of the bill. I also want to note that the Manitoba Teachers' Society made some very strong points about the changes in the bill to the role of principal. Again, I believe that the issues that they underlined are very significant. The minister is intending in this bill to enable a superintendent to become, as it is in a number of designated schools across Manitoba, the principal of a particular school, and in this case it is South Winnipeg Technical Centre. I gained some comfort from the fact that the school is specifically named in the bill. It is not in regulation.

We have the opportunity to keep a watching brief on this and assurances that we will be able to assure people that this is not something which is going to take place on a wide-spread scale, because indeed there are very genuine and deeply felt concerns in the Manitoba Teachers' Society that should be taken very, very seriously about the prospective changes in the role of principal that have already occurred as a result of this government's policy, and may indeed be intended in the future as the government moves in many ways to limit the role of the Manitoba Teachers' Society.

With those remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will conclude, but I believe we have another speaker.

Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk (St. James): I rise to put a few comments on Bill 27. This is a bill that has several different clauses that deal with fairly separate issues. In particular, we are concerned about two sections of this bill, one relating to the transfer of authority from the province to the school divisions, the replacement of school buses, and the other section which deals with the right of students to attend public school between the ages of seven to 21 or until they receive a diploma.

(Mr. Edward Helwer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Both of these areas are particularly significant, and that is why I rise today to put a few comments on the record. In terms of the capital bus program, this government has, as far as my sources indicate, unilaterally decided to move away from their requirements of buying new buses and replacing them for school divisions, to moving that responsibility onto the local level in terms of school divisions. Now, the pretense that they argue is on the basis of local autonomy, that the government is trying to decentralize, provide more opportunities for school divisions to make these decisions on their own. In some sectors that may be appropriate.

However, I ask the government which school division has asked for this program? Which school division wants the responsibility to replace the school buses? I have heard of none and the reason for that being that transportation is often, when looked at in terms of priorities, lower on the scale. Trustees and school divisions try to provide the best educational services possible. Providing students with transportation becomes an area which is extremely expensive, is a fairly significant budget item for school divisions and is sometimes considered an area that we can reduce or look at perhaps other options.

We have seen a dramatic reduction in the number of students being transported in today's transportation system for schools than we did in the past. In fact, Mr. Acting Speaker, the trustees association did a recent analysis I believe in December of '96 that looked at the results of funding levels of transportation programs, and we have seen the reduction of over 4,000 students that at one time used to be bused are now no longer receiving that service.

Why is that, Mr. Acting Speaker? Obviously school divisions have been faced with underfunding since 1989. When you are faced with providing fundamental services to children in the classrooms or perhaps modifying programs for transportation, obviously school divisions have chosen to try to make those other choices, choices that would not impact directly on the student. What that has meant is that many school divisions have opted for a longer pick-up distance, so that if you once lived within one kilometre or at the one kilometre distance, you would have received the

transportation provision and your children would have been picked up by the school bus and taken in.

* (1600)

Or in the city, there are certain programs that received busing, language programs that received busing, because it is one of equity and the ability of those children to be able to access that program. If a family decides that, yes, indeed they are going to take up the government's option of an immersion program, is there not an obligation to help that family for instance to access the school which would be well beyond in many cases their local community school? So if we wish to have those options become realistic or viable, it is important to provide the supports necessary to families, so that they can actually reach those opportunities.

So we have seen the pick-up distances moved from one kilometre to 1.5 kilometres and perhaps in-between stages as well. We have seen students have pick-up spots which are a little bit further from where they used to be picked up. Perhaps there was pick-up on their street or in front of their home, and now they are required to walk to a certain pick-up spot. It is significant, because what it means is less ability, fewer services for families, a greater reliance on the local families to actually drive their children to school or arrange some other alternative, and that, Mr. Acting Speaker, means another expense, another cost, basically incurred because this government has chosen not to fund public schools at the same level as it was in the past, has decided that it is within their parameters to see these types of programs and services reduced. For that reason, when the government claims that there has been no tax increases, it falls flat on the ears of the constituents in St. James. What they have seen are further expenses being incurred in many, many different sectors: by user fees, by charges for virtually every sector of government, additional charges in every component of our life. That is why when the Premier and the Filmon government stand up to trumpet this no-tax policy, it is indeed not believed, not believed because the record indicates that people have had to dip into their pockets much more significantly now than they did from the past.

(Mr. Gerry McAlpine, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

The capital bus program is a significant cost expenditure for school divisions. For instance, we know that there are a considerable number of vehicles that, indeed, have come to the end of their typical useful life. In some lease programs conducted by the private sector, school buses are replaced at a seven-year age limit. What is particularly shocking are that public schools are being forced into using vehicles that are double that age, not seven years—when the private sector would write off a bus for one dollar, I understand—but they are keeping them well beyond 14 years. Some school divisions will be forced to have and maintain buses that exceed 15 years, 15 and a half years, and what is really shocking is that this year the government has decided to lift the maximum age on these transportation vehicles, on school buses.

Now they talk about flexibility, but what it really means is that on the roads we are seeing older and older vehicles that do not have modern-day safety equipment, may not meet what we consider to be safety standards that we would like to see in all of our vehicles that are transporting students. What it also means is that there have been radical increases in the cost of maintenance for school divisions. We know that the maintenance portion of the transportation is the responsibility, and has in the past been the responsibility, of school divisions. What they saw was maintenance costs rise from anywhere from 20 to 40 percent additional costs in terms of maintenance without the appropriate grant level to cover those expenditures, and where would the money come from?

Well, obviously, it comes out of the property taxes that all of us share and which most people feel is unfair and that the true responsibility should remain within the realm of the provincial government, as it always has in the past, as is the case in other jurisdictions. What this is is another example of the government downloading its responsibility, trying to skirt its financial obligations to provide sufficient funding, and in Manitoba's case, tragically, we have faced a situation where we lost another child in regard to school bus safety concerns.

The question has been raised over and over again: How many children will have to die before governments will take action and take the appropriate steps? What is very, very unfortunate is that here we deal with a bill that actually guarantees that what we

are going to see is older buses, higher maintenance costs, more pressure on school divisions to perhaps tighten corners at a time when we mourn the loss of another child to a terrible, terrible tragic accident. This is hardly the time for this government to bring such an amendment to The Public Schools Act. In fact, I would suggest that the onus on this government is to ensure its responsibility, wait until the inquest has reported and then look at the overall bus transportation policy to ensure that our safety inspections are up to par, to ensure that the inspection policy change, which was implemented, I understand, a couple of years ago, from having each bus inspected annually to one of a random inspection process where 10 percent of the fleet is inspected, one that relies on individual school divisions to do daily monitoring.

We know from the minister's department that indeed we are seeing a greater number of infractions for school buses and that would only be normal given the age of the buses. The aging buses are more difficult to maintain and older vehicles have a number of challenges. I would know that personally, Mr. Acting Speaker, having recycled my vehicle for probably too long. I know that maintenance costs go up on older vehicles and how it is extremely important to ensure that it actually is up to date in terms of all of our standards and what we expect on vehicles.

*(1610)

The situation, in terms of the bus capital program, is one that is even more serious and calculated. It is our understanding that the bus fleet is actually fairly aged, but it is not a method where there is a certain number, let us say 100 buses that need to be replaced a year, that in fact there is a large number of vehicles that have reached the end of their real life. That is why the government extended the age.

Well, instead of 12-years replacement, let us push it to 13 years. That way we will defer the need for doing that capital replacement. When they finally hit the wall in terms of extending the age, they then turned to this idea of, well, let us argue we will provide more flexibility. More flexibility to do what? You provide the opportunity to ensure that we are going to see older buses on the roads, higher property taxes and more safety infractions. That is a fairly dismal proposal.

They hit the wall this year because there is a large number of vehicles that, by all rights, should be replaced by this government. Instead of doing the right thing, even in the very year where we had a death of one of our own children, instead of doing the right thing, they have downloaded the responsibility to school divisions. Hang your heads, because this means a virtual guarantee of more incidents. So instead of reflecting on how we can improve safety, they have ensured that safety standards will be eroded. There are so many things that the public is dealing with that this item they are pushing through in a bill that has several different sections that deal with a number of unrelated topics. We know that school divisions will not have the funding to replace those aged vehicles.

In fact, our local school division—my riding of St. James is split. There are two school divisions in the riding. One, unfortunately, is in the circumstance where they have a huge number of vehicles that require replacement, and that is the Winnipeg 1 School Division. Their annual capital program allowance is \$99,000; their needs are close to \$2 million. Now, I would call that a very significant cut to the ability of that school division to do the right thing, to replace those buses and to provide the optimal safety opportunities to their children. What is that school division going to do?

An Honourable Member: Which one is that?

Ms. Mihychuk: Well, that school division in this case is Winnipeg 1 School Division, which will have to look at other opportunities, other—what would we say—flexibility, to be polite. What it really means is how can they transport their children to school in vehicles that are old, vehicles that need replacement, vehicles that have huge maintenance costs and have come to the end of their useful life with a grant of \$99,000 when they have the needs that exceed that by a factor of twofold. Instead of \$99,000, they need \$2 million to replace those vehicles.

What have they done? They have changed the length of the distance of pickup. They have reduced the grade level. Instead of having it to the end of Grade 5, they now only transport children to the end of Grade 4. We know that these children are faced with significant safety concerns even taking public transit.

If this government was serious about providing public safety, it would recognize its responsibility also in the city of Winnipeg. We have many young children in Grade 4. That would make them nine-year-olds, 10-year-olds, being required to stand on many streets that are extremely busy during rush hour to get on public transit to go to their schools. Some of them are required to transfer buses and find their way to their local schools, a condition that most of us would think is unacceptable.

Those reductions to programming are inevitable and are going to be accelerated because of this government's bill, because of Bill 27, which basically offloads the responsibility of the province to ensure safety, to ensure the replacement of buses and provides a meagre, insufficient funding allowance to local school divisions. This is at the same time when schools are facing increased needs. We have seen the real needs increase, the number of special needs students increase, the number of students that require the extra help to grow; we have seen child poverty increase at dramatic rates, a shameful record.

What does it mean when we see child poverty increase? Is that just a fairly abstract proposal? Hardly. What it means is that the children that are coming from those homes that experience poverty have a more difficult time because they are disadvantaged. They do not have the library perhaps at the tip of their finger; they do not have a large selection of resources at home. Many of their parents are working two, three jobs part-time, looking at low-paying jobs. They are not available to provide the supports in many cases.

Poverty also leads to unstable housing conditions, and when that happens, we know that children suffer because they have a certain length of time where they have to get familiar with the teachers, get settled into the classroom, become familiar with the curriculum to get into the mode of learning. For each move, that child is probably pushed behind by half a year, and some families move four or five times in one year. It is very, very difficult for those children who are being moved because of their economic situation, accelerated by this government's policies to have to move four or five times a year to be in a positive learning environment. That is fundamental for learning.

So our need is growing, absolutely. Needs are growing in the school because that is where they are facing the front line, and the staff in schools see the increased needs. Children are coming to schools, many schools in the city, Stevenson-Britannia School, which is in the division of St. James, provides a clothing depot, a food bank, a toy-lending library and parent resources. This is in St. James School Division.

There are families throughout Winnipeg who are relying more and more on schools to provide what we would consider fundamental needs like food and clothing. That is shameful, and we are seeing more and more reliance on schools to provide those extra supports for families at the time of need. Why is that? Because this government has not taken up its responsibility to ensure that families are receiving what they need, that we see real positive meaningful work to allow families to be in a stable location in a healthy neighbourhood. Therefore, we would see the less reliance on the schools so that we would see, in fact, the needs of students decrease. But, no, at the time when students are coming with greater needs, this government has decided through this bill to offload the responsibility for school buses. Well, if you have a choice between providing direct services for students or—

* (1620)

Mr. Acting Speaker, we are facing the challenge that as the needs are increasing, the province has actually through this bill had the nerve to download another sector of educational funding, and under the guise of pretence of flexibility, it means underfunding and it ensures higher property taxes, less safety standards. We say shame on them. They should at the minimum withdraw this clause, wait until we hear the results of the inquest, look at a comprehensive review of the school buses in Manitoba, ensure that they meet the safety standards that we intend, ensure their stub-nosed vehicles, ensure that they are replaced in a timely manner and ensure that the province maintains a hands-on approach towards safety.

The other section of this bill that we are opposed to is the section that deals with the rights of students to attend school. The bill clarifies some of the age limits on when they enter, and that is a positive aspect, but

what is particularly disturbing is the government has decided to basically limit students' rights to attend school under the age of 21. This is actually a regressive step. What is now in legislation is that students have the right to attend between the ages of seven to 21. The government has decided to add a clause, or until the minister, or until they receive a diploma as defined by the minister. Well, is that acceptable? I think not.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the minister may wish to assure us in whatever way that she wants by conducting meetings and providing this assurance that there are going to be four additional credits, but that is not sufficient. In today's world, where we are seeing students being challenged more and more, a Grade 12 diploma is basically a requirement to be a ditch digger; students need the opportunity to come back into a high school program, a secondary program, to receive the credits that they need.

If they decided to now come back for a vocational upgrading, so be it. Should we not support our young people? Should we not encourage them to come back and get the education they need so they could find meaningful work? Do, indeed, we think that students should get a diploma and then get kicked out? Are we saying that our children who are 16 or 17 years old should have a definitive what-career plan?

We say, no, there needs to be lifelong learning. And what has the government decided in this bill? It is that we are going to actually limit their ability to come back, a regressive move, at a time when young people face unemployment rates that are unacceptable, at a time when minimum requirements will exceed the necessity of the job.

Many of the jobs that now require a Grade 12 we know do not need a Grade 12 in terms of complying with the job. Many employers now use it as a screening tool. If a student, for example, decided to—and I know this may seem unbelievable, but some students may take the easy road through high school. I am sure that the government members would never consider that. But sometimes our young people decide to take a general program. They do not think they are going to go on to a post-secondary institution. They are going to try and get a job after high school. Then the cold world of reality hits them, and they realize that

their diploma is not going to get them meaningful work, that they are going to have to come back and take some credits that are prerequisites for the university or the community college that they wish to enter.

Does it mean that this government does not think they have the right to go back, that they do not have the right to look for meaningful work? Yes, that is what this bill means. That is what this bill means, that instead of looking at a more open system, at a flexible age, a more flexible age of entry and exit, this government has decided to be more restrictive, close the door on students, close the door on young people that are asking to come back, perhaps to take another degree, another diploma, to look at options.

What does it mean, Mr. Acting Speaker, for students of special needs? We know that for many pupils with special needs public schools provide them with an opportunity to be in a warm, caring place and to develop their skills to the maximum. Can we imagine a day where the minister, perhaps under regulation, which is very easy to amend, decides that perhaps 12 years of formal education is the maximum that these students will be allowed to stay in school? Is there going to be the pressure for instance, unfortunately, from school divisions that are so extremely underfunded in terms of special needs that they are going to ask the government to look at that because they are in such a situation they cannot provide the services for special needs students? Are we going to see the day when parents are going to say our special needs students do not belong in schools?

That day is coming, Mr. Acting Speaker, and this clause is actually facilitating that, facilitating the pressure on special needs students, facilitating the system kicking out kids because they maybe made the wrong choice. Instead of making more opportunities, ensuring our young people have a future, they have decided to shut the door tight, ensure that there are fewer opportunities and a more difficult time in the future.

So rhetoric is on the record from the throne speech where the government talks about more ability to go back to school, lifelong learning, but their actual record in terms of this bill is exactly the opposite. For that reason, we are opposed to these two sections: No. 1,

that it is going to have a serious detrimental effect to our young people in terms of the transportation system; No. 2, in terms of limiting the rights of young people to attend school.

Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McAlpine): Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading on Bill 27.

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

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

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

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): On division.

* (1630)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division. The motion is accordingly carried.

Bill 29—The Education Administration Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 29, The Education Administration

Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration scolaire), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the whole issue of intellectual property is a very serious and difficult issue. The issue of intellectual property is a very serious issue. Members who have read the whole evolution of trade disputes in the last 15 years will know that United States in particular, to a lesser extent other nations, but in particular the United States, has argued long and hard and successfully finally that intellectual property and copyright should be protected at a very high level, and that basically it becomes, essentially in trade talk, a tradeable good and becomes subject to all the same kinds of protections that trade goods have enjoyed, that hard goods have enjoyed over many years.

Members will be aware that there have been three at least large and long battles in this country over the issue of drugs and drug patent legislation, and the whole business in that industry of intellectual property. Indeed, there is a strong case to be made. Intellectual property is a class of property that ought to be carefully protected and carefully thought about in terms of its status in law, in terms of how its use can be enjoyed by various people and what obligations they have when they make use of new intellectual property or existing intellectual property.

The whole area of copyright, in particular, is full of great difficulties. You know, it has been said by various philosophers that there is no such thing as a new idea, that there are only new packages for older ideas. So in the sense that we talk about the protection of intellectual property as though it could be owned by any one person, that presents some very serious problems. Who owns and who can be said to own the mind of a great musician that develops the kind of music developed by a Beethoven, a Mozart, in our own century, a Sullivan or a Joan Baez or a Brian Wilson or a Ralph Vaughan Williams or any number of composers, Mr. Deputy Speaker?

The whole notion of how the cadences of music and the relationships of notes develop and who uses the

various signature cadences, how one develops the various scales that are used in western and eastern music, and who can be said to own the pentatonic scale or who can be said to own a chromatic scale is a very difficult question, because ultimately all music is based on some sense of the mathematical relationships between notes, and notes are simply sound frequencies. So how this can then be translated into individual property that is owned by an individual musician or author, of course, becomes a very difficult question. How long should an author have the rights to the property that has been created?

When the great Gilbert and Sullivan musicals which many schools have performed over many years and which some of us have had the joy and pleasure of taking part in as older folk—Gilbert and Sullivan wrote in the 1880s—the honourable member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) has performed, I am sure, in a number of Gilbert and Sullivan operettas in his local career. In fact, I am not sure whether I can see him as a Mikado or as a Katisha. This would be a difficult choice. Nevertheless, they have given great pleasure to many school children who, up until reasonably recent times, have enjoyed the ability to use this music without having to pay onerous copyright. Yet, you know, the family of Sir Arthur Sullivan gave the copyright to the producer of the operas, D'Oyly Carte, and D'Oyly Carte became an opera company. The opera company owns the copyright to the Gilbert and Sullivan operettas. So when one produces an opera now, a Gilbert and Sullivan opera, you have to give credit to D'Oyly Carte, who actually owns the copyrights for these operettas.

When you think then of the written word, as opposed to music, the whole question of how do schools get access to ideas that are obviously the reason that schools exist is to explore and to transmit and to challenge ideas. How does one then get the right to produce material for students to study and to reflect on and to use in projects if every time that is accessed, there is a copyright fee? The initial cost may be small, may be only a matter of a few cents, but in aggregate, over a period of years, the cost of the copyright far exceeds the cost of the book that had the material in it in the first place. When you add to that the difficulty that schools face when a government, such as the one opposite, reduces and reduces and reduces funding in an environment where the costs of educational

materials are escalating far more quickly than the cost of inflation, then you can see the tremendous difficulty that faces schools who want to have materials available for their students and, of course, at the same time do not want to infringe on the copyright privileges of authors who created materials that students would want to use.

I can remember my sister as a teacher in Newmarket, Ontario, telling me that until the copyright legislation came in, because of the cuts that had happened in their school division, the hottest place in the building was the copier room, and it was because the Xerox machines were running off the copies of old textbooks. She said the hottest room in the building was the photocopier room where the machine was running virtually the whole day photocopying texts or portions of texts because they could not afford to supply the texts to the students. So they were actually incurring higher operating costs in their school by photocopying than were the costs of the texts, but the text came out of a different budget and that budget was empty, so they could not buy any texts. What a silly, silly situation to be in in the first place. [interjection] The member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) says he remembers that well. Well, I know he would never infringe on a copyright law. Never.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the whole issue of copyright for print materials is a very, very difficult one, because, as I said earlier, who owns ideas? Who has the right to say I have an idea? Finally, when you couple all of this with the situation that our schools find themselves in, where this Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) and this government have so reduced funding that the value of funding to every pupil in the system is \$500 less than it was only six or seven years ago, how are schools supposed to provide the adequate materials that they need to provide the kind of classroom environment that students ought to have? What does this act say? This act says that not only do they have to abide by copyright, but the Department of Education will charge each school a copyright fee when they send out materials. So no longer is the department itself absorbing all of these costs, as we did historically; we are now going to offload these costs as well, thereby increasing the cost of education to school divisions and decreasing the effective support that the province provides.

* (1640)

So, with these remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we express our great concern about this legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed.

Bill 55—The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey), that Bill 55, The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Hydro-Manitoba), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to put a few words on the record about Bill 55, and I would indicate that I know our critic has a few words to say as well. The Deputy Premier has mentioned something about selling Manitoba Hydro. I know that this is part of what is happening with this bill, and that is that the government has refused to put in any guarantees, real guarantees, that would require a vote of the people of Manitoba before they could sell off our hydro company. So I am glad he is talking about selling Manitoba Hydro. We know we cannot trust Tories with our public assets. I can just see them, you know, in the next election they are probably going to run on from the people that brought you the sale of MTS, coming to a venue near you, the sequel.

An Honourable Member: The former Filmon team.

Mr. Ashton: Yes, the not-so-Filmon Filmon team. You know, save the Jets; we will not sell your phone company; we will make sure prostitutes' cars are seized; and we will protect your health care. We are going to do a top 10 list, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of Tory campaign promises that I do not think you are going to see in the next election. Somehow, I just do not see those issues coming up. I must say the Conservatives were pretty

creative in the last election. There were a lot of people who believed that they actually, really were going to save the Jets, believed them when they said they were not going to sell off the Manitoba Telephone System. I just want to say that is why our critic moved, in report stage and in the committee, an amendment that was very straightforward. What was it? It was called, entitled "citizens' vote."

We are all citizens of this province, people who have lived in this province, and we all own Manitoba Hydro through the government. I am a believer in public ownership, and I find it amazing that in a way this Conservative government is clinging, I think, to a sort of an older concept of state ownership. It is interesting, I do not think that the state necessarily is a negative thing; but, when you have a removal of the sense of ownership, and I do not mean in the sense of being able to sell it off bit by bit, but I think what we are trying to do is say: hey, Manitoba Hydro is an asset that belongs to all Manitobans; it does not belong to a particular government. They do not have a right to sell it off unless they have support from the people.

Do you know what they did in committee? They would not even consider the amendment. Do you know what they did in the House? They would not even consider the amendment in the House. By the way, it is interesting because we know why. Because the minister said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he said in committee a few weeks ago and our critic was there, the member for St. James (Ms. Mihychuk), I was there, and he said on MTS, for example, the decision was made by that group of Manitobans, that large group—you know, I could use the word "club" because that is sort of the words the stockbrokers used—and who was it? Did he think a million people? Did he think those that vote in an election? Did he say people that might vote in the citizens' vote? No, he said, he did not even say the Manitoba Legislature.

His version of democracy is that you elect a government. It does not matter what they promised they were going to do; once they are in power for four or five years, they get to make these real tough decisions, and, in this case, they sold off MTS. I note, by the way, it was not even the caucus. It was not even the caucus; it was the cabinet. I say to members opposite, backbenchers on the other side, we are on

your side too. We want you to have a say over the future of things like Manitoba Hydro and MPIC. Think about it.

It is interesting, I mean I have asked questions going right back to May: what happened to MTS? It was confirmed they did not even take it to their caucus. That is how much they trust in the judgment of their own elected members. I look around the room, and I see, for example, the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render). I would have trusted the member for St. Vital to have a say on this. I would have trusted many of the other people who are not in cabinet or who were not in cabinet at the time. I look at the member for Riel (Mr. Newman). Well, then again, I think I know which way the member for Riel would have voted, but I would have trusted the fact he would have given it serious consideration, to be fair.

That is what we are fighting for with Manitoba Hydro, and what is sad about this particular bill is, you know what they are doing now? The Tory communications team has decided to come up with a new sort of way with dealing with the fact no one believes them on public assets any more, and there was that section in there saying you cannot sell off a part of Hydro and the rest of it. Now what is interesting is, why would they oppose to having it going a vote of the citizens, the people of Manitoba, a citizens' vote? If you are to believe what is in there, what would they have had to lose? If they had no plans to sell off Hydro, what would it cost them to put that in there? Nothing. I would hope that would never be used. I would hope that no one would think of selling it off, because it is a major public asset, but you cannot trust Tories with our public assets.

Hey, if you trusted them with MTS before the 1995 election, I make my point. I mean, I just want to see them in the next election, trust us. I actually wonder what they can even say trust us on anymore. [interjection] Well, there is an interesting analogy relating to the car thieves from the member for St. James (Ms. Mihychuk), and indeed there have been a lot of car thefts under this government as well.

I just say that let us learn from what happened last year with MTS. You know, that was not the way to make public policy. That was, I think, one of the

saddest comments I have ever seen in this province. That was one of the biggest decisions in Manitoba history, the decision to sell off the Manitoba Telephone System. It was not raised in the provincial election. It was not put to a vote to the people of Manitoba. You know, they promised public hearings, they did not even have public hearings before they made the decision. They would not even have public hearings in rural Manitoba. I wonder if that had anything to do with the fact that 78 percent of rural Manitobans and the UMM and MAUM were opposed to the sale.

I say to members opposite—[interjection] Actually, it is all about reform. You know, they are lucky there is no recall legislation in this province because they all would be recalled in rural Manitoba for not representing their constituents. [interjection] It is interesting that the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) now is using Preston Manning as an example for breaking promises. I guess we could compare who has broken his word more, Preston Manning, Preston “Stornoway” Manning, or the Deputy Premier, Jim “I will not sell off your phone company” Downey.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I say to members opposite that is not the way you deal with major decisions. Well, what choice does that leave us? I want to just reference one other issue before moving a motion. We asked questions today that were raised by MKO. By the way, I want to, on the record, commend MKO, particularly former Grand Chief George Muswagon, whom I worked very closely with on many issues, and who was an outspoken champion of First Nations people, First Nations communities. I wish him well, of course, the new Grand Chief Francis Flett, former chief for The Pas, and I want to say on their behalf I am disappointed that the government did not consult with MKO. Surprise, surprise, surprise. I say to the government, recognize the reality of First Nations. Recognize the fact that you are dealing with self-government. You are dealing with First Nations that are seeking to reassert much of what at times appeared they had lost, but in my opinion they never lost. I say treat—[interjection]

It is interesting because the friends of aboriginal people in the Conservative Party did not even consult with MKO, Mr. Deputy Speaker, did not even consult. That may have something to do with the reason why—and I must admit I remember the last election

well, and I could recite the election results, because they like to crow about, you know, northern Manitoba. They like to talk about it.

* (1650)

I love the fact that aboriginal people voted clearly. I went to my constituents, I think there were four votes for the Conservatives in Nelson House, 200 for the NDP. There was one in Ilford, we had 43. There were six, I think, in York Landing. Split Lake, there were, I think, about a dozen. We had 220. I can say categorically—oh, by the way, it was interesting, the Deputy Premier, he was Minister of Northern Affairs for a while, and then the current Minister of Health was. I know who accepts responsibility for this, but this is the Tory record in northern Manitoba. They got their lowest vote in Thompson in 30 years. More people voted NDP in Arthur-Virden than voted Conservative in the Thompson constituency.

I remember when the Deputy Premier used to say that I should come down there and challenge him, and I say, well, you should run up in the North. I think I know the result in the North. But I tell you, with the growing base of New Democrats in rural Manitoba, especially in Arthur-Virden, it is almost tempting to take on the Deputy Premier or run against him on MTS. Maybe we will do a trade here. We will see how much support he gets in northern Manitoba.

I want to put this on the record because we have serious concerns about this bill, because it does not protect Manitobans against the sale of Manitoba Hydro. We have serious concerns too because I am concerned any time First Nations are not accorded the most basic principle I believe that we have to accept in this province with First Nations; that is, respect.

That is why I move that the motion be amended by deleting all words after the word “that” and substituting the following, and that is moved by myself, seconded by the member for St. James (Ms. Mihychuk) that Bill 55, the Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur L'Hydro-Manitoba), be not now read a third time but be read a third time this day six months hence.

Motion presented.

Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk (St. James): This is, and I ask all members to support this motion, which basically asks the government to let Manitobans have a voice on Manitoba Hydro's future. Mr. Deputy Speaker, today we see a call from MKO, a call asking the Minister of Energy and Mines responsible for Manitoba Hydro (Mr. Newman), who happens to be also the Minister of Northern Affairs to have some sensitivity, to have some appreciation and listen and provide for the opportunity of MKO members to reach out to him and speak out on this bill.

We have asked in the past for this government to consider a six-month delay. We asked in this House, and what did the government say? No. We asked in committee, give us six months; let Manitobans speak out; let Manitobans have a voice; let Manitobans have a share in the vision of Manitoba Hydro; let Manitobans tell this government what they think of Manitoba Hydro's future—should it be private or should it be in the hands of the people. Do they agree with the Filmon team selling it off?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we raised those concerns in committee, the minister rejected them outright. We urged the government, now that we have heard from the First Nations community directly appeal for a time to review the implications of this bill, which are changing the structure of Manitoba Hydro in a significant way, provide the time, provide the ability for First Nations to understand the implications, to understand what the minister is presenting in Bill 55, give six months time for the people of Manitoba to review the bill, to talk about Manitoba's future. If the government is so assured of this bill, then why will they not allow MKO and Manitobans to look at it, to speak to it, and give us six months time to review The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me quote directly from the MKO press release that was put out today: “There are too many potential implications for the MKO First Nations in Bill 55 for MKO to accept the attempt by Manitoba to unilaterally impose this legislation. MKO will be contacting the Minister's office today and insisting that Manitoba set Bill 55 aside until First Nations have had a full opportunity to express our concerns to the government,” concluded the new Grand Chief Francis Flett.

I would be glad to table this press conference, because perhaps they have not had an opportunity to hear from First Nations, and if not, then they will support this motion of a hoist for six months. Would that harm Manitoba Hydro? Six months consultation with the people of Manitoba. Is it going to hurt the government? Six months consultation would provide an opportunity for all of the stakeholders to have a chance to talk about Hydro's future. We heard the appeal from many workers in Hydro represented by CUPE. We heard the appeal over and over again by our side. We heard the appeal from Manitobans in a small survey conducted by one of the local news media.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we now hear the serious concerns of MKO, First Nations communities, directly impacted by many of the Hydro development projects that occurred in the North. They represent those communities. They deserve a fair chance. They deserve the respect of this House to put the bill aside for six months, provide an opportunity to hear their concerns, look at the future of Manitoba Hydro, and then come forward.

So I urge the minister, as the minister representing Northern Affairs and Manitoba Hydro, have respect for First Nations, listen to MKO, provide us with the time to look at the future of Manitoba Hydro and to tell this government that Manitobans want Manitoba Hydro in public hands with the people of Manitoba, and even though this government has put a quasi "Manitoba Hydro is not for sale." We say, let the Manitoban people speak to this government and tell them what they want. They want Hydro; it is a Crown corporation for the people of Manitoba, even though this government has said no over and over again. So give us six months time to review the bill, listen to the people of Manitoba and listen to MKO. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Nays have it.

Formal Vote

Mr. Ashton: Yeas and Nays.

* (1700)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yeas and Nays have been requested. Call in the members.

The motion before the House is the motion moved by the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following: Bill 55, The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act, be not now read a third time but be read a third time this day six months hence.

Division

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

Yeas

Ashton, Barrett, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Evans (Brandon East), Evans (Interlake), Friesen, Gaudry, Hickes, Mackintosh, Maloway, Martindale, Mihychuk, Reid, Robinson, Sale, Santos, Struthers, Wowchuk.

Nays

Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Newman, Pallister, Penner, Pitura, Praznik, Radcliffe, Reimer, Render, Stefanson, Sveinson, Toews, Tweed, Vodrey.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 21, Nays 24.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion is accordingly defeated.

* (1730)

Mr. Gary Kowalski (The Maples): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was paired with the member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst), as my colleague from Inkster was paired with the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). If I had the opportunity to vote, I would have voted in favour of the motion.

Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk (St. James): I move that we adjourn debate, seconded by the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson).

Motion agreed to.

House Business

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder, it is 25 minutes to six, if there is leave to waive private members' hour today?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to waive private members' hour? [agreed]

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Deputy Speaker, pursuant to discussions amongst party leaders, it is felt that we could not see the clock this evening at six o'clock and sit until nine, and that for the purposes of this particular agreement, if there are any divisions, they would not be the standing recorded type of division from here until nine o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to not see the clock at six o'clock until nine? [agreed]

Is there leave that the recorded votes not be allowed, that any recorded votes will be on division? [agreed]

Bill 30—The Farm Practices Protection Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader) I move, seconded by the honourable Deputy Prime, Premier—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McCrae: It is probably only a matter of time, Mr. Deputy Speaker—that Bill 30, The Farm Practices Protection Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection des pratiques agricoles), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to take a few moments to put a few words on the record to indicate that we had indicated earlier we support this legislation. I want to also put on the record that this legislation replaces the old Nuisance Act, and this legislation deals with odours and noises that are typical of the livestock industry and changes the original legislation to allow the board to rule on specific issues and have the ability to have a court hearing.

What I want to say on this bill is that we all recognize the importance of the livestock industry in this province. It is a growing industry and one that is changing, and along with growth and change, there is often confrontation, although to many people who are urban dwellers or people who are not used to living close by livestock, the odours may be offensive. That is why we have to do much more.

The government has some responsibility to do much more in research to ensure that odours from the industry are handled in a way that they are not offensive to people who live in close proximity. I had the opportunity to see some of the new technology that is being used now to dispose of wastes, particularly from the hog industry, and I have to commend the people who were involved in the industry for their new technology, but as I said earlier, there is much more that has to be done. This is one area where the government should be doing more research. I have been critical of the amount of money that the government chooses to spend on agricultural research both federally and provincially.

* (1740)

I think that we have to do much more of that and use new and innovative ideas to ensure that the by-products of the industry are incorporated in a way that is not offensive to other people, does not create problems.

The waste from these industries is a natural fertilizer and can save—by using the wastes from the hog industry or any industry, it can reduce farm costs for fertilizers tremendously. But we have to handle them in a way that—and I believe that there is much more work to be done. As the industry grows, we will have to ensure that that research is done.

The government has one project that has been funded now at the University of Manitoba, I believe it is, where they are testing the odours to see how they can be handled better or how you can decrease the odour from these wastes. That is a good project, but it is one of many that have to be done.

I think one of the things the government seriously has to look at is how we are going to handle the increased amount of waste. I firmly believe that we have to be looking at ways of processing waste, particularly as we move towards larger operations, because as these larger operations are established, there is more waste and the land base is not always there for distributing the waste. If the waste was processed in some manner that it would then become a dry product, it could be a value-added product that could be distributed in organic farming. I believe there would be a market for it, and it is one thing we have to look at.

There is no doubt the problems result when people who are expanding their hog operations decide to build in close proximity to urban centres or where there are already residential set-ups, and that is where problems lie. We have seen just recently there was a hog operation that was supposed to be built in the Eldon R.M. near Brandon, and it was rejected because of concerns. There are hog operations that are being proposed in the Interlake area; in fact, I understand there were four new ones that are approved, so there is a difference. In some municipalities they are being rejected where they have more zoning by-laws; in areas where there are no zoning by-laws, the projects are going ahead.

I believe that the government should be working much more closely with municipalities, and perhaps we should be looking at ensuring that there are zoning by-laws in all municipalities so that then we do not have to worry about operations establishing themselves too closely to one another. There is a beginning of hog

operations in my part of the province, and although only the first hog barn is being built, we are hearing a bit about a confrontation between people who have smaller operations who are concerned about disease spreading from one operation to the other. The industry is going to grow. We have to be sure that it grows in a fashion, as I have said many times, that it does not have an impact on neighbours, but certainly, now that this amendment has been brought forward, those people who have a concern and when they go for a hearing, the board now has the power. The board's powers are enhanced to allow them to take it to a court hearing. The board's powers are also enhanced in other ways which make it clearer for them to get involved in addressing certain issues.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with those few words, I want to say that we are in support of this legislation, but I would encourage the minister to find those resources that are needed to ensure that the necessary research can continue so that we would avoid types of conflicts. Incorporating the wastes into the soil, straw spreading on top of lagoons are some of the things that can be done, but there is much more. It is an issue the government has to address if we are going to see the industry, various livestock industries grow in this province.

But, in particular, it is the hog industry that tends to cause the most concern, because it is that industry that has the sweetest smell to it and sometimes not greatly appreciated by those people who happen to live in close proximity to the industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed. Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 31—The Livestock and Livestock Products and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 31, The Livestock and Livestock

Products and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur les animaux de ferme et leurs produits et modifications corrélatives) be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Deputy Speaker, again, I would just like to take a few minutes to speak on Bill 31, The Livestock and Livestock Products and Consequential Amendments Act and say that this bill, as we indicated before, is the result of changes that were brought forward last session in the new Animal Care Act. I want to say that most people who make their living by raising livestock and animals are very caring about their animals, because if you do not look after your animals well, you certainly are not going to reap the profits of it. I look at the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns). The Minister of Agriculture is involved in the cattle industry. I am sure that he would agree that if you are going to reap the benefits of the industry, you certainly have to keep your animals healthy.

This bill was brought forward because there were complaints on how people were handling puppies. There was the whole puppy mill industry, a horrible documentary that we saw on television, news clippings, where people who were raising dogs for pets, were raising them in some horrible conditions. Of course, the Humane Society and most people in the province were upset to see that these kind of activities were taking place but really there was no ability, I believe, under The Animal Husbandry Act to enforce any charges against them. As a result, the department looked at what could be changed. What was brought forward was The Animal Care Act, and the changes have been made to result in that.

But as I was indicating, I am very pleased with the way the livestock producers in Manitoba, the majority of them do look after their animals very well and, in fact, there are very, very few complaints that are reported in the livestock industry. As I say, there are complaints with pets.

In the livestock industry, one of the groups of people that I want to commend is the people who are in the PMU industry. Just a few days ago, there was a very good report that was put forward on how the livestock

and the horses in the PMU industry are being raised. I know that the PMU industry producers have been doing a lot over the last few years in improving their barns. I have had the opportunity to visit a few of the barns that were below standard, and they have done a tremendous amount of work. They have done a tremendous amount of work to improve their image.

* (1750)

There is much more that has to be done, but I want to commend them on the work they have done and on the report that they have received on the quality of the animals that they raise. Certainly, as I say, most livestock producers want to see healthy animals, but there has to be the opportunity to have the follow-up for inspectors to have the ability to enforce the law on those people who are not giving the best care possible for those animals.

The bill also deals with new technology, something that I am not too familiar with. I understand the technology—we will be getting away from in many cases tagging, ear tagging of livestock. We will be moving toward a computer chip, where you will be able to trace animals right from the farm site to market and get better control. This is very important for the food industry as well.

We hear many times of—not very many times from Canada, but there have been cases where contaminated meat has made it, gone out of the country. It might be contaminated with antibiotics or things like that. It puts a bad light on the food industry of Manitoba and of Canada. So this legislation brings us in line with other provinces and brings us in line with international standards and ensures that there is the ability to trace an animal from the farm gate to the point of sale or slaughter. Should there be a problem with some livestock, then it can be traced back. Should there be residue found, should it be contaminated, the problem can be addressed immediately.

(Mr. Edward Helwer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Our livestock industry is far too important for us in this country for us to put at risk, and these kinds of steps that are taken forward are very good. One of the concerns that we raised with the bill was that at the

present time brands are registered with the province. I understand it is moving over to—the ability under this legislation for a private sector to take over the registration, it is another move toward privatization.

The other issue that is dealt with in this bill as well is inspections at auction marts, which, I understand, the cattle producers have been calling for for some time. I can recall in our auction marts the farmers had asked for this. Apparently, in Saskatchewan, it is a government-run program where you have the ability to check who owns livestock, and it reduced the risk of stolen cattle being sold.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, again, this will be, as I understand it, done by the private sector rather than by a government inspector. I think that that would be a weakness in this legislation, but other than the fact that the government is moving toward privatizing these services, we would hope that the government would keep some control, because there is a purpose for government being involved and having government standards. Other than that, we have no opposition to this legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Helwer): Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Helwer): Agreed and ordered.

Bill 34—The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 34, The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg et la Loi sur les municipalités), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Acting Speaker, speaking to Bill 34, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act, it is another potpourri of

amendments to the City of Winnipeg. These are noncontroversial in some parts of it, the eligibility for position of city auditor, tax credits for unserved dwellings, business improvement zones, managing debenture debt, fire prevention inspections, variance notices, variance amendments, transitional provisions on business assessment and taxation. There is also the whole issue of grants and credits to owner-occupied buildings which could be much more controversial. This is intended to increase the city's assessment base in the long term and the erosion of qualifications of the electrical inspectors.

I want to just talk about a few sections of this bill. [interjection] Okay, moving right along here speaking to The City of Winnipeg Act, now I want to speak for a moment about the Business Improvement Zones because I was the minister responsible for The City of Winnipeg Act and Urban Affairs when the Business Improvement Zone legislation came in. The whole philosophy of BIZ, as we call it, and then at that point the Downtown Business Association was represented by one Susan Thompson, a store owner at the shop she owned on Main Street. There were also a number of lawyers who were looking at the Business Improvement Zone legislation. We had a number of consultative papers on Business Improvement Zone legislation before we passed it. We passed it because we wanted to enable neighbourhoods and businesses in neighbourhoods to look at legislation and to look at a way in which they could work in a co-operative approach to be attracting and marketing their own business area and also having improvement in the business part of their community.

I would say to the government that the Business Improvement Zone legislation, the BIZ legislation, has worked quite well. I am not sure how many BIZs there are in Winnipeg now since the time we passed the bill, but I was going to say it would be approaching double digits, and I know that the—[interjection] The member for Crescentwood (Mr. Sale) informs me the last one was the airport, but I know there are areas like Sargent Avenue and Provencher and Downtown and the Exchange and Corydon and Osborne, and a number of other areas that are unique to the city of Winnipeg and are able to take advantage of the legislation, the kind of vision we had in the past to look at ways in which they could co-operate, a co-operative approach, if you will,

because it was really felt by business—and we agreed—that if they marketed their area together, they could have more effectiveness. Even if you had two or three restaurants in the same area, if they were able to get people into the area itself, then the cluster impact, the economic impact of the cluster would be positive for all of them.

I have to say that this government, in my view, has totally failed on some of the advantages of business, BIZ, particularly in downtown Winnipeg. We just saw again crime results from certain parts of the business improvement zone legislation—and we are going to be dealing with all your bills later, the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh). You better stay here.

We are very disappointed in the lack of partnership from the provincial government. The whole idea of business improvement zone legislation is to not have taxpayers' money go into massive subsidies for business improvement. It would actually come from the businesses themselves, but that does not mean to say that the province itself should abandon some of the business in the city of Winnipeg.

* (1800)

Mr. Acting Speaker, I think what has happened in downtown Winnipeg is deplorable. I do not know whether many of these members drive through downtown. I think some of them should and would have seen the boarded up, for sale or closed signs in downtown Winnipeg. Of course, when you ask questions to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) about his lack of vision of downtown Winnipeg, he does not even take responsibility for some of the decisions he made when he was formerly on the power bodies and power brokers of City Hall. He was ironically on the Trizec—or voted for the Trizec building—and the denial of people to have the opportunity to speak and participate in one of the most famous intersections in Canada, that being Portage and Main. Here he voted to send people underground in the most famous intersection in Canada.

Of course, years later, again we see neglect and neglect in terms of the business improvement zones in downtown Winnipeg. We do not see a government or a Premier that is willing to take measures to look at both the social and physical

development of some of our key business improvement zone areas in a positive way.

When I asked the Premier about the Wollenberg study that was commissioned by the business improvement zone people and released publicly and reported publicly in one of the major newspapers—which itself has left downtown Winnipeg, I might point out, and I think all of us have to practise what we preach—when they abandoned downtown Winnipeg, perhaps they should look at the models that are used in other cities where the creative part of the newspaper is produced in the downtown area. They could use the historic Free Press building to do that, and the presses are out in a less costly area. If you look at the Toronto Star, the presses are way out in the Markham area of Toronto and the offices are downtown. Maybe that is an option for the Free Press, to start reversing some of the trends to go only to the burbs at the expense of the downtown area.

The Wollenberg study, and the Free Press to their credit reported on it very effectively, stated just open up Portage and Main. Just open, as a symbol, again, of bringing in the light and bringing in the people, particularly in our beautiful four-season province, to the downtown area—[interjection] Well, the Premier just said, well, we do not take any decisions on City Hall, why is the member asking me this terrible question?

Well, he, (a) was a councillor in the past, and (b) we have the Department of Urban Affairs and The City of Winnipeg Act for a reason. The city of Winnipeg, The City of Winnipeg Act and business improvement zones are creatures of this Legislature, are decisions that were made by all 57 members to recognize the challenges that we have in one of our urban centres that is vital to the importance and future of the whole province. The government then turned their back on this recommendation from the consultant and many other recommendations for many other consultants. Whether it is on the social fabric of the inner city in terms of education and training, whether it is giving kids and people opportunities to have recreation and meaningful long-term opportunities in their communities, this government turns its back.

Even small things, like why are we putting all kinds of money, millions of dollars in the Wellness centre at

Seven Oaks which may be a good decision but allowing the North Y on McGregor to totally collapse because of lack of public support? Why are we putting public money into a wellness centre and withdrawing public money and investments in a place like the North Y where the crime rate and the lack of programs for kids is great?

I was talking to some families when I was campaigning for Judy Wasylycia-Leis, and they told me that their kids used to go play basketball on Friday and Saturday nights and stay out of trouble with the North Y. Now that is, unfortunately, boarded up. I know in the past when we were in office, we funded some money to the North Y because we believed in it. These people across the way, they are just moving their money to Tuxedo, they are moving their money to the northwest quadrant of the city, and in effect they are abandoning the Business Improvement Zone ideas.

As the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) pointed out, look at the advice and the decisions that they made on the casino. Every group, every tourism group, every hospitality group, every group working in downtown Winnipeg said do not take the casino out of downtown. The Business Improvement Zone of downtown Winnipeg said the same thing, said do not take it out of downtown Winnipeg. You know, who is running this government? It is just a bunch of loonie counters working for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) that only care about the loonie return rather than looking at a balance between return of investment, return of revenues in the gambling industry and the economic development realities of these decisions.

We think the Minister for Lotteries, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson), and the Premier (Mr. Filmon), who all served on City Council and built a city infrastructure for 750,000 people in terms of planning way back in the late '70s which developed all kinds of hard costs for the citizens of Winnipeg, very high taxation and very high borrowing rates, it is kind of ironic that when they come back to the province, they turn their backs on their own decisions in the city of Winnipeg.

To make it worse, they do not help the city of Winnipeg and business improvement zones flourish, but rather, even the easiest of requests, taking a historic

building like the Capitol Theatre and looking at that as a potential replacement to the Fort Garry casino, they just do not even look at it. The only people looking at ideas are getting no support from this government and from this political party that basically abandoned downtown Winnipeg, north end Winnipeg, I think abandoned Winnipeg completely. Someday it is going to catch up to them as the people in the city of Winnipeg, the 600,000 people, realize they have no friends on Broadway with this Tory government in office.

Look at the BFI decision, a very small decision to help both environmentally and economically for the city of Winnipeg. Do we see members opposite supporting these decisions? No, we do not. We do not see them supporting the city of Winnipeg. They see them support the corporate friends that they have and the Texas-owned BFI over reducing the costs to the City of Winnipeg between \$4 million and \$7 million annually. Just a little idea that could help the citizens of Winnipeg, it could help us conserve our land utilization strategy. Even the airport recommendations on planning recommend against it, but you know, if you have got the inside track with these people across the way, that is all you need.

Those are just a few comments I wanted to put on the record. I am sure my colleague from Wellington will speak on the erosion of electricians by weakening that provision. Of course, we could not expect any support from the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) who has done nothing for apprenticeship here in Manitoba. She has basically decimated the Apprenticeship Program in this province. She would not know an Apprenticeship Program if she ran into it, and there has not been an Apprentice Program she has not seen that she has not cut, and cut dramatically. I think the Minister of Education should take a stand on this bill and vote against it. If she has read it, she would know that the last few Apprenticeship Programs left in this province are being eroded with this bill in The City of Winnipeg Act by not allowing apprenticeships in the electrician profession in Manitoba. Why do you not stand up for a few remaining Apprenticeship Programs in Manitoba, a few of the trades here left in Manitoba, or are you just going to continue to cut, cut, cut, gut, gut, gut, in terms of what you are doing in the province of Manitoba?

Thank goodness, the NDP had the vision to bring in business improvement zone legislation. Thank goodness, under our leadership and vision these zones are flourishing. Regrettably this group across the way has no ability to move forward with these business improvement zones, and I look forward to the day when we are back in office and Manitoba and Winnipeg can grow again and flourish again, rather than wilting as it is doing under the repression of the Tory government. Thank you very much.

* (1810)

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Acting Speaker, I have spoken briefly on Bill 34 on second reading and would just like to put a few comments on the record tonight on third reading. The bill itself is fairly innocuous, as I stated before, with a couple of exceptions, one being that the amendment allows the city of Winnipeg to give tax credits for unserviced lots and other financial incentives for homes that are built in the city of Winnipeg.

Now, one would say: Why would we be in opposition to this particular part of Bill 34? Frankly, as we have stated before, the concept of providing financial incentives for people to build homes within the city of Winnipeg is a proposal that, on principle, we very strongly recommend, support and have spoken out in favour of for many, many years.

As a matter of fact, if one drives—and I am sure very few of the members opposite actually do make the trip across the Salter Street bridge going into the north end of the city of Winnipeg, a journey that I would recommend that they undertake at least once in their lives, so they understand how the other three-quarters of the city lives. If they did, they would see on the right hand side, the east hand side, several houses that—I do not know the streets that they are on but they are just to the right of the Salter Bridge as you cross over—that were part of the Logan neighbourhood improvement process that was undertaken under the NDP government in the late '80s. Those houses unfortunately have not been joined by very many compatriots in the last nine years. This government has done virtually nothing to assist in social housing. As a matter of fact, as my colleague the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) has pointed out with great

regularity, this government along with the federal Conservative and then federal Conservative government in Liberal clothing, have emasculated the whole concept of social and co-op housing, housing being one of the basics for survival.

Food, shelter and clothing, we have all heard for decades and generations are the basic necessities of life. Even when we talk about quality of life issues, the UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child and the UN definitions of health that are very much more inclusive than food, shelter and clothing, do recognize the fact that, if you do not have basic good housing, you can forget pretty much the concepts of health, the concepts of social health, the concept of economic health, because you are missing one of the basic building blocks of a good, compassionate society.

So, the province under this government has not followed the good beginnings of social housing and co-operative housing movements that were undertaken by the previous NDP government. They have in fact cut back and participated as willing participants in the cutbacks to the social housing concept in the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba.

We see in that neighbourhood, the Logan neighbourhood and other places throughout the city where social housing has not completely been taken away, what positive impacts social housing, infill housing, whether it is social housing or not can have on a neighbourhood. When you have, as we have in the city of Winnipeg, nearly 2,000 unbuilt-upon lots within the older neighbourhoods, it seems to us ridiculous that the province allows the City of Winnipeg to have an amendment passed in Bill 34 that says any new home buyer can get a tax break no matter where within the city that they build their home.

We have talked in this House and will continue to do so, and when we are government in a few short years, we will actually act on our principles as we have in the past and ensure that the capital region as a whole and the city of Winnipeg in particular have very strong bases upon which to build. One of those bases, as I have said, is a strong housing component.

This amendment to The City of Winnipeg Act, part of Bill 34, allows the city to say that it is working on

infill housing, to say that it is working on keeping people in the city, and technically, I guess, that is true. What the province could have done if they actually paid attention to their Capital Region strategy, if they actually did what they say they are going to do in the concept of sustainable development, they would have said: okay, City of Winnipeg, you want an amendment to allow for tax credits and grants for new home construction within the city; well, we will give that to you, but what we really want to see is for you to give priority in those programs to the areas within the city that are in the older neighbourhoods where there are many lots available for construction.

Instead, the province did not take a leadership role, did not say to the city, of which, by the way, the majority of the city councillors on the current City of Winnipeg Council are of the same ilk as the four or five previous city councillors who now sit on the government benches. They are prodevelopment. They do not care about the needs of the older parts of the city of Winnipeg. They do not represent the older parts of the city of Winnipeg, with one glaring exception, if I may be so bold as to take just a slight detour, and that is the member for Daniel Mc ward, one of the wards that I represent, Mr. Silva, who chronically votes with the prodevelopment faction in the City of Winnipeg. He is a man who represents along with his fellow councillor, who also is a very prodevelopment person, Mr. Prystanski; the two of them represent some of the poorest neighbourhoods not only in the city of Winnipeg, not only in the province of Manitoba, but in the country of Canada. Their voting record on issues such as this is deplorable. One would hope that the voters take cognizance of this.

However, the City of Winnipeg with its prodevelopment majority asked this Province of Manitoba to give them this housing credit, and the province did not say, gee, okay, that is a good concept, but what do we have here? We have an inner city that is dying. We have lots of spaces in the older neighbourhoods where we could put good solid new homes where people would go. People do not mind older neighbourhoods, and I think that is something that is missing from the mindset of members opposite. Many people, if they had good housing stock, would choose to live in the older neighbourhoods of the city of Winnipeg. You drive down even the parts of the

inner city that have very bad housing stock, Langside, Furby, Sherbrook, Maryland—[interjection]

Yes, as the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) reminds me, there are some very good public housing units in those neighbourhoods, but it is a mix. It is a neighbourhood in transition. It is a neighbourhood that needs assistance. It is a neighbourhood that could have been made much more positive with some assistance from the Province of Manitoba in The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act, but, as I was saying, even those neighbourhoods and those streets that have a mix that are in trouble in some areas, the elm trees along those streets are gorgeous and beautiful and make it a far more pleasing neighbourhood physically than, for at least half of the year, the newer neighbourhoods where the trees are new, where sometimes the trees have not even been planted yet.

There is a sense of community in many of our older neighbourhoods that needs to be developed in the newer neighbourhoods. There are schools built. There is the infrastructure there. The costs to the city, the costs to the province, the costs to developers in these older neighbourhoods would be smaller than they are in putting more housing into newer areas within the City of Winnipeg, could have taken a leadership role in this regard, could have said to the city, no, sorry, we represent the entire province. The province chose not to take this advantage that was given to them by the City of Winnipeg, and for that we are deeply sorry, because I think an opportunity was lost, an opportunity that the province could have taken to show that they do care about the City of Winnipeg. They are not just passively passing through any prodevelopment amendment that comes from the City of Winnipeg.

* (1820)

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, on that regard alone, in addition to the other areas that the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) has raised, other concerns with the potentials lost, if I may say in this bill, we are not going to vote against this bill. We do think that any time you amend The City of Winnipeg Act, you have an opportunity to strengthen the city. You have an opportunity to do something about perhaps giving more money to the City of Winnipeg for Dutch elm disease, especially as a result of the horrific outcomes that we

are going to be faced with as a result of the flood. Last year we had a doubling of the loss of trees in Manitoba from 2 percent to 4 percent. We are losing our urban forest. We are losing our elm trees along our riverbanks. The Province has kept its Dutch elm grant to the city at \$700,000 for the last three or four years at least. There was an opportunity to actually be proactive in dealing with the City of Winnipeg amendments. Every time you bring that bill forward, you have a real opportunity, and I regret to say that the provincial government chose not to take advantage of some of those opportunities, and for that we are very sorry. Another golden chance has been lost among many by this government.

With those few words I will conclude my remarks on Bill 34.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Helwer): Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 34, The City of Winnipeg Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

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

Bill 35—The Condominium Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), that Bill 35, The Condominium Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les condominiums et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Helwer): Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading, Bill 35, The Condominium Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

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

Bill 37—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), that Bill 37, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Loi modifiant le Code de la route), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Helwer): Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 37, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

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

Bill 40—The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), that Bill 40, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood): Mr. Acting Speaker, the whole issue of labour-sponsored funds became a serious concern in the 1980s when often companies that were successful and profitable would nevertheless decide, for reasons that often had nothing to do with the local plant and the profitability of that plant, that they were going to shut down.

Probably many honourable members will remember the Varta battery plant out by the airport in Winnipeg. It was one of those plants which, in spite of being

profitable, in spite of having a very strong and capable sales force and a workforce that was being productive, suddenly the announcement was made that we are shutting her down, and a lot of good jobs went with that plant being closed down.

Well, in the case of Manitoba, that was one of the participating moments that caused the government of Howard Pawley to begin discussions with the labour movement towards the development of a fund that would allow for the investment of public funds, the workers' funds, pension funds in a Venture Capital Corporation, managed by the labour movement, that would enable companies like that company I referred to, the Varta battery company, to be taken over sometimes with the workers' involvement, sometimes without, but the whole purpose being to maintain the investment, to maintain the jobs, to strengthen the economic infrastructure of a city.

Now, setting up these funds was an innovation in Canada at that time. There were only a couple of equivalent funds. In Quebec there was the solidarity fund, which is an offshoot of the Caisse de dépôt and in Ontario they have begun to develop the Working Ventures fund. So the Crocus Fund was one of the early funds developed in Canada, and, of course, was the first and to date the only fund developed in Manitoba.

Now, it is quite a tribute to Manitobans' commitment to their own economy and a tribute to Manitobans' willingness to invest in a fund that was to be managed very professionally and very competently by the labour movement, Mr. Acting Speaker. The record of Crocus is truly astounding. With an initial guarantee and initial working capital of \$2 million put forward by the government which we supported—after all, we had initiated the development of the fund before 1988—the Crocus Fund grew more quickly than any other labour-sponsored fund in Canada.

The fund grew first to \$7 million, then to \$20 million, and then to over \$35 million. Most recently it grew to over \$60 million in contributed capital, all money from Manitobans, all committed to investing in productive, high-quality jobs for Manitobans.

* (1830)

Mr. Acting Speaker, it does not stop there. The Crocus Fund has a very careful investment screen. This is the term they use to describe the process by which they screen investments that might be made by the fund. They have some very important criteria which I think all members, and particularly the government, might consider when it is looking at economic development.

For example, they look at the question of whether the proposed investment is environmentally sound and environmentally sustainable. They look at the issue of whether the proposed investment will turn over some of its profits to its workers, and they look at the question of whether down the road the company is prepared to turn over ownership through an employee buy out or employee ownership transfer. They look at employment equity. They look at a whole range of good corporate citizenship, sound modern management practices, which will give companies the best possible chance to survive and thrive.

The record of the fund, Mr. Acting Speaker, is outstanding. The fund's units, first of all, have increased in value some 15 percent since the fund began operation a few years back when it was initiated. Now, that may not sound like a great record, but you have to remember that most of the fund's resources were not invested until fairly recently. In fact, it still has over \$30 million in capital available for investment. So really, it has had an outstanding success rate and some very good companies which have come on the Manitoba scene, including things like Westsun International, Green Gates Restaurant, and a number of other companies have been the recipients of Crocus investments.

I know Crocus has taken great pride in the work that it has done, and I would commend the government for working with the Crocus Fund officers and directors to prepare the amendments in this bill which were done with the Crocus Funds' involvement and direct knowledge. This is the way this kind of legislation, of course, should be developed and amended. So we will be supporting this bill, because it helps move forward the purposes of the Crocus Fund which, of course I am sure, all honourable members and certainly those on this side of the House strongly support. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Helwer): Is the House ready for the question?

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I propose next to deal with Bills 9, 55 and 61, for the information of honourable members; firstly, Bill 9.

DEBATE ON THIRD READINGS

Bill 9—The Public Utilities Board Amendment Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Helwer): To resume debate on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Radcliffe), Bill 9, The Public Utilities Board Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Régie des services publics), standing in the name of the honourable member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

Is there leave to have the bill remain standing?

Some Honourable Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Helwer): No. No leave.

Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I want to just make a few concluding comments

I am disappointed the government did not listen to the substance of our objections and did not listen to the specifics of concerns that were made by various groups at the public hearings. We have already stated at debate at second reading that this is just a continued weakening of consumers' rights at the Public Utilities Board. It allows for delegated power to continue to exist in the hands of the political appointees at the Public Utilities Board.

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

It is, we think, not in the best interests of consumers for this forbearance to be provided in the Public Utilities Board. We have spoken against that at second reading, and when we hear this government talking about the public interest, it usually means you had better hold on to your wallets because the opposite is actually true. Just look at the public interest of selling the telephone system that used to go to the PUB, and the Premier (Mr. Filmon), of course, was wrong in this Chamber this week. We did not have time to correct all his mistakes, but he was wrong in the Chamber the other day when he said decisions were made at cabinet on telephone rate increases. They were made at the Public Utilities Board, so was hydro, so was the gas company.

What was added by the government, which was a correct decision in my view, was the Manitoba Public Auto Insurance, and that was added to the PUB jurisdiction. But, of course, they only added part of what they look at, at the PUB. They did not add even this latest rate increase proposal. They call it 4 percent, but everybody that has reviewed it knows it is 9 percent because some of the other changes that are part of the hidden group are not rate increases. They are just matters that provide less coverage, are not rate increases; they are just getting shafted by another name. So we are disappointed that this government is not strengthening the Public Utilities Board, for example, dealing with the Minister responsible for the Public Insurance Corporation (Mr. McCrae) requiring that the changes that were being made go before the PUB. **Maybe somewhere we can get some justice.**

Look at this government that has surrendered to car thieves in this province. The deductible is no longer being covered by the public auto insurance and, of course, what does this government do? They wave a white flag and say, we surrender to the car thieves, we are going to make the victims pay for the stolen cars, we are not going to go after the thieves, we are going to go after the victims. Of course, that is the hypocrisy of members opposite that talk tough and run away from any protection for consumers.

We look at this bill in partnership with the government's Hydro bill where they put more power to the PUB, and, of course, this bill plus the Hydro bill again should worry us, but it is a part of a bigger

pattern, the bigger pattern of deregulation. The deregulation steps follow like this—reorganize the Crown corporation, deregulate the Crown corporation, say it is going to a week in Public Utilities Board with political appointees, promise not to sell it during the election campaign, hire brokers a couple of weeks after that, do not tell the minister responsible so he will not tell the public the truth, then you sell it, then you amend the legislation and then you say, oh, we do not know what happened, we do not know how to protect the people, and we are not going to take any position on donations to the Conservative Party or anything else.

That is the pattern of the Conservative government, and they think—maybe they have been told by the same people that did not tell them that they were going to sell telephones so that they can get away with it next time around. I suggest to members opposite that if any Manitoban thinks that the Tories will keep Hydro in public ownership, they are just not going to think that because they know that the last time they were told, yes, you can cross your heart, you can cross your fingers, but when you cross out your word from the last election campaign, that is the end of it for the people, and it will be the end of a lot of seats in the next election, because the people know they cannot trust members opposite with their public assets. They sure know they certainly cannot trust them even after they try to justify the sale.

This weakening of the PUB is a continuation of the government's absolute priority to protect the corporate interest over and above the consumer interest, and there is no question that the public gets gouged time and time again by this government. If they like the example of the PUB getting out of regulating prices, they will love gas prices. You know, this is the model that this government likes, these kind of cartels that operate at the expense of consumers rather than helping consumers through some kind of protection or some kind of other body.

I also want to say that the Section 34(1) is different in the telecommunications act, and that was pointed out to the minister. I am surprised he did not listen to the local gas company here in Manitoba. [interjection] Yes. I said listen; I did not say act. Most of the times you do the opposite. I thought they would have paid attention to some of the legitimate arguments made by the inner

city gas or the Centra Gas, and obviously 74.1(3) dealing with the word “associates” has not been properly considered by the government, and we were disappointed on that.

On the bigger picture, we are voting against this bill and we are voting against the Tory agenda, and we are voting for consumers and with consumers by voting against Bill 9. Thank you.

* (1840)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: No.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Doer: On division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Deputy Chair, Speaker, we will call you Mr. Speaker; we will promote you.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 55—The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On Bill 55 (The Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Hydro-Manitoba), standing in the name of the honourable member for St. James (Ms. Mihychuk), is

there leave for this to come back before the House? Leave? [agreed]

Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk (St. James): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to put a few words on the record in one of the final stages of the passage of this bill through this process, and our extreme disappointment with the Conservative government's attitude, arrogance and insistence on ramming through a bill that has significant economic consequences and is on the minds of all Manitobans.

This government has said no to us over and over and over again. That, we say, we are not surprised by, but for them to reject citizens' request for public hearings, for the government to reject the call by First Nations communities under the umbrella organization of MKO, to reject the calls by the workers of Manitoba Hydro, the CUPE workers who came forward and asked the government to provide time for consultation and provide hearing time—for those reasons, we say shame on the government that they did not provide an opportunity for Manitobans to talk about the future of Manitoba Hydro.

Now our side has put forward in committee several amendments, amendments under Section 2, that the government refused to consider, sections that dealt with a commitment to be stated clearly and boldly in the bill that the purpose of Manitoba Hydro was to provide to all Manitobans, to make the mission of Manitoba Hydro to serve Manitobans wherever they reside with reliable, cost-effective and efficient power at the lowest possible rate. That is the goal of Manitoba Hydro today, and that is the goal that we ask the government to ensure in the future, and they said no.

We asked the government then to consider ensuring that Manitoba Hydro continued its path of energy conservation, including public education, conversion to more efficient means of using power and research and development in new sources of energy. A concept that you would think the other side of the House, given their rhetoric on sustainable development, would accept such a motion, a motion that we encourage Manitoba Hydro to use conservation projects, develop alternative energy sources. In fact, that is part of the reason for the bill. They refused. They said no to conservation. They said no to research development.

Subclause (e) of our amendment asked the government to put in the bill that Manitoba Hydro respect the environment, to actually put into place the principles of sustainable development as articulated in their Bill 61 of sustainable development. Now, would that seem a hard thing for the government to accept? Hardly, since indeed this House may be accepting Bill 61.

Well, we will see, but the principles of sustainable development which the Premier (Mr. Filmon), in particular, stands up and trumpets, Mr. Sustainability has now said he is not willing to say to Manitoba Hydro you are to operate under the principles of sustainable development. They said no. The Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro said no to sustainable development.

Now, we also brought in an amendment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in regards to 15(2), and this was the government's attempt to say do not worry, be happy, trust us. Well, the message that we gave the government is you have no credibility. Nobody believes you. nobody believes you, nobody believes you. When they had the ability to actually put in an amendment that was going to ensure a vote to the citizens of Manitoba before the sale of the corporation, would they do that? No. The minister said that was not necessary. The government was elected. Did we not hear this before? The government was elected with a mandate. They were going to make the decision about the future of Manitoba Hydro.

Well, I can say to you that if they sincerely wanted to make a commitment to the people of Manitoba, they would have adopted our amendment and said we will accept the citizens' vote. We will provide the people of Manitoba the opportunity to discuss fully and to decide on the future of Manitoba Hydro, not like the process they used in MTS, but, no, they did not do that. They put in this little amendment, this clause, in The Hydro Act which is only as valid as the pieces of legislation that comes in here.

The next session the government can decide to bring in another amendment to The Manitoba Hydro Act, and it can negate this clause completely. Not only that, when they had the opportunity to say to Manitobans—and to adopt the amendment, they adopted it under the

premise or under the guise that this is going to cost Manitobans money.

Now, I would say that given if they had the commitment, which they say they do, if they had the commitment, there would be no fear, for indeed there would never be the call for the sale of Manitoba Hydro. But no, they said no to that. They said no to the suggestion that the expenses, if that is their hurdle, be incurred by Manitoba Hydro. They said no to a vote by the people of Manitoba. They said no to the people who own, control and wish to keep Manitoba Hydro.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is indeed a government and a minister of arrogance. The minister of arrogance says no, it is not necessary, this government will decide the future of Manitoba Hydro. Not only that, he said it is not the whole Filmon team, it is the cabinet. The cabinet will decide on the future of Manitoba Hydro. So, I would say that the people of Manitoba are correct when they say phooey on the Tories, we do not believe them. We believe that the government—

An Honourable Member: How do you spell that?

* (1850)

Ms. Mihychuk: I will be getting a phone call from Hansard—that the government of Manitoba cannot be trusted, that the Filmon government cannot be trusted with Manitoba Hydro, that, indeed, their record proves their untrustworthiness and their arrogance. The pattern is consistent. What they did in the first effort for MTS and what they did for Manitoba Hydro, reorganize into business units; No. 2, deregulate MTS, deregulate Manitoba Hydro; No. 3, assure that the government has no intentions to sell. Is it ringing any bells? Do we see a pattern here? Number 4, an election where you deny, deny, deny.

Well, I would say this where it is going to change. Manitobans have caught on. We are going to go to the next provincial election. Manitoba Hydro will be up front in the election campaign. As we have heard from our Leader on this side, Manitobans will have, despite the will of the Filmon team, a voice in the future of Manitoba Hydro through the next election at least, since they rejected over and over and over again the vote of the people.

Then what happened to MTS after the election? The brokers were called in only two months later. Tell us that they had no plans. That seems extremely unrealistic. Brokers were called in. Well, brokers, what do you think? Do you think we should sell the telephone system? Gee, you want to make \$35 million? Boy, let us really think hard and long about this one. Well, the conclusion was fairly obvious. "Sell the telephone company" is the message the government got. It is the message it carried out, and do not let the government try and fool any Manitoban that they have not been approached by interested people to sell Manitoba Hydro, that indeed that option is being put before them. Indeed, it is a serious concern when the Premier (Mr. Filmon) himself stands up and says the future of Manitoba Hydro depends on a totally deregulated environment. Well, those sound like very ominous words.

Manitobans want a say. Manitobans want Manitoba Hydro. When the Premier is sending out the message that the future ownership is dependent on regulation, there is little need to worry why MKO, why CUPE, why Manitobans want six months to discuss the future of Manitoba Hydro. They want to be able to tell this arrogant minister, this arrogant government, and this arrogant Premier what they want to do with Manitoba Hydro, and what they can do with their plans.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, six months is a reasonable amendment that we brought forward in this House at second reading, that we brought forward to committee, that we discussed even today and where we had a recorded vote asking the members of this Chamber to provide the citizens of Manitoba, the First Nations communities, the workers at Manitoba Hydro and everyone concerned with Manitoba's economy, an opportunity to discuss the significant changes to Manitoba Hydro.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to say that this side of the House is in favour of interchange agreements. We have successfully built a strong Crown corporation that can provide the lowest rates in North America and probably the lowest rates in the world; a Crown corporation that is efficient, effective and employing Manitobans and working for Manitobans in terms of economic development; a Crown corporation that must absolutely torment the Filmon team because of its success:

absolutely a perfect record in terms of its history; a commitment that Manitobans made to a Crown corporation, took the risk through a Crown corporation and now we reap the benefits. So let no one say that the New Democrats do not support Manitoba Hydro.

Indeed, we developed many of the northern projects, including Limestone, which is now being paid out of the pockets of the Americans, and we appreciate every cent that they are paying. It will be soon paid off, the whole development project for Limestone, and the revenues from that export agreement sale to the northern states will then be for the benefit totally of Manitobans and for Manitoba Hydro. So let no one say that the New Democrats are opposed to sales agreements. In fact, our record is the record of success. We signed the deal. We actually got down to the table and signed it, and when we left them with another deal on the table for another significant economic development project, did we sign the deal? No. We did not sign the deal. The Tory government, which rode that deal right into the dirt—we do not have a commitment for that project from Ontario that was prepared and ready to go, and they blew it, they blew it, they blew it.

So let the government reflect on the record, Manitobans took the risk, believed in the Crown corporation and were about to reap the profits, and we say congratulations to a strong Crown corporation. Stronger than any private sector energy firm.

Now let us just reflect on that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. What about those theories about only private can do it better. Hardly. In this case there is unquestionably—this is a case where a Crown corporation was successful, is successful and is virtually guaranteed to be successful in the future. Is it only our side that recognizes that? No.

You know, this side of the House recognizes the importance of Manitoba Hydro and its security in the future as a Crown corporation. And that other group of individuals who is fairly private-sector orientated, the Dominion Bond Rating agency, what do they say about Manitoba Hydro's future? That in fact this Crown Corporation is in probably the best position to manage deregulation, to manage the changes in the energy industry and be successful as a Crown corporation.

So when we look at the history of Manitoba Hydro, and when we see the successes of Manitoba Hydro, and we have seen this is the third year of record profits, and we have seen Manitoba Hydro provide economic development for the North, economic security for the south, reliable and low-priced service to Manitobans, we say to them, this is an important economic issue that Manitobans want to talk about.

When we try and talk about it, the government says no. The government said no to six months. The government said no to the vote. The government said no to sustainability. No wonder people wonder what this government is up to. They have rejected every reasonable amendment that we have brought forward. No wonder the people of Manitoba do not believe you now, do not believe you in the election and will not believe you in the future when you talk about your intentions not to sell Manitoba Hydro.

* (1900)

So although, you know, the absolute arrogance is what to me seems the most disturbing, the Minister who is responsible for Manitoba Hydro is also the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs, a person that should have some sensitivity, some appreciation that the North and northern communities who probably sacrificed, without question, the most for hydro development, have asked this government in all sincerity to provide an opportunity to consult. What does the minister say? All people are equal. That sounds like it came right out of the—what colour is the Reform Party?—right out of the Reform Party manual, we are all equal. Well, we all have the ability, he said, to come to committee.

I do not know if the minister who is the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Newman) has actually been in Shamattawa, Island Lake, Norway House. I mean, if, if—and the other side is shouting, I am sure he has—well, if the minister has been to those communities, he would understand that the ability of those people is not the same as those that live on Broadway or the stockbrokers that work on Portage Avenue in the Richardson Building.

Now, I can assure you having worked in the North for over 12 years, having visited those very communities, having been to a number of the northern

hydro projects, that, indeed, a person's ability to come down to committee with very short notice, I might add, is not one of equality.

There is no appreciation by the Minister of Northern Affairs for the difficulty in terms of logistics, in terms of notification, to actually attend a committee hearing, and when a reasonable request by MKO comes forward in an attempt to reach out to this government, they said no. They said, no, they would not consider postponing the implementation of this bill for only six months. No, they would not listen to the chiefs in the North. No, they would not listen to the people of Manitoba and their request for an opportunity to speak on Manitoba Hydro's future.

I think that the record stands for itself, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This government has no credibility in terms of its voice that we have no intentions to sell Hydro. Its record in terms of this House for this bill has been one of ramming it through, arrogance, closed door, nonconsultative.

So we say to this government that is an extremely disappointing approach to dealing with something that is so fundamentally important to Manitoba's future, to Manitoba's economy and to the Manitoba people. For those reasons, for those reasons we are opposed to Bill 55, and opposed to this government's record of dumping and selling off every Crown corporation it can lay its hands on. If it were not for public outrage of the sale of MTS, Manitoba Hydro would be on the block today. So we say, let us go to the people of Manitoba with the future of Hydro, and let us put it to the people, the citizens of Manitoba, where it belongs, and not in the hands of the Filmon team and this Conservative government. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division.

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you please call report stage on Bill 61?

REPORT STAGE

Bill 61—The Sustainable Development and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill 61, The Sustainable Development and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur le développement durable et modifications corrélatives), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in, by leave.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 61—The Sustainable Development and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Rural Development): By leave, I move, on behalf of the Minister of Natural Resources, seconded by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill 61, The Sustainable Development and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur le développement durable et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Stan Struthers (Dauphin): Ever since the white paper on sustainable development was put forth by this current Conservative government, it received all kinds of expressions of concern on all kinds of different issues. It produced quite an amazing backing off, quite an amazing watering down of the legislation that eventually did become introduced in this House not that long ago.

Just since there have been many reviews of this act done, I just want to briefly indicate some of the main things that the bill does and then add some comments from there.

What Bill 61, The Sustainable Development Act, does is, it commits government departments to the principles of sustainable development. It establishes an advisory group, the sustainable development round table, which is chaired by the Premier and has a fixed number of cabinet ministers sitting on it and fixes a secretariat, or a Sustainable Development Coordination Unit, and requires the government to produce a sustainable development strategy within two years and a set of sustainable indicators within three years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the concerns that we had on this side of the House was a fear that the government would pass this act, having put a whole number of controversial issues from Section 7 of the white paper on hold temporarily, pass the act, and then go back to regulations and Order-in-Council and essentially get in through the backdoor many of the things that Manitobans resisted since August of 1996 when the white paper first came out.

* (1910)

That was one of the concerns that we had. It still remains a concern, so what we did was, we introduced a couple of amendments in the committee which were defeated by the government. One of the amendments to Section 7 of Bill 61, simply put, was an attempt on our part simply to put into the act the contents of a letter that the Minister of Natural Resources had sent to me in which the minister commits himself and his government to bringing to the House any of these changes, any decisions that the government makes in terms of The Sustainable Development Act, in particular Section 7, Part 7, of the white paper. They

said that they would introduce into the Legislature either a new statute or amendments to this Sustainable Development Act should it be okayed or approved by this House. So I appreciate and thank the Natural Resources minister for writing me that letter and putting in writing his government's commitment to coming to this House through either a statute, a new bill, a companion bill or an amendment to existing legislation. I also want to make clear that the Natural Resources minister and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) both have committed themselves to what they term as extensive consultation processes before they introduce any of the controversial parts of Part 7 of the white paper.

I was quite disappointed, however, that the government saw fit to defeat the two amendments that I put forth. The second amendment that I did put forth was an attempt to have The Regulations Act govern the decisions that are made by this government in making regulations that go along with this act. The reason I wanted that amendment to be adopted by the committee was to ensure that Manitobans have every possible opportunity to know what is going on with decisions that this government makes in terms of sustainable development. Now if the government is making regulations having to do with this act, I would want those regulations to be gazetted so that people could be made aware that changes are being made by this government in the future. The government saw fit to vote that down. Like I said, I was disappointed that happened, but it did and we have to deal with this act now at third reading.

I think maybe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I am most disappointed with in this bill is that this government missed a real opportunity to make some good positive steps in protecting our environment. I have talked before about how in tune the younger generation is with sustainability, the environment and how much further I think they are than we are. I think students who are in school as we speak—I guess not as we speak—but this week those students are moving on into the world eventually, and they will be making decisions in this Legislature having to do with sustainable development. I have a lot of confidence in their ability to make good sound environmental sustainable decisions. What we need is the legislation in place to help them. What we need is to be able to pass on our environment in as good, if not better condition than what it is today.

One of the presenters the night before last at the committee stage on this bill made several very good suggestions, some positive proactive decisions that I think this government should have taken up. I think it is incumbent upon any government when it is presented with some good ideas, to take a very good look at the possibilities and then make the effort to incorporate that into their legislation. For example, whistle-blower protection was something that one of the presenters put forth to the government the other night and made a good, solid case to have the government incorporate that into the legislation. This government, of all governments, needs to give this kind of protection, even for their own people who work within their own government departments, to be able to blow the whistle when they see pollution, excessive energy waste, anything that has a bearing on the environment.

This government's track record is not one that they should be all that proud of. When a civil servant questioned what the government was doing in the hearings on Louisiana-Pacific, that civil servant quickly found himself out of a job.

Those are the kinds of things that tell me and others in this province that whistle-blower legislation is something that is necessary. If we cannot depend on our civil servants for good, objective, well-reasoned, well-thought-out information to make our decisions, then we do not have much environmental protection out there. If people get fired because they do that, then that has a chilling effect throughout the whole civil service.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another suggestion that was made by this group that presented the other night was that government subsidies to economic sectors that result in wasteful use of natural resources should be eliminated. They make a good point. Why would we want to take taxpayers' dollars and turn it over to a company that does not make the best use of our natural resources? We have a lot of natural resources out there, but they are limited. We have to always remember that they are limited.

They also suggested that we embrace the zero emission philosophy. They understood that we may not always be at zero emissions, but that should be our goal and the government should be making that part of any legislation that has to do with sustainable development.

The principles of sustainable development are set out in Bill 61, so why would zero emissions not be part of the principles or at least part of goals that this government would shoot for?

(Mr. Gerry McAlpine, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Mr. Acting Speaker, our side of the House has been involved in the debate on sustainable development for quite some time, and we have done a lot of work consulting with Manitobans and with anyone who will meet with us and talk about sustainable development, sustainability, protecting the environment, protecting our natural resources.

I just want to mention three things that people have been telling us that are necessary. One is an environmental bill of rights. Now this is something that I think this government should take very seriously. We need something that citizens of our province can point to and say: there is our protection; there is what is making us sustainable; there is what is protecting our environment. So we can use the resources in an intelligent way for a long period of time.

People can point to that environmental bill of rights, and they can use that to protect our sustainability in Manitoba. We also suggest that the province could incorporate an environmental ombudsman into its Sustainable Development Act, an ombudsman with some power to take a look at the environmental bill of rights that I would hope the government would introduce at some point, an ombudsman who could look at that environmental bill of rights and say: here is a culprit; here is what the government should do to that company or to that group that is emitting harmful chemicals into our air or dumping harmful chemicals into our water or practices that are harmful to our environment generally.

* (1920)

We need somebody independent from government, who can report to government on the people out there that are breaking our environmental laws. That, I think, is very important.

One last thing that I want to put forth to the government, and hope that some day there will be a

government on the other side who will take this initiative and take this concept seriously, and that is the concept of intervenor funding. It makes no sense to me to do a whole lot of work involving assessments and impact studies, all kinds of research, simply to prove that a developer can go ahead and use a resource for that developer's own profit. What we have seen in the past in this province is not a fair playing field. It is not a fair playing field. You can see it over and over, one example after the next.

A big company comes in and they see a resource that they want to get a hold of and they want to make some money out of it and provide employment, not nearly as much employment as what the government brags about, not nearly. Every project that this government has gotten involved in has vastly disappointed the people locally in terms of lack of employment, but let us accept the fact that some of our resources can be used to provide jobs for people. There is nothing wrong with that. What is wrong is the process that we use in order to make those decisions in the first place. What is wrong is the lack of input that we seek from the people of Manitoba who are most affected, most impacted by these decisions on natural resources.

Mr. Acting Speaker, what we have seen in this province is an unfair playing field. You can look back to the Louisiana-Pacific hearings, for example, that took place in our province not too long ago. On one side you had the company with a whole raft of lawyers and a whole raft of people hired to make L-P's case, consultants, PR people, all kinds of scientists and biologists. You name it, they had it on one side. Who was on the other side? Concerned individuals with not as deep pockets as what the Louisiana-Pacific would have, but nevertheless people who are very committed to their areas, to their local communities, very committed to building healthy communities. They wanted a say in what was going on in the Swan Valley area, too. Did they have a chance? Did they have any hope at all of convincing this government that Louisiana-Pacific and the whole debate involving Louisiana-Pacific should have had any other outcome than what eventually happened?

What made matters worse is that not only were the pockets of Louisiana-Pacific deep, but the taxpayers' own dollars were going towards proving that Louisiana-

Pacific was going to be paving the streets of Swan River in gold. The Department of Natural Resources threw its weight behind the developer, behind the company. Now, is that fair? If L-P was good for the area, was going to provide employment, was going to follow all the environmental rules that we have in our province, why could we not have intervenor funding for those people on the other side to put forth—[interjection] Mr. Acting Speaker, now that just proves what the people opposite are saying now that trying to set up this phoney jobs versus the environment kind of a baloney argument that they come up with, it tells me that this government does not have the imagination to look any further than just simply tossing our resources up for some big American company to come in and exploit. Now we—[interjection] There we go again, you do not like Louisiana-Pacific. That is the only argument that this government could come with. They do not have the imagination whatsoever to say that we should fund some of these people on the other side of the debate, so they can come forward and simply make their case with the same kind of resources available to them as the proponent of the idea had available to them.

What is the government scared of in these situations? What are you scared of when it comes to providing a fair playing field for both sides of this argument? [interjection] The former Minister of Natural Resources is not scared of anything and I believe him. What I want to know is, when will some government make the playing field level so that we can get a good discussion about what we do with our resources in this province. This Bill 61 does not allow for that. This government does not have the vision to say that we need a level playing field, does not have the ability to commit itself, or the imagination to commit itself to having some funding going towards smaller groups, the individual people who can then muster an argument against the large, multinational corporations that come in here and pull the string of this provincial government. This would have been an opportunity for this government to do that.

With those comments, I want to leave a little bit of time for some of my colleagues to speak and just urge this government to shed its 18th Century view of resource extraction and pull itself up into the 21st Century, and then we will start to support some of its measures when it comes to resource management. But

until that time, until this government gets itself into the 21st Century—heck, it would be a nice improvement if this government got itself into the 19th Century—and started to catch up to the rest of us a little bit.

With those words, thank you very much.

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Acting Speaker, I just want to put a few words on the record in terms of Bill 61, The Sustainable Development Act. As the member for Dauphin has mentioned, the government released a white paper well over a year ago that was released to the public, allowed for public debate on the principles of this government's version of sustainable development. It faced a great deal of criticism in the environmental community, in the mining community. Many different groups out there, the municipalities as well, opposed some of the clauses within that bill, and the government was forced to withdraw that bill and make substantial changes to it, and we have before us today Bill 61, the watered-down version of the white paper.

I would like to just read a few lines from a newspaper story from The Globe and Mail, and it is titled Canadians Put Environment First, and it goes on: Nearly three-quarters of Canadians feel that protecting the environment is more important than promoting economic growth. The survey also shows that world-wide concern for the environment has deepened in the past five years, and the people around the world are becoming more concerned about the effects environmental problems can have on health.

So it is a very important issue, it is a very important debate that we are having this evening on this bill and on the government's track record on environmental and sustainable development issues on where this province or this government is taking us in terms of sustainable development. As was mentioned by my colleague, the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers), it is clear to me and to members on this side of the House that the government is taking a rather prodevelopment approach when it comes to development in our province. He also mentioned the fact that the younger generation, individuals who are in schools, have far more concerns, they are far more aware of environmental issues, which is good of course. We applaud that, recognizing that these individuals are the future leaders in our province,

and it is important for us as legislators in this generation to leave a legacy to our children.

* (1930)

But what will that legacy be? What, in fact? Looking back at the Prairies or the area that we live in and what has happened over the past 150 years and the level of development and the change of the ecosystem, Dr. Adrian Forsyth, and I would just like to read this one quote: Within one human lifetime, the Prairies have passed from wilderness to become the most altered habitat in this country and one of the most disturbed, ecologically simplified and overexploited regions in the world. That I think, Mr. Acting Speaker, is an indictment of the way we have treated the Prairies and our environment over the past century. It appears that this exploitation of the Prairies has continued.

It was not that long ago, again 150 year ago, that there were grizzly bears on the Prairies. Of course, we all know the fact that huge buffalo herds made their homes and grazed in this area, but now there are no native buffaloes in this area. I know there are a few herds. There is a herd I know on Highway 59. I often drive by and see, but that is the only plains bison that are in existence here in Manitoba. In fact, it was in a very short period of time that all the herds became extinct in this province, and that was only in the last 150 years. How much has changed. It was basically the same for thousands of years. Some of the current practices of this government and our society, what will that have impacted upon our environment for the next 150 years?

Our economy is based on very much a resource-extraction economy. Some of that extraction is nonrenewable, some of it is, and some of it I feel has been overharvested. The member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) has raised the issue of logging and the effects that that has upon the great forests in this province, mining, hog operations—for example, you know the government is committed to doubling the number of hogs in this province. Well, what impact will that have upon the water, upon the environment in general in this province?

I want to talk a little bit about a story that was relayed to me by my father. When our family moved from

Selkirk out to the area that is commonly known as the Oak Hammock Marsh—we always refer to it as St. Andrew's bog—my great-grandfather, when he moved out from Selkirk there at the turn of the century, my father would tell me the story that he and one of his neighbours would hook up a horse with a wagon, and they would go out and they would shoot, kill, harvest prairie chickens. They would get enough, and their wagon would be full and that would sustain them over the winter. Well, Mr. Acting Speaker, there is not one single prairie chicken left, the greater prairie chicken, left in Manitoba. Although I do not want to blame my great-grandfather for all of the problems that we face now, it was that type of mentality that saw the end of the greater prairie chicken in this area and many other species that are now threatened in this province.

The bill itself, as has been mentioned by my colleague, states that the government should consider principles of sustainable development and all the decision making. The act is full of wishy-washy language that we do not feel distinguishes the environment as being anymore important than any economic activity and, of course, it can be interpreted a number of ways. We are concerned about the round table that becomes mandated in the act. It is an appointed round table and the Premier remains the chairperson of this round table, the round table as established.

We all remember the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in 1990 canoeing down the river in one of his TV ads during the 1990 election. We understand, of course, that was a rented canoe and since then he has hung that canoe up or whoever owned it asked for it back, because we certainly have not seen much in terms of anything of substance from this government as it relates to economic growth in a sustainable way.

It also entrenches the Sustainable Development Co-ordination Unit within the act. There is no indication of the makeup of this act. The history of this unit has not been a very positive one either, Mr. Acting Speaker. They talk about a development strategy and sustainable indicators, and I think it is important that when we talk about sustainable indicators—this is something that I have raised in Estimates with the Minister of Environment over the last number of years when are they going to get these indicators and so on, but the act

does establish the indicators coming into force three years from now. I think it is also important that when you look at indicators and you look at costs, you look at growth, that we also take in the depletion of our ecosystems and put it on the side as a liability in terms of our gross national product.

We are very proud in this province, of course, of our agricultural industry and the amount of economic growth that farming provides to our citizens, but there is no indication as to what some of the downsides of that particular industry may have. I am speaking in terms of the gross national product, for example, where we do not recognize topsoil depletion as an item of depreciation, as you would do in any other business where items that you use, you depreciate those items. I would suggest that when the government looks at indicators that they look at topsoil and forestry, the fish, the minerals, that we do extract as a depreciation that can be scored against economic growth.

I will talk a little bit about the Sustainable Development Innovations Fund. It remains part of the act, and this fund has a reputation of patronage. I have Resolution 18, and if we stay here a couple of more days, perhaps we will get to it. Perhaps we will get to this resolution next week, and we will have a chance to debate it, to debate the merits of this particular fund and how this government has used this fund over the last number of years for patronage appointments and so on. In fact, I wrote to the Provincial Auditor to investigate the disbursement of these funds, and he has agreed to do so. The Auditor has looked at the fact that over 90 percent of these funds have gone to Conservative ridings. In fact, 90 percent of the allocation of these funds in the Sustainable Development Innovations Fund have gone to Conservative-held ridings.

Of course, the purpose of the fund is to promote new activities supporting economic development in harmony with the environment, and it was the result of special taxes, special levies on a number of products.

The Auditor in the past—this is not the first time of course that the Auditor has found some problems with the administration of this fund, in particular, how funds have been disbursed. I can see why, considering when you review the funds that were granted in the last fiscal year, you will see again that the majority of them, the

vast majority of the funds had gone to Conservative ridings. I know that my colleagues have been very diligent in promoting this fund within their own constituencies. I know that groups in their areas have put in applications but, for some reason, they seem to be denied.

* (1940)

There is another disturbing thing—not only is it disturbing, it is clear the government is using this as a patronage mechanism device—money that has been collected by a special levy that all Manitobans pay regardless of how they voted in the last election, but they have also used substantial amounts of that fund for what I would suggest are activities and initiatives that should be paid for out of general revenues.

Last year, in fact, the Manitoba government—here is one—the Manitoba government building initiatives, where Manitoba Government Services, a department of the government, received a grant for a hundred thousand dollars. Now, why did that not come out of the normal operations of that department? Why in fact did that government department have to raid this fund that was supposed to be used for economic or environmentally sustainable and innovative initiatives? They used that fund to promote—they used that \$100,000. The reason they are using it, of course, is to retrofit some of the government buildings. We support that concept, but why are they taking this fund and using that for that purpose?

As you go through it, another one, the Capital Region's waste management strategy, again, that was the Department of Environment—which at one time used to administer this fund, now it is the Department of Natural Resources that administers the fund—but they used to administer the fund, Manitoba Environment under the Minister of Environment (Mr. McCrae), \$15,000 grant, and this goes on and on and on.

One of our concerns was something that we did raise in the resolution, if we can ever get around to actually debating it, is that we feel that the government should use this fund not so much for patronage purposes, but use it more as it was intended. That, of course, is for innovative ideas in terms of sustainable development which, in this province instead of 90 percent going to

the members opposite and only 10 percent coming to this side of the House, in fact the money is paid for by all Manitobans. We feel that there must be a more equitable process in place to ensure that the funds be administered in a fair manner.

We suggested that perhaps this Round Table on the Environment and Economy look at all the grants and decide which applications have merit and then recommend those to the minister or to the cabinet to make the—of course, they make the final decision, but we feel that would be a better process as opposed to the current one. We did raise this with the Auditor. The Auditor is currently investigating this program, so we applaud the Auditor for doing so. We would like to make the system a far more transparent one, one that is far more open to the public.

As my colleague the member for Dauphin (Mr. Struthers) has raised, we support the initiative of course, the general concept of sustainable development. We recognize that we must move toward economic growth and environmental sustainability, but only time will tell whether this act will in fact do that. We know there were some clauses within the other which took away the public out of the process, which we objected to.

Currently those clauses have been removed from this act, and we are concerned that they may be initiated by regulation. But the minister has written to my colleague the member for Dauphin and has indicated that he will not do that. In fact, if they do move on those other areas, they will do so by legislation next year.

We feel, as the member said, that there should be innovator funding. I remember I went to some of the Clean Environment Commission hearings on the granting of a licence to BFI to build their waste disposal site in the R.M. of Rosser, and on one side of the room you have the City of Winnipeg with all their lawyers and engineers and consultants, and on the other side of the room you have BFI with all their engineers and lawyers and consultants, and in the middle there are just members of the public who do not have the resources of either one of those two giants, and they clearly did not have the economic clout or the ability to make an informed statement. It is regrettable that they are

intelligent and knowledgeable individuals, but they just simply did not have the resources that the other two giants had.

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

We do regret the fact that the government in the end did license this facility without looking at the broader issues of waste management within the Capital Region and allowing this Texas-based giant to build this waste disposal site in Rosser against the objections of both the City of Winnipeg and many other environmentalists in our community.

So those are some of the legacies of this government. We would like to see a commission—I know the Clean Environment Commission is continuing within this legislation—but we would like to see perhaps a commission appointed for a period of six years so it is there over the length of any one government and as such would not be so much influenced by the government of the day. Perhaps that commission could report back to this Legislature like the Ombudsman does, the Auditor and so on, which again would take out some of the political manipulation we often see.

We would like to see specific triggers for public hearing and consultation and an environmental bill of rights and an environmental ombudsman. All these I think are very innovative ideas, things that we regret were not part of this piece of legislation. Although we oppose the original draft, the original white paper, this one is much, much watered down. However, we do not feel that it provides better security in terms of protecting the environment; however, it is far less draconian than the white paper.

Mr. Acting Speaker, as I mentioned, we in this House are here passing legislation that will affect generations to come. Again going back to my community, it was not that long ago where it was safe, and it was a common practice to swim in the Red River, to water ski in the Red River. Well, none of that is being done anymore. The only one who ventured into the Red River in recent times was the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Enns). I do not think anyone has done it since. I am not sure if they are looking at the actions of the minister and making a decision based upon that. It is

generally recognized that the Red River is not safe to come in contact with human contact.

I am pleased that with the concern to us that the massive flooding that we had would have a negative impact upon that. The minister has assured me that in fact it has not, but I know that is something that we encourage him to monitor because we know that the beaches in the southern basin of Lake Winnipeg is a resource that is enjoyed by Manitobans and tourists in the upcoming summer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just wanted to say once again that this is a legacy. Whether or not this bill will ensure economic development and sustainability, only time will tell. I think it is important for the government to know that Canadians, as the survey has said, feel that protecting the environment is a very, very important thing and something that we on this side of the House are committed to and that we will ensure over the next number of years that this government is committed to that as well. Thank you very much.

* (1950)

Ms. MaryAnn Mihychuk (St. James): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to put a few words on the record on Bill 61, The Sustainable Development Act, brought forward by this government, a government that talks a lot about sustainability, but its record proves exactly the opposite, a government that in fact has instituted a program that pumps the oil reserves of Manitoba faster and harder than any other jurisdiction ever, reserves that we estimate of approximately 10 years that are being pumped out at double the rate. Clearly, that is not a policy that is in harmony with sustainable development, with the long-term use of the oil and gas reserves of Manitoba.

The heritage of that program will be derelict wells. The heritage of that program will be only an oil and gas museum in Virden, because if they continue to pump out the reserves in the oil and gas pools of Manitoba, there will be nothing left for future generations. It goes right in the very face of their so-called Sustainable Development Act and the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) touting of sustainability when his own Minister of Energy and Mines, the jump-to-the-pump Minister Darren Praznik and now recently replaced jump-to-the-

pump Minister David Newman continue the program of exploiting the oil and gas reserves of Manitoba.

Now not only is there a program, a giveaway of money to Albertan oil companies—as if they need to be subsidized—I would like to suggest that there are many other individuals who could use that money and hire much more needy than Albertan oil companies but, no, this government decided it needed to subsidize Albertan oil companies. Not only should they be condemned on that and on their program of exploiting and high-grading the use of oil and gas reserves, but they have now decided to open new oil wells in Turtle Mountain Park. They do not have enough. They are not pumping it out fast enough. They now have to go into a park to open up more wells. We say it is a shame. Shame on this government for not respecting Manitoba's resources, not understanding the limited reserves we have, particularly in terms of our fossil fuels. Our natural oil and gas reserves are very small compared to other jurisdictions, and then, indeed, they have broken the fundamental principles of sustainable development in those programs.

Now, I also want to mention at this time another area that I am very familiar with, and that is the area of aggregates. Aggregates are materials used for, of course, construction, for concrete, asphalt, road construction, building trades. It is a very important resource. Now, this government has a propensity for things that glitter, and I am afraid that sand and gravel—of course, stone does not glitter. So it is not a glitzy mineral, but it is fundamentally important to the Capital Region, fundamentally important to Manitobans. Do we know what the reserves for aggregate are in the Capital Region? Unfortunately, no. Do we know how much is going to be available in the future? Unfortunately, we do not. Does the government realize the largest stockpile of aggregate—where is it? The provincial park known as Birds Hill. Birds Hill is the largest resource of aggregate available to the city of Winnipeg. That is why there was a threat to Birds Hill Park, in terms of their parks policy, because indeed it is extremely attractive to the construction industry, and they want the availability and access to the sand and gravel resources in Birds Hill.

You can look at other jurisdictions, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In Toronto, they use barges to bring in

aggregate. They haul it for over 60 miles. Here in Manitoba, we, too, are getting in short supply of aggregates. Why? Because if they have not transferred, decentralized, demoted or basically—what was it?—downsized the very people who would assess the situation, they have allowed uncontrolled urban sprawl in the Capital Region, particularly in the area north of the city, extremely dangerous, sterilizing useful aggregate resources both in terms of limestone and in terms of aggregate potential with very little thought of the future, again with very little thought to sustainable development principles. In fact it flies in the very face of sustainability. This government has a responsibility to assess our resources, manage them properly, and ensure they are there for the future. They have failed on all three accounts in terms of the aggregate resources of Manitoba.

I also want to cite two other situations that talk to the hypocrisy of this bill and this government's record. In the area around the R.M. of Woodlands, it is my understanding that the community rose up and objected to the location of a new garbage dump, and they were very concerned about the potential contamination of the water table. Indeed, the government in this case listened to the community and said, no, you know, given the potential threat we will not open another garbage dump at this particular site, I believe if I recall correctly, close to Marquette. It is a coincidence, but that stream, the water table and the stream actually flow into my riding of St. James, so there is a relationship between the people of Marquette and Woodlands and my own home riding here in the city. So you would think that the government would have a certain sensitivity about the contamination, or potential contamination, of that water source. What did the government shortly do thereafter? Approve a massive, huge hog operation in that very same location, suggesting that economic benefits well exceed the environment in this case. So we say that operation should have gone through the same scrutiny as the garbage dump, the same guarantees for the environment, the same principles of sustainability need to be assured.

This government also has rejected the city and the environmental's plea to not allow BFI to open a landfill site in the R.M. of Rosser. Did they listen to the people of Winnipeg, to city councillors, to local

representatives, to hundreds of people who took the time to write to them, to plea to them? Did they listen to the environmentalists? Did they listen to, or consider, sustainability? Does it make sense to open two landfill sites when there is sufficient space in the one that we have? No. Does it make sense to spread out our waste in more sites? No. Does it make sense to threaten our water table for further contamination? No. What drove that decision was based on their own agenda, their own benefits. So I would say shame in terms of their oil and gas policy, their park policy, their aggregate policy or their lack of, the decision in Woodlands and the BFI landfill location. I would say the record of this government is basically to sustain the round table on sustainability and ensure its continuance but not necessarily the health and promotion of a sustainable economy here in Manitoba.

So with those few words, I would like to say that this side and I fully support the principles of sustainable development, extremely disappointed with the government's record, and urge them to actually read and adopt the principles of sustainability as they refuse to do also in Bill 55, the Hydro Act.

So in addition to the other points, I would like to point out that we did attempt to bring in the principles of sustainability in the Hydro Act, and this government refused. So with those comments for the record, I would like to conclude my speech.

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to speak on Bill 61 for a few minutes, and I have listened to my colleagues with great interest. I was very glad to hear the comments of the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) and interested to learn of his request of the Auditor to look at the Sustainable Development Innovations Fund, one which I have had some very, very serious concerns about.

In fact, I would assume that some of the government members have some serious concerns about it, too. I think there was on two or three occasions in which projects were allowed to slip through the net there that were not in Tory ridings. So there must be some concern in the Tory cabinet as well about it.

* (2000)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am also interested in speaking on this bill from the perspective of democracy and open public debate. One of the principles of sustainable development is the requirement for open public discussion, for open information, for the responsibility of any government or agency to involve the public from the very beginning in all of the matters under discussion. If you were to characterize or to think of the Tory government, the Filmon government, open, public, free debate, freely accessible information, are not elements that would come to one's mind. It seems to me that they are at the very bottom of the list for this government, and over the course of this government's history of office, we have seen some very significant changes in the opportunity for the public to become involved in and to debate the issues of the day.

In fact, if honourable members want to read in brief what the Tories really think of public committees and public discussion, they would do well, I think, to read the speech of the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh) in this session when she spoke on special needs, because it really was the epitome in very, I would say, brutal terms of what the government thinks of public discussion. The government, she said, was not going to hold to its election promise of holding public meetings about the special needs review because public meetings only offered the opportunity to the opposition to express its ideas. That is pretty brutal, it is pretty blunt, but it is exactly what the government thinks. It is the way that they have dealt with many, many issues.

Let us just look at the Freedom of Information bill, for example, a white paper that went out, that was barely discussed, very few meetings were held. The minister promised that she would hold a second paper that would have said here is what we heard, a very noble ambition and the very proper way to go about it, just as the principles of sustainable development would support, but it did not happen.

I do not remember which of the ministers of Culture and Heritage it was who said that would not happen, but it did not. So that very important stage of the government saying here is what was said, here is what we heard and here is our next step, it simply did not happen on a bill which has now led to very, very serious concerns about the rights of the people of

Manitoba to have access to their own documents, to their own information about the policies of their own government.

That important step was missed, and the government did very little to rectify the difficulties it ran into in the very small number of public hearings that it had and its inability and its lack of desire, in fact, to discern, to listen to the people on freedom of information.

So it has over the last couple of days had to face quite a barrage of public opinion roused by the Manitoba Library Association, by the Taxpayers Association, by a wide variety of groups who have come together to say, look, this is not what the people of Manitoba want, and you have gone the wrong way. The government, as usual, has its bit between the teeth and it is heading off in the wrong direction. It is heading off in a direction which has nothing to do with the principles of sustainable development.

We have only got to look at today in the House when the government was asked through the opposition on behalf of MKO to delay the passage of one bill, just to delay it so that there could be public discussion in the North in a way in which it has not yet happened, but the government had no time for that; it must go through. There is only one legitimate voice in Manitoba according to this government, and that is the voice of the Filmon cabinet. I do not even know what the caucus has to say about much of their policies, but it seems to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the principles of open public discussion are not ones that are dear to the hearts of anybody in the cabinet.

Let us look at a second area where I think the principles of sustainable development have not been achieved, and I think that is in the shift to regulation that we see throughout so much of this government's activity. This session, last session and previous sessions, matters which were in the public forum, matters which were dealt with by legislation where people could easily read them, have access to them, understand them, for the most part, to the extent that they are written in plain English, those are being gradually removed in many areas of many departments, and they are being shifted to regulation. Regulations, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which are often very dense, very difficult to understand.

I can tell you I spent this afternoon with the regulations of the social assistance act. It took me a long time in the library, and I had quite clear directions from a particular civil servant, to find the sections which were required to inform citizens of their rights. I will tell you that in my constituency that happens two or three times a week.

The regulations in social assistance, in workers compensation, in many areas of government activity are very, very important, and they are almost inaccessible to the general population. Increasingly, so much of government policy is being put into regulation, and, of course, regulation can be changed every Wednesday. It is not an area for public discussion. It is an area for government secrecy, and much of the business of government and the business of the people is being transferred out of the hands of this Legislature and into the hands of a very narrowly conceived cabinet which is not interested in listening to opposition and is not interested in holding public meetings.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we can look at other areas where the government has moved away from public forums and from a broader, accessible democracy. Let us look, for example, at the limitations on Winnipeg City Council. Time after time in the hearings on the reductions to Winnipeg City Council people came forward and said this is not the way we want to go. Twenty-nine city councillors reduced to a handful; people cannot get hold of their city councillors. The cost of administering that type of council has gone up; the difficulty of finding the amount of money that is required to run in ridings of that size, all of these things are inimical to the expansion of democratic debate, but that is the route the government went, and we should have seen it. Well, in fact, we did say, and we were right, that what has happened at Winnipeg City Hall and what has happened in city government and the participation of citizens in civic government, all of that has diminished, and it diminishes all of us. It has diminished the city of Winnipeg. We are all going to pay for that in Manitoba as the city becomes less and less the economic engine and the driving force of so much of the economic activity of the province.

Let us look at appointments to boards. This is a government which has reduced the number of people in the Human Rights Commission. This is a government

which has also gone to appointed boards of hospitals, of health districts. You look at those appointed boards and what do you find again? A very narrow representation of the people of Manitoba.

Boards dealing with post-secondary education which have no representation from the broad area of education which in its transition committee could find no aboriginal people to sit on that transition committee. Health boards for the North which have no aboriginal people sitting on them. How many women are on any of those boards? When the government says trust us, we know what we are trusting them to do. We are trusting them to replicate the very narrow population that they believe they represent, and I think that really is a shame for the kind of Manitoba that I think has been there in the past. It is becoming much more two Manitobas. A Manitoba of the wealthy—the people who contribute to the government's fundraising galas, the corporate world. Only that has become legitimate in the eyes of this government. The world of the public, the world of public opinion, the world of ordinary people, really has no legitimacy in the eyes of this government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think as we look at the sustainable development bill, we should look at some of those broader principles, and we should ensure that those kinds of underlying approaches to the expansion of democratic debate are things which should be part of our consideration of this bill. Frankly, I think this is a much reduced bill. The government did go to public hearings on this, and it ran into trouble, and it backed off very quickly, and came in not with a bill that those people who spoke at the public hearings would like to have seen but a much, much watered down version that would enable it to coast for yet another couple of years on the magic carpet of sustainable development.

* (2010)

Finally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to talk about a government which pretends to espouse the principles of sustainability, but which is about to, if we are to believe the Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh), the senior level Canadian history, and I speak about this in the shadow of July 1, Canada's birthday. I speak about it in the context of a recent survey which has looked at province by province and the inability of many, many

Canadian students across the country to understand and to know their own history. I speak too as somebody who teaches Canadian history. I feel very strongly and very passionately about it. I also think that a government which pretends to speak of sustainability must also understand that the people of Manitoba must have the opportunity to learn their own past.

We have almost no content of Manitoba history in our schools. We have almost no aboriginal history in our schools. We have a Minister of Education who is set to destroy, to take away the senior level of Canadian history as a compulsory subject. She tells us that she is going to put more in, but where is it going to go? Are the teachers to talk faster? Are the students to read more quickly?

There are only so many hours in a day, and what the minister is doing is saying at the years of Grade 3, Grade 6 and Grade 9 when there is the opportunity to teach some Canadian history that she is going to add more. She is going to take all of those other minutes and hours that would have been taught at Grade 11 and she is going to somehow going to cram them down, more layers further down. What are we going to get? We are going to get people who are aged 14, Grade 9, the last time they will have the opportunity to take a formal Canadian history in many, many school divisions as they continue to reduce their teaching staff. It may not become available. It may not even be an option in many divisions. They are going to be taking it at the Grade 9 level when the cognitive level, their ability to understand a wide variety of concepts, is not the same as it is as they approach their age of majority and as they approach the age of voting.

I listened with interest to the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) talk about his grandfather's stories of the prairie chicken, a part of our natural resources and of our renewable resources which is now no longer renewable. I listened to him talk about the disappearance of the bison. We could have added too the loss of the sturgeon in so many parts of Manitoba, the loss of those fisheries as they were mined by the great interests from Chicago and from Minneapolis, and yet that understanding, the ability to teach that historical, that deeper sense of the appreciation of the issues of sustainable development will not be there for all of our students.

Saskatchewan has a Grade 12 compulsory course. Other provinces have Grade 12 compulsory courses. Our students in some cases are going to be leaving school with American history, but not Canadian history, and I think a government that has any interest in the sustainable development of the Prairies must find the opportunity to teach at a senior level the experience of the generations of the past. I do not mean just those since the arrival of Europeans, but the seventh and 10th and 15th generations as we go back to 12,000 years ago and the way in which they used the resources of these lands.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it makes sense to me to teach that. It makes sense to me for students to understand that, and I look, for example, at the flood booklet that the government published. I do not know how much they spent on it, and I think it was a valuable exercise in helping students to express their feelings. But how much more useful it could have been had it expressed the idea that Manitoba had had floods before. How much more experience would have been available to students to understand that their ancestors in the 1820s, in the 1850s, even in the 1950s, had also experienced a flood, had also conquered and dealt with and suffered in different ways? That was not there. I do not blame the teachers, and I do not blame the government for that, but I do blame an attitude that says we can dismiss this. I do blame and I do fear, I think, for an education system which is going to dismiss history in that way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the principles of sustainable development, I think, are ones that we can all agree on. We agree on it in the context of Manitoba. We agree on it in the context of the North American continent as well as in a global sense. Indeed, they are all interlinked. We are inescapably linked together in that sense. I do think that the government has presented us with this in this bill a much reduced version of what is achievable and what is possible in Manitoba, and I much regret that. This is a first step, and I congratulate the government for taking that first step, but I think there is so much more that is being missed.

Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River): Mr. Deputy Speaker, The Sustainable Development and Consequential Amendments Act, Bill 61, is a bill that appeared in a much different state than we first saw in the draft paper, a much watered-down bill, and the

government did water this bill down because they listened to the people who expressed some real concerns in the direction that the government was going in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I had the opportunity to sit through the presentations and hear what the public was saying about this bill. Certainly, as my colleague has just indicated, it is a start. It is a start about what we can do with sustainable development, but there is certainly much more that can be done. One of the documents, in fact, was a presentation from the Manitoba Federation of Labour, and the presenter says, and I quote: Bill 61 appears to be little more than a policy statement masking a legislation. There is no target set for real change, and no one really answers the questions, what does it do, with anything more than a flippant response. It is a generic report. The objective, apparently, is to ensure the public sector of Manitoba keeps the concept of sustainable development in the back of its collective mind as part of the routines of their activities.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we talk about development, there is room for growth and development in this province, but when we do have this development, we have to ensure that we are doing it in harmony with the people that live in this province. One of the issues that comes to mind for me is the aboriginal people who are consulted very little in this province. We have the Hydro bill that today we moved the hoist on because, in listening to the aboriginal people, there is real concern that the proposals put forward by this government for hydro have been done without consultation with the aboriginal people, the people who are most impacted by hydro development. In fact, one of the people who is very concerned about this is the chief from one of the reserves in my constituency, and that is Chief Hubert Kematch from the Sapotaweyak Cree Nation in the Pelican Rapids area. These people feel very much, not only with hydro but in many activities that this government proceeds with, that they are left out.

Another example of where they were left out of discussion was when the Louisiana-Pacific agreement was signed, and the people from Swampy Cree Tribal Council were one of the groups of people that opposed at the hearings the licensing of Louisiana-Pacific

because they felt their livelihood was being taken from them. They were not being given the opportunity to share in the economic development. I remember very clearly their representative at the hearings saying we are not opposed to this development. All we want is a piece of the pie. That is what we have to look at when we look at sustainable development. We have to ensure that it is not just a few people gaining wealth at the expenses of others. We have to think about local people who have lived there all their lives, people who have harvested the resources, people who use the resources for medicinal purposes, other traditional uses. We have to respect those things when we move forward with economic development, and that is certainly not something that has been addressed by this government when they talk about economic development.

The other people who I want to talk about are people on another reserve, and that is the Pine Creek reserve. The chief there is Chief Clifford McKay. In this area, the people in Pine Creek live along a lake, and they have always harvested the lake for their own use. Some of them are commercial fishermen as well.

On Lake Winnipegosis, there has been a great reduction in the amount of fish in the lake for various reasons. It always seems to be that it is the aboriginal people who are blamed for overfishing and selling fish when there are many—and it is very easy to blame someone who lives close by. These people have been talking about looking at co-management of resources. They have been talking about getting together with the Department of Natural Resources and looking at ways that the resource can be managed, so that it is sustainable. I hope that the government will listen to them and ensure that this actually does happen.

* (2020)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, those things do not seem to be addressed, and this government's idea of sustainable development does certainly not meet the needs of many of the people in my community. People want to see resources used, but they do not want to see them exploited. They want them to be managed as they have been for many generations. They have been managed, and people are very worried. Again, I refer to the aboriginal community who say they want a part of the action. They want to be working at managing the

resources, using the resources, but they do not want all the revenues going outside the community.

One of the issues that was raised at the hearings was the fact—one of the problems with development in this province, and when we go through the Clean Environment Commission to get environmental licences, is that there is not intervenor funding. I will always remember the hearings for Louisiana-Pacific when they were being held in Swan River. There was the company who had all the resources, they had lawyers, and in fact the company had a lot of help from government putting their proposals together. All the information was available to them, but for those people who wanted to raise concerns, they could not get any support from government, and government should look at providing resources for people on both sides of the issue if they truly believe in sustainable development.

(Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

You should not be afraid, governments should not be afraid of opposition, because those people who were raising concerns were standing up for the people in the valley. They were concerned about, as we were, as to whether or not the harvest would be sustainable; whether or not the plant was going to be built too large for the amount of wood that was being required; whether there was going to be an impact on the wildlife in the area. Those were the issues that people were raising. The people were also raising the issue of sustainability of the community and whether or not there would be a negative impact on the quality of air, quality of water. Now that should not be seen as negativism. People were asking questions to ensure that the quality of life would be preserved. So that is where I think this government is weak, and as I understand it, they could have addressed this under this legislation to say that in true sustainability, they would put in place intervenor funding when people are applying for an environmental licence so those people who want to intervene would have that ability.

Now that we have the Louisiana-Pacific plant built, there are people who are still concerned about the impact of this increased harvesting and people want to do studies on it. There have been people, and I cannot at the moment remember the place where the funding came from, but a substantial amount of money has been

provided to a Mr. Dan Soprovich to do a research project on cavity nesting birds. I believe he has approached the Department of Natural Resources to get some approval to have a few sites where he can do the studies that are required to look at what the impact of this harvesting will be on cavity birds and to leave a few test blocks for it to happen, but the government has not been co-operative. It seems very strange when this is a project that is recognized across Canada, and it has funding from the United States on it, because various people want to look for the information that might be out there on the impact of harvesting on cavity birds in the type of area that we are in the Parklands, but the government does not co-operate on those kinds of things.

We have a government that is talking about sustainable development, and this act is a step in the right direction, but this government has to do more. It has to ensure that people and industry can live in harmony, that we are not destroying what is so precious to many people in the community. We must not allow our heritage to be destroyed. We must work towards an environment where it is a safe environment for people to work, whether it is inside of plants, whether it is in the woods, no matter where it is that we have a safe environment, and if there are problems in their workplace, that people feel comfortable raising their concerns, and they have the opportunity to raise them. It does not matter which facility it is, if environmental regulations are being broken, people should have the ability to speak out on them.

Now, for example, again I raised in the House earlier this year the whole issue of the emissions from the Louisiana-Pacific plant. The problem with those emissions is again lack of commitment from this government to fulfill their promise to bring natural gas to the Swan River Valley. As a result of that, we find that they have had to shut down their RTO equipment. That has been reported. Up here, we have very weak controls or lack of commitment from the Department of Environment, and they are not prepared to do anything. If you had the proper kind of legislation, people within the plant—when they were doing their work, if they saw this happen, could report it.

I am also very concerned with the lack of commitment to sustainable development in this

province. When I raised the issue about waste material and the plant being moved out into low-lying areas, the government indeed did not take that very seriously to begin with. I was very pleased that after raising it again, we found that the government did follow up and some of those sites have been cleaned up, but that is not the way it should happen. I believe that those things should be addressed ahead of time, and we should have insurance that our environment is not going to be sacrificed, and whether it is—for some people it may be just a slough, but a slough plays an important role in the environment, in one of the parts of our environment.

So, with those few words, I want to say that it is a beginning of a piece of legislation on sustainable development. It falls far short of what could be done. There are many goals that we can reach and by working together, can reach them, but I think what we really have to think about is that we do not have to sacrifice every part of this Earth that has been created for us for the sake of making more money. Money is not the end of means to everything. Maybe we have to make some sacrifices so that in the end we do have very healthy environment to live with. Maybe instead of just thinking about making money for a few—at the upper scale, which we find. The majority of money is controlled by a very few people in this world.

Why do we not think about starting to create a more sustainable society where there is a better sharing of the wealth, where there is a health care system that is there to meet the needs of all people, an educational system that offers the opportunity for all people to share in and a better society as a whole, not a society that is only based on making more money at any price, sacrifice whatever has to be sacrificed and not care one bit about what is left for future generations? That is not the responsibility we have been given.

* (2030)

Our grandfathers did a much better job at preserving the environment, and I look at the rural community again and I look at the forests in our area. Our grandfathers were much more sustainable when they were using the resources than we were, and they were quite prepared to ensure that there was something there for future generations. We have to do that. We can be a leader; we can set an example for other parts of the

world. Let us take that responsibility and set some goals that will indeed put us ahead in sustainable development and have a safe place for people to live and work.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you call Bills 16, 39, 300, 301, 12 and 33?

REPORT STAGE

Bill 16—The Council on Post-Secondary Education Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 16, The Council on Post-Secondary Education Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Conseil de l'enseignement postsecondaire), reported from a Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 16—The Council on Post-Secondary Education Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 16, The Council on Post-Secondary Education Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Conseil de l'enseignement postsecondaire), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wanted to put a few words on the record, given the chance. I did not get the opportunity during second reading.

The addition of independent colleges to the Council on Post-Secondary Education is necessary and a prudent step. The independent colleges requested their addition to the Council on Post-Secondary Education which was created last year to replace the University Grants Commission. Partly, the addition of private colleges will aid in allowing students to transfer courses from private to public institutions. The ability to transfer courses from private to public institutions is necessary and a much-needed administrative change.

I doubt, however, if the latest legislation will change much, though, regarding this government's record on education. I find it somewhat ironic that as we allow private institutions on the Council on Post-Secondary Education, the Education minister has increased funding to private schools while starving public schools of the much-needed funding.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have had plenty of opportunities in the past to talk about the financing of public schools, and I could talk at great lengths in criticizing this government's lack of a vision with respect to the financing of public education, but I will resist in an attempt to respect at trying to get a rather shorter speech as opposed to a longer one, at least at this particular one.

The government's record on post-secondary education, as I say, is equally dismal. On the government's side they might say fantastic, but on the opposition side, I think there is probably a concurrence that it would be dismal.

Increases in tuition fees now mean that the public universities are expensive private colleges, in the eyes of many. The minister, however, is content to say that everything is okay in public schools, like she fiddles with province-wide exams while public education is burning before her eyes.

With those very few words, Mr. Deputy Speaker—

An Honourable Member: Keep going, some more.

Mr. Lamoureux: Well, if you really want—no. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 39—The Labour-Sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): On behalf of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Downey), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 39, The Labour-Sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Act (Loi sur les corporations à capital de risque de travailleurs), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 39—The Labour-Sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Education (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 39, The Labour-Sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Act (Loi sur les corporations à capital de risque de travailleurs), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood): Very briefly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were very concerned about this bill's failure to define labour unions appropriately in terms of the criteria for the establishment of these

funds, and so was the labour movement in Manitoba because of the problems experienced in other jurisdictions with funds that were essentially simply venture capital searching out employee groups or small employee organizations that they used for their purposes as sponsors to gain access to tax credits.

(Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

I think, wisely, the minister responsible for the legislation acknowledged that there was a problem and amended the bill to make the definition more appropriate to follow criteria that have been used in other jurisdictions, and we are pleased with that.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we remain concerned about the level of capital required to start a new fund; \$25,000 is ludicrously low, and I think that in consultation with other funds, they made it very clear to us that it was very important to them that any new funds succeed.

They were not necessarily opposed to having other funds in business, but they were very concerned that if there were going to be other funds, they should be well run, adequately capitalized and have a maximum chance of success, because a fund that fails brings discredit and investor wariness to all of the funds in any given province and indeed has effects across the country. We were not pleased that the government refused to see the problem in this area.

The third area of concern was around the whole area of content of the employment levels of the work of firms that might receive funding from a Manitoba-based, labour-sponsored venture capital fund. The problem here is that the province was not prepared to legislate clear requirements for Manitoba-based employment so, in effect, there would be no requirement of any substance for Manitoba employment in any new funds that were established.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we were very concerned that Manitoba tax credits would be earned by individuals for investing in companies which might have little benefit in terms of employment to Manitobans. They might have located here in theory but have the majority of their employment in another jurisdiction, in another country, or even offshore, even though they were here

domiciled legally for tax credit purposes. We did not think that was a reasonable way to approach this whole field. Regrettably, the government did not choose to see the problem which we were pointing out in regard to required employment levels for investment. Those comments, Mr. Acting Speaker, conclude my remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Sveinson): Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

* (2040)

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

REPORT STAGE

Bill 300—The TD Trust Company and Central Guaranty Trust Company Act

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), that Bill 300, The TD Trust Company and Central Guarantee Trust Company Act; Loi concernant la Société de fiducie TD et la Compagnie Trust Central Guaranty, reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 300—The TD Trust Company and Central Guaranty Trust Company Act

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): By leave, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), that Bill 300, The TD Trust Company and Central Guaranty Trust Company Act; Loi concernant la Société TD et la Compagnie Trust Central Guaranty, be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 301—The Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company, Montreal Trust Company of Canada and Montreal Trust Company Act

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): By leave, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), that Bill 301, The Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company, Montreal Trust Company of Canada and Montreal Trust Company Act; Loi concernant la Société de fiducie Banque de Nouvelle-Écosse, la Compagnie Montréal Trust du Canada et la Compagnie Montréal Trust, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Motion presented.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Sveinson): Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

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

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Hold it, hold it. Whoa. I thought I was back in November here for a minute.

Mr. Laurendeau: It is not third reading yet.

Mr. Doer: Okay, I have just got to make sure, look what happened to Harry Enns today. He had to speak after a third reading. He has been around here for a long time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Sveinson): Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

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

THIRD READINGS

Bill 301—The Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company, Montreal Trust Company of Canada and Montreal Trust Company Act

Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (St. Norbert): By leave, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer), that Bill 301, The Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company, Montreal Trust Company of Canada and Montreal Trust Company Act; Loi concernant la Société de fiducie Banque de Nouvelle-Écosse, la Compagnie Montréal Trust du Canada et la Compagnie Montréal Trust, be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Sveinson): Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Well, I will repeat myself. In a spirit of co-operation and considering the good work of the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau)—this is probably the kiss of political death to my good friend—I want to say that we will support this private member's bill. I think it is worthy of noting that there should be more private member's bills supported in this Chamber. Private member's bills are not supposed to be only government private member's bills; they should be other matters of merit for all Chambers.

I want to say I guess it is appropriate that the Bank of Nova Scotia, of course, has an ex-Manitoban as one of its vice-presidents, Rick Waugh. Of course, the NDP position on banks is well known. [interjection]

Well, in some ways the banks in Canada are an interesting issue because they are regulated as opposed to the American bank system, which is deregulated. In a lot of ways they have not gone through some of the marketplace pain that we have seen with saving and loan operations in the United States, the good old U.S.A., the kind of marketplace that members opposite worship at in terms of their kind of unregulated environment. Of course, in relative terms we want monetary and fiscal reform in Canada, but a regulated banking industry has served Canadians better than the unregulated system in the United States. But credit unions, of course, we believe are the way of the future and more co-operation in community and nonprofit will be the way in which all of us operate in the future.

We have been briefed by legal counsel on these bills, and we have been briefed by the member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau). When they first told us that this was passed in Ontario, we were quite worried, so we inquired about what happened in Saskatchewan. We have checked the research in Hansard from Saskatchewan. I should say that Saskatchewan is a good province to look at in terms of following their leadership and advice. Just yesterday, Saskatchewan made a decision that they would keep all their Crown corporations and public ownership and, again, showing leadership and vision and philosophy that we support, they said no to privatizing the telephone system, of course, which contradicts the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) when he predicted last year in this Chamber that Saskatchewan would follow this ill-fated decision of this government.

Mr. Acting Speaker, speaking along on this bill. I am sure the member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach) will be speaking on this bill on banks and trust companies, but we note that this bill—hopefully, the intent of this bill is to ensure that individuals will be able to have their assets and liabilities dealt with without having to go and petition, I mean, using lawyers. Because this may cut lawyers out of the process and having a better way to go, we will take the evil of banks over the evil of lawyers in this bill—[interjection] I take that back, okay, for the member for St. Johns (Mr. Mackintosh).

An Honourable Member: Just kidding.

Mr. Doer: Just kidding. We are just kidding.

I just want to say we will pass this bill in a spirit of co-operation and follow the advice of Saskatchewan, and I take back everything I said about lawyers. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Sveinson): Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

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

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

REPORT STAGE**Bill 12—The Manitoba Water Services Board
Amendment Act**

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 12, The Manitoba Water Services Board Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission des services d'approvisionnement en eau du Manitoba), reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS**Bill 12—The Manitoba Water Services Board
Amendment Act**

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 12, The Manitoba Water Services Board Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission des services d'approvisionnement en eau du Manitoba), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Did the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

The honourable member for Wellington. So seldom, Becky.

* (2050)

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is it, Commissioner.

An Honourable Member: Commissioner.

Ms. Barrett: No, I am not about to give you that kind of a promotion.

My colleague from Interlake and I spoke on second reading in this bill and, as we said in the committee hearings on this bill, we are going to vote in opposition to Bill 12.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the saying is that good things come in small packages. I think it can be said that bad things also come in small packages.

Bill 12 is a very small bill. It is a short bill with very large potential ramifications. It is those ramifications and implications that we are concerned about and say to us that we cannot support Bill 12.

This is a small piece of legislation, but it fits in the package of the legislative agenda of this government, the legislative and the operational agenda of this government. It follows in the line of the removal of public resources from public control that we have seen in the granting of the licence to BFI, which has effectively taken away the ability of the City of Winnipeg to control its waste management stream. It has given a huge amount of money and control to a multinational, transnational corporation that has hundreds of millions of dollars in fines levied against it in the past decades.

It has given control over one of the elements of sustainable development that we have been talking about here tonight to a large, transnational, very bad corporate citizen. This is only one example. Another example that we discussed at great length, I am sure everyone remembers this, is the sale of the Manitoba Telephone System. Another one of our public resources that is now in private hands. Not only private hands, but not even in Manitoba hands. Not only not in Manitoba hands, but in many cases not even in Canadian hands. Soon there will be nothing left of the public telephone system that we held so dear since 1908. Not even a head office here. In a few years, the head office will even be gone. Then I am sure they will keep the acronym MTS, and it will mean multitransnational something.

We believe, along with the Provincial Council of Women, who presented a very good brief to the public hearing process under Bill 12 a few days ago—we believe, along with the Provincial Council of Women, the environment movement and many people in Manitoba and across the country, that water is not a commodity that should ever be in any part of private control.

I am going to quote here from the brief of the Provincial Council of Women: We must ensure that water will be safeguarded for future generations and not allow costs or market-driven decisions to jeopardize this principle. We should be aiming at free water for all, not a system that is based on full costs being shared by all consumers. The original concept of a public utility was to protect this principle, but by allowing persons, partnerships or unincorporated associations to own and operate the water distribution infrastructure, we will be putting this common trust at risk.

I could not have said it better, and I thank the Provincial Council of Women yet again for coming forward and speaking on behalf of the public good. Unfortunately, they have had to speak on behalf of the public good against a rising tide of bad legislation on the behalf of this provincial government.

Bill 12 could potentially lead to a lack of accountability on the part of Manitobans or on part of the people who will own and the corporations who will own this water infrastructure. One of the reasons for public resources being held in public hands is that they are technically and theoretically a public accountability. There is a certain degree of transparency and accountability that is supposed to be part of public ownership.

What we have seen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that even in areas of public ownership—

Point of Order

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the honourable member.

We are approaching the agreed-upon time, and in order to accommodate the honourable member and

whatever other business we might be able to complete, would there be agreement not to see the clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there leave that the Speaker not see the clock at nine o'clock? [agreed]

* * *

Ms. Barrett: In conclusion, we feel that it is essential that the public resources be held in public hands so that the members, the people who are elected by the public, are and remain accountable and responsible for the use and the stewardship of those resources. We do not believe that Bill 12 will assist in that regard. We do not believe Bill 12 will help us in working towards sustainable development. It certainly will not help in dealing with urban sprawl, and for all of these reasons, we are voting against Bill 12. Thank you.

Mr. Clif Evans (Interlake): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just want to make a few comments and pass on this bill to vote.

This bill and the minister's description of why Bill 12, the amendment to Bill 12, was introduced, the question that I have is why. Why was this amendment presented? Why and who wanted this amendment put in place for the water services act? The minister indicated that the Manitoba Water Services Board is now wishing to seek private partners in the development of the Cartier water supply system. Why is the Water Services Board being forced to seek partners? The minister has never explained that.

We understand full well that communities in parts of our province due to either drought, contamination or whatever reasons are in need of proper water supply, water treatment, sewage. We know that, and we support that. We support the need for these communities. We support the need for the communities to have good water.

But why privatize? Why use an entity in that co-operative, as they call it, as a private entity? Why be able to allow a private company, a private consortium, to have the ability to say to these communities, well, we have to make some money out of this; this is why we are involved in it. Who asked them to be involved in it? Did the Minister? Did the Water Services Board?

Did the communities? We do not know that, and for the fear of not knowing something, we fear what may occur.

Now, the minister has indicated that an agreement will be put in place, and that the government of the day will be involved as a partner to build this treatment supply. Well and fine, but if the government is involved and the government is going to oversee, I hope, this agreement—because that is an important part of this whole scheme, what that agreement is going to say. The costs: what it is going to cost the ratepayer. What it is going to cost the people who want to use it and how is the system going to be maintained? How is it going to be kept? How are the increments, as inflation or whatever situation that is brought about, that are going to have this consortium say to the PUB, to the minister of the day and to the people, well, we need more money. We need more money; so instead of a \$5-a-month rate, it is going to be \$7.

An Honourable Member: Just like in England.

* (2100)

Mr. Clif Evans: Just like we have seen in England, just like we have seen here in this province with MTS. Today, it is going to be a little bit, but tomorrow we do not know, and next week and next year only heaven knows for sure what the cost of that supply is going to be. So we do fear that.

Again, I want to put on record—the minister told me that agreement was going to be a safety lock for the municipalities to be involved, a safety lock; it will be a guarantee—I want to, on record, Mr. Deputy Speaker, make sure that this minister guarantees us here and the municipalities that are involved that that agreement will say the right things, will have the right things involved so that these communities are protected from any future opportunities of high increases of costs to them for whatever it may be—[interjection]

Gouging, exactly. These people have said themselves we are in this to make a profit and only to make a profit. I have not heard this consortium say we are there doing this, getting involved, at the whim of the government or whoever, only to assist the communities.

We know that the communities are in need. We know that, and we want to make sure that they do have good water, but we are worried and we continue to be worried. We want to make sure that this minister has a full grip on the agreement that if and when the municipalities, as he said, will get the treatment and the supply, the plant back to them after a certain amount of time, we want to make sure that the agreement is in place, that that guarantee will be there that, when they receive this plant in return after 20 years, it is in the kind of condition that Mr. Deputy Speaker will know that it is not going to cost the communities tons of money to have to upgrade, maintain, rebuild, do whatever.

So that is why we oppose this bill, this amendment, and I also say, were there any alternatives? The minister never ever indicated any other alternatives, never told us exactly who was dealing with this, never. So, when the minister brings forth an amendment like this saying that, well, these communities want it, the communities never indicated to anybody that I know of that they wanted to go through this consortium. The government, Water Services Board—[interjection]—that is right, so what about a co-op? So, if there were other alternatives, what promoted this minister and this government to implement this amendment to The Water Services Act, providing the opportunity for private enterprise to be able, at the whim of the consortium, to increase, increase and increase the rate service to these people for a much needed and important entity, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

With those few words, I just say to the minister and the government, I wish we would have had the opportunity, a greater opportunity, to be able to deal with this matter and find out exactly why, who, when and of course again why privatization? Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 12, The Manitoba Water Services Board Amendment Act.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 33—The Executions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 33, The Executions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'exécution des jugements et modifications corrélatives), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave to move the report stage of Bill 33? [agreed]

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour, say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 33—The Executions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, (by leave) I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 33, The Executions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'exécution des jugements et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is one of these goofy ideological bills that was sitting from the other side of the House and the new Minister of Justice (Mr. Toews). This bill privatizes a function of the Sheriff's Office, particularly the seizure and sale of property pursuant to an order of the court.

Now, we asked the government how can they justify this legislation and this privatization when there is no protection for trust accounts, for monies received from the sale of this property? The government says we are going to save dollars though. Then we ask: Why are you doing this when there is no requirement for liability, coverage, protection when there is no bonding requirements in the legislation to protect the consumer? The government says, well, we are going to save dollars though. Then we say, how come you are doing this? Why are you privatizing this when just a few weeks ago your senior officials at the Sheriff's Office was telling the staff, privatization is off the table?

Of course, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they said, but we are going to save dollars. The heck with staff relations and open and honest government, fair dealings with our workers.

We said how come you are arguing this "save dollars" thing when you are also saying there is going to be no staff reductions as a result of the bill? They said no, we are going to save dollars. We said, but you are now going to impose a new cost for the seizure and sale pursuant to orders that will be laid against government departments that did not have to bear that cost before, like Maintenance Enforcement, for example, Taxation. All they kept saying, we are going to save dollars.

We said how come you are doing this when the Province of Saskatchewan said, no way are we going to privatize the Sheriff's Office, because there is going to be those added costs to government departments, it would not be cost beneficial? No, the minister keeps saying we are going to save dollars. Why are they doing this when the Province of British Columbia is now looking at going back to using the sheriffs instead of private bailiffs for seizure and sale? They keep saying, no, we are going to save dollars.

Why is it that they are doing this when a study commissioned in the Department of Justice to look into privatization of the Sheriff's Office and which concluded that renovation rather than privatization is the way to go? This government still says, no; we are hidebound, we are going to privatize; we do not care about protecting the consumer; we do not care about what has happened to other jurisdictions; we do not care even about our own studies.

No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government said we are going to privatize. They can give us no justification, no cost-benefit analysis whatsoever to show that the people of Manitoba, including people as taxpayers, are going to benefit whatsoever by this privatization.

It is entirely ideological. It is again an example of how this government worships the marketplace without any evidence at all. They just worship it, and they worship it for the sake of worshipping it without any substantial basis. We are saying that this is a better way to go.

No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these people opposite, they do not care about services. They do not care about costs. They just care about the marketplace. This is a bad bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Mackintosh: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division.

House Business

* (2110)

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you please recognize the honourable member for Turtle Mountain (Mr. Tweed) to make a committee report.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I recognize him, I seen him before. The honourable member for Turtle Mountain.

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Turtle Mountain): Do I have leave to present the First Report on the Committee on Rules of the House?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable member have leave? [agreed]

Standing Committee on Rules of the House First Report

Mr. Mervin Tweed (Chairperson of the Standing Committee on Rules of the House): I wish to present the First Report on the Committee on Rules of the House.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Your Standing Committee on Rules of the House presents the following as its First Report.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Dispense.

Your Committee met on Thursday, June 26, 1997, at 4:00 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building to consider matters referred.

Your Committee has agreed to the following changes to the Rules, and recommends them to the House.

1. That Rules 2 and 3 be repealed and the following substituted:

“Daily Sittings

2. The House shall meet each Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday that is not a holiday, unless otherwise ordered.

Hours of Sitting

3. (1) The time for the daily sittings of the House shall be 1:30 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays unless otherwise ordered.

Friday Sittings

(2) During the debates on the motions for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and the Budget the House shall sit on Fridays from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Thursday Morning Sittings

(3) Except during the debates on the motion for an Address in Sittings Reply to the Speech from the Throne and the Budget the House shall also sit on Thursdays at 10:00 a.m. and on these days the Speaker shall leave the Chair at 12:00 noon until 1:30 p.m.

Daily Adjournment

(4) At 6:00 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays and at 12:30 p.m. on Fridays during the debates on the motions for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and Budget, the Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put.

Adjournments over weekend

(5) When the House is adjourned at 12:30 p.m. on Fridays during the debates on the motions for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and the

Budget and at all other times on Thursdays at 6:00 p.m. it shall stand adjourned, unless otherwise ordered, until the following Monday.”

2. That subrule 9.(3), (4) and (5) be repealed and the following substituted:

“Deputy Chairmen of Committees

(3) At the commencement of every Legislature or from time to time as the necessity may arise, the House shall appoint two Deputy Chairmen of the Committees of the Whole House.

Deputy Chairman to act as Chairman

(4) If, at any meeting of a Committee of the Whole House, or any section thereof, the Chairman of the Committees of the Whole House is not present, a Deputy Chairman shall act in the place and stead of the Chairman.

Appointment of Acting Chairman

(5) In the absence of the Deputy Speaker, and both Deputy Chairmen, or any one of them the Speaker may, in forming a Committee of the Whole House, before leaving the Chair, appoint any Member or Members to be Chairman of the Committee or of any section thereof.”

3. That subrules 19(1) and (2) be repealed and the following substituted:

“Daily Routine

19.(1) The daily routine of business in the House at 1:30 p.m. shall be as follows unless otherwise ordered:

*Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills
Oral Questions
Members' Statements
Grievances*

Order after Routine Business

(2) The order of business for the consideration by the House, day by day, after the daily routine and on Thursday mornings shall be as follows:

(a) Government Business

(Monday through Thursday and Fridays during the debates on the motions for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and the Budget)

*Orders for Returns and Addresses for Papers
Committee of the Whole House, for consideration of Bills
Report Stage, Bills reported from Committees
Government Bills - Third Readings, Second Readings
Government Motions
Opposition Day Motions*

Private Members' Business**(b) Private Members' Business**

5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on each Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday.

Monday

*Private Members' Resolutions
Private Bills
Public Bills by Private Members
Orders for Return and Addresses for Papers referred for debate*

Tuesday

*Private Bills
Public Bills by Private Members
Private Members' Resolutions
Orders for Return and Addresses for Papers referred for debate*

Wednesday

*Orders for Return and Addresses for Papers referred for debate
Private Members' Resolutions
Private Bills
Public Bills by Private Members*

Thursday

*Public Bills by Private Members
Private Bills
Private Members' Resolutions
Orders for Return and Addresses for Papers referred for debate*

(2.1) When a division is requested during Private Members' Hour that division shall be deferred to the next Private Members' Hour when it will be conducted as the first item of business.

4. That subrule 19.(5) be repealed and the following substituted:

“Question Period

(5) The time allowed for question period shall not exceed 40 minutes.”

5. That the following new headings and rules be added immediately after Rule 19:

“MEMBERS' STATEMENTS**Members' Statements**

19.1 (1)(a) One each sitting day, up to five Members may be recognized to make a Members' Statement on any matter.

Time Limit

(b) Each statement shall be no more than two minutes in duration.

Restrictions on Scope

(2) A Minister of the Crown may not use the time allotted for Members' Statements to comment on government policy or ministerial or departmental action.

GRIEVANCES**Grievance - Member to Speak Only Once**

19.2 (1)(a) A Member may not raise or speak to a grievance on more than one occasion during a session of the Assembly.

Not to be raised during Throne and Budget Debates

(b) Grievances shall not be considered while the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne or the motion for approval by the House in general of the budgetary policy of the Government are on the Orders of the Day for consideration by the House.

15 Minutes each

(2)(a) Each Member is entitled to speak for no longer than 15 minutes on a grievance.

No Restriction on Subject Matter

(b) There shall be no restriction on the subject matter raised in a grievance.

No Limit on Number

(3) There is no restriction on the number of grievances that may be raised on any given day.

Terminated same day

(4) Any grievance is terminated when the House adjourns and shall not be continued or resumed at the next or any subsequent sitting of the House.

OPPOSITION DAY MOTIONS**Number of Opposition Days**

19.3(1) In each session there shall be up to 3 sitting days to be known as Opposition Days.

Distribution of Opposition Days

(2) The Official Opposition shall be entitled to not less than two Opposition Days in each session and the second largest Recognized Opposition Party shall be entitled to one Opposition Day in each session.

Government House Leader to announce

(3) After consultation with the Recognized Opposition Parties, the Government House Leader shall announce the date or dates which are to be designated Opposition Days, which date or dates shall not be more than ten sitting days after publication of Notice of an Opposition Day Motion or Motions.

Days during Throne and Budget Debates not included

(4) Sitting days on which the motions for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and the Budget are all debated shall not be included in calculating the ten day period referred to in subrule (3).

Two sitting days notice

(5) In accordance with subrule 51(3) and notwithstanding subrule 55(2), two sitting days notice of an Opposition Day Motion, filed with the Clerk by a Member of a Recognized Opposition Party, shall be printed in the Order Paper.

If more than one notice

(6) If more than one notice of an Opposition Day Motion is received, the Speaker shall select one for

debate, taking into consideration the order in which they were received.

Time Limit

(7) During debate of an Opposition Day Motion, no Member shall speak longer than ten minutes.

Not for Second or Third Reading

(8) No motion under this Rule shall be for Second or Third Reading of a Bill.

Not a non-confidence motion

(9) No motion under this Rule shall be a motion of non-confidence in the government.

Not during Throne Speech or Budget Debates

(10) No sitting day shall be designated an Opposition Day during consideration of the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne or the motion to approve in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

One only per week

(11) Only one Opposition Day may be designated during any week the House meets.

First item of business

(12) A motion to be debated on an Opposition Day shall be considered as the first item of business under Orders of the Day.

Debate limited to one sitting day

(13) Debate on an Opposition Day Motion shall be limited to one sitting day; thirty minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of the motion and any amendments thereto."

6. That subrule 21.(4) be repealed.

7. That Rule 26.1 be repealed.

8. That subrules 27.(1), (3), (4) and (5) be repealed and the following substituted:

"Setting aside regularly scheduled business of the House

27.(1) After Grievances in the routine business of the House and regularly before the Orders of the Day, any

Member may move to set aside the **regularly scheduled** business of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, of which the Member has given prior notice to the Speaker not less than **ninety minutes** prior to the sitting of the House.

Procedure on motion

(3) After any explanation made under subrule (2), the Speaker shall rule on whether or not the motion under subrule 1 is in order and of urgent public importance, and if the Speaker rules in favour of the motion, the Speaker will then put the question "Shall the debate proceed?" to a vote of the House. Notwithstanding subrule 5(1), the ruling of the Chair shall not be subject to appeal.

Idem

(4) If the House determines by its vote to set aside the **regularly scheduled** business of the House to debate a matter of urgent public importance, each Member who wishes to speak in the debate shall be limited to ten minutes. The debate on the matter of urgent public importance shall not exceed two hours in duration. On conclusion of the debate the House shall proceed to Orders of the Day.

Restrictions on motion

(5) The right to move to set aside the **regularly scheduled** business of the House for the purpose mentioned in subrule (1) is subject to the following restrictions:

(a) Not more than one such motion may be made at the same sitting;

(b) Not more than one matter may be discussed on the same motion;

(c) The motion shall not revive discussion on a matter that has been decided in the same session;

(d) The motion shall not anticipate a matter that has previously been appointed for consideration by the House, or with reference to which a notice of motion has previously been given and not withdrawn;

(e) The motion shall not raise a question of privilege; and

(f) The discussion under the motion may not raise any question that, according to the Rules, may be debated only on a distinct motion under notice.

Business not to stand over

(6) Any debate on a motion made under subrule (1) is terminated when the time allotted for the debate has expired, or when the House adjourns on the day of the debate prior to the expiration of the two hour time limit, and shall not be continued or resumed at the next or any subsequent sitting of the House."

9. That new subrule 51(3) be added immediately after subrule 51(2);

"Opposition Day motions

(3) Notwithstanding subrules (1) and (2), two sitting days notice is required for a motion to be debated on an Opposition Day."

10. That subrule 65(5) be repealed and the following substituted:

"Concurrent sittings

(5) The Committee of Supply shall, unless otherwise ordered, sit in **three** separate sections concurrently, one section in the Chamber and **two** sections outside the Chamber, to consider the estimates of separate government departments."

11. That subrules (7.1), (7.2), (7.3) and (7.4) be repealed and the following substituted:

"Formal Vote in Committees

(7.1) Where, immediately following the taking of a voice-vote, two Members demand that a formal vote be taken, the Members shall be called in, **all** sections of the Committee of Supply shall meet together and a count-out vote shall be taken.

All sections of the Committee of Supply to meet

(7.2) For the purposes of taking a count-out vote pursuant to subrule (7.1) **all** sections of the Committee of Supply may meet together in or outside the Chamber.

"Count-out" vote

(7.3) For the purposes of subrules (7.1) and (7.2) "count-outvote" means the counting aloud by the Clerk of the Committee of the Members rising to vote

for and against the question when a formal vote has been demanded.”

12. That subrules 65(7), (8), (9), (10) and (11) be repealed.

13. That subrule 65.1(1) be repealed and the following substituted:

“Concurrence Motion

65.1(1) In each session, on completion of the consideration of all supply resolutions, a concurrence motion shall be moved in the Committee of Supply with all sections sitting together in the Chamber.”

14. That subrule 65.1(3) be repealed and the following substituted:

“Text of Motion

(3) A motion pursuant to subrule (1) shall be stated as follows:

“THAT the Committee of Supply concur in all supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, _____ which have been adopted at this session by all sections of the Committee of Supply sitting separately and by the full committee.””

15. That these amendments shall come into force on the opening day of the Fourth Session of the Thirty-Sixth Legislature.

16. That gender neutral language be adopted throughout the rules.

17. That the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly be authorized to renumber and reprint the Rules.

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

Motion agreed to.

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that the First Report of the Standing Committee on Rules of the House be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Mr. McCrae: If you could call those bills that have been passed at the committee stage and are now before us, by leave, it is my expectation, for report stage—if you would call those bills, please.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 21—The Jury Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): On behalf of the Attorney General (Mr. Toews) (by leave), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Education and Training (Mrs. McIntosh), that Bill 21, The Jury Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les jurés), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division.

Bill 36—The Wildfires and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cummings) (by leave), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of

Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay), that Bill 36, The Wildfires and Consequential Amendment Act (Loi sur les incendies échappés et modifications corrélatives), reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 36—The Wildfires and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), that Bill 36, The Wildfires and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur les incendies échappés et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 38—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2)

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), that Bill 38, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2) (Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 41—The Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): On behalf of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach) (by leave),

THAT the following be added after Section 4 of the Bill:

4.1 Section 17 is amended

(a) by repealing clause (a); and

(b) in clause (c), by adding “, and carry out his or her functions in accordance with this Act and the regulations” at the end of the clause.

[French version]

Il est proposé d'ajouter la suivante après la section 4 du projet de loi:

4.1 La section 17 est modifiée

(a) en abrogeant la proposition (a); et

(b) en proposition (c), ajoutant “, et en exécutant ses fonctions en accord avec cette Loi et avec les règlements” à la fin de la proposition.

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must inform the honourable minister that his proposed amendment to add a new section to Bill 41 is out of order because it seeks to amend a section of the original act which is not being amended by this bill which is contrary to *Beauchesne Citation 698.8(b)*. I understand that this amendment was ruled out of order in committee.

Mr. McCrae: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a result of discussions, I understand there is leave to allow this amendment to be put to the House in any event.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there leave of the House to—

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we are hoping to establish a precedent, because there were a few amendments we would have liked to have leave on, too.

* (2120)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to bring forward the amendment? [agreed]

Amendment—pass.

Mr. McCrae: I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach):

THAT the following be added after section 9 of the bill:

9.1 Section 49 is renumbered as subsection 49(1) and the following is added as subsection 49(2):

Exception

49(2) Subject to the approval of the minister, a health corporation is not required to dissolve or disestablish under clause 1(b) or (c) if it does not transfer all of its operations and property to the regional health authority.

[French version]

Il est proposé d'ajouter, après l'article 9 du projet de loi, ce qui suit:

9.1 L'article 49 devient le paragraphe 49(1) et il est ajouté, après ce paragraphe, ce qui suit:

Exception

49(2) *Sous réserve de l'approbation du ministre, la personne morale dispensant des services de santé n'est pas tenue de procéder à sa dissolution en application de l'alinéa (1)b) ou c) si elle ne transfère pas l'ensemble de ses activités et de son actif à l'office régional de la santé.*

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must inform the honourable minister that his proposed amendment to add a new section to Bill 41 is out of order, because it seeks to amend a section of the original act which is not being amended by the bill, which is contrary to Beauchesne Citation 698(8)(b).

Mr. McCrae: We certainly do respect your ruling in this regard, but I understand also again there have been discussions about this matter, and if there is leave of members of the House, this amendment could indeed be considered.

Mr. Ashton: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, yes, there is leave and I think this is twice now. It is a precedent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there leave to accept this amendment? [agreed]

Mr. Tim Sale (Crescentwood): I want to just put on the record a concern about this wording and ask the

House leader if he might just consult with his colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik).

It is not clear to us why an institution should have to get the approval of a minister not to dissolve its corporation should part of its operations be folded into a regional health entity. This is one of the amendments that had to be made on consultation with the faith hospitals, the faith health delivery groups, who were very concerned with this bill, because it had a number of clauses in it which very much affected their operation.

It had clauses, for example, that would have compelled a hospital to accept an administrator under certain circumstances who would not be bound by the by-laws of that organization, such as by-laws in a hospital that prohibited some particular forms of medical procedures to take place in that hospital because of its faith connections. That amendment was made in committee.

I think the fact that these amendments are having to be made now and at this stage and in this way is evidence of the fact that it is not a good way to make law, to move quickly and at the last minute with major, major legislation which has not been shared with the community appropriately, which has not involved an appropriate communication and consultation, and therefore we get ourselves in a situation where we have an amendment before us.

We have been very co-operative. We have agreed to move this forward by leave, but I would ask with all respect the House leader to seek the advice of legal counsel and through the Minister of Health, ask the Minister of Health, why should Misericordia Hospital require the minister's permission not to dissolve its operation, for example, of Villa Rosa and the other things that the Sisters of Misericordia operate, simply because their hospital has been folded in?

I would think there would be merit in deleting the words "subject to the approval of the minister." I believe a health corporation is not required to dissolve or disestablish if it does not transfer all its operations and property to the regional health authority, and no permission of a minister should be required for them to do what is their right in law, namely, to continue to

operate anything that they are currently operating that is not part of the regional authority. The House leader, as a former Health minister, I think, can understand the concern that I am raising. We are talking about the disestablishment issue.

So, with those words of concern, I would ask the House leader if he would pass on those concerns and see if there would be some reason why the minister should have an approval function, not to require disestablishment. It seems to me it would be the organization's right not to disestablish, and no approval of a minister should be required.

Mr. McCrae: Well, unaccustomed as I am to answering questions related to the health system here in Manitoba, I would undertake indeed to ensure that this matter in question is passed along to the Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik) and with my request that he contact the honourable member to address the matter being raised in his question.

I assume, with that undertaking, the honourable member and his colleagues are prepared to move forward with the report stage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Amendment—pass.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): I move, seconded by the member for Rupertsland (Mr. Robinson), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 42—The Provincial Court Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): On behalf of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews), and seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), I move that Bill 42, The Provincial Court Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale et modifications corrélatives), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 42—The Provincial Court Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

* (2130)

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): With the leave of the House, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 42, The Provincial Court Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 43—The Law Society Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, and on behalf of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 43, The Law Society Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 43—The Law Society Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Radcliffe), that Bill 43, The Law Society Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau), be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 44—The Municipal Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, and on behalf of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay), that Bill 44, The Municipal Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités), reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 44—The Municipal Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 44, The Municipal Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités), be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 45—The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, and on behalf of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), that Bill 45, The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la preuve au Manitoba),

reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 45—The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, by leave, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Newman), that Bill 45, The Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la preuve au Manitoba), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 46—The Criminal Injuries Compensation Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews) and seconded by the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay), (by leave) I move that Bill 46, The Criminal Injuries Compensation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'indemnisation des victimes d'actes criminels), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

An Honourable Member: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division. The motion is accordingly carried.

Bill 47—The Adoption and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, by leave, and on behalf of the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Radcliffe), that Bill 47, The Adoption and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur l'adoption et modifications corrélatives), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

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

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division. The motion is accordingly carried.

Bill 50—The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and on behalf of the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) (by leave), that Bill 50, The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi sur l'accès à l'information et la protection de la vie privée et modifications corrélatives), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

An Honourable Member: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division. The motion is accordingly carried.

Bill 51—The Personal Health Information Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and on behalf of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Praznik), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) that Bill 51, The Personal Health Information Act (Loi sur les renseignements médicaux personnels), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

Voice Vote

* (2140)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it. The motion is carried.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division.

Bill 52—The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1997

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and on behalf of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), that Bill 52, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1997 (Loi de 1997 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives), as amended and reported

from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed.

An Honourable Member: No.

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division. The motion is accordingly carried.

Bill 53—The Local Authorities Election Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, by leave, and on behalf of the honourable Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Derkach), I move, seconded by the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews), that Bill 53, The Local Authorities Election Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élection des autorités locales et modifications corrélatives), reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS**Bill 53—The Local Authorities Election Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act**

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs.

Mitchelson) (by leave), that Bill 53, The Local Authorities Election Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élection des autorités locales et modifications corrélatives), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 56—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and on behalf of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 56, The Family Maintenance Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 56—The Family Maintenance Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), (by leave), that Bill 56, The Family Maintenance Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'obligation alimentaire), be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion presented.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): We are prepared to see this legislation forward, but we just want to put our regrets on the record. We have moved a substantial number of amendments to this bill in committee, one of them being to ensure that these awards are indexed. It is important that these awards and the income going to

custodial parents keep up with the rate of inflation. It is important that we use the courts wherever we can to ensure that that takes place and that we use legislation.

We also moved an amendment to ensure that the needs of the child are considered first and foremost by the courts in making orders. The government, believe it or not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, turned down that amendment. We also moved amendments to ensure that the child-support service that the government is contemplating establishing does not require a user fee from the consumers of that service. The government refused that amendment, and we will be watching very carefully to ensure that there is no such user fee established. We also have concerns about the limited scope of the child-support service, and so we will be watching to see how the government moves forward with this new administration.

There were other amendments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but with those comments, we are prepared to see the legislation go through, and we will be watching this very carefully. We will be watching to ensure that the courts, indeed, treat these guidelines as a floor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 58—The Law Reform Commission Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and on behalf of the honourable Attorney General (Mr. Toews), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Vodrey), that Bill 58, The Law Reform Commission Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit), as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No?

Voice Vote

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

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

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Gord Mackintosh (St. Johns): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On division. Accordingly carried. Agreed.

Bill 59—The Conservation Agreements Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and on behalf of the honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Cummings), I move, seconded by the honourable Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey), that Bill 59, The Conservation Agreements Act (Loi sur les accords de conservation), reported from the Standing Committee on Economic Development, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 59—The Conservation Agreements Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Downey), that Bill 59, The Conservation Agreements Act, be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 60—The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): By leave, and on behalf of the honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Reimer), I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Findlay), that Bill 60, The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la loi sur le logement des infirmes et des personnes âgées), reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, be concurred in.

* (2150)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 60—The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Amendment Act

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the honourable Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) that Bill 60, The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la loi sur le logement des infirmes et des personnes âgées), be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the honourable minister have leave? [agreed]

Motion agreed to.

House Business

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I now ask the advice of the government House leader.

Mr. McCrae: I think that we have done enough work for today and with regard to the people who have been

helping us get all this work through, hopefully we will not be keeping them around here too much longer, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I believe it is agreed that the House will sit tomorrow at 10 a.m. for the conduct of business if you want to check that out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the will of the House that the House reconvene tomorrow at ten o'clock? [agreed]

Mr. McCrae: Shall we call it nine o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall we call it—[interjection]

Mr. McCrae: Yes, with the understanding that we would meet to begin a normal day with Routine Proceedings and Question Period, and on that basis, shall we call it nine o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With the understanding that there will be a Question Period tomorrow then, agreed? And Routine Proceedings. [agreed]

The hour now being after nine o'clock, this House now adjourns and stands adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning (Friday).

Thank you and have a good night.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, June 26, 1997

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Presenting Petitions

CRTC Presentation
Struthers 5321

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Obstetrics Closure—Grace Hospital
Mihychuk 5321

CRTC Presentation
Struthers 5321

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Standing Committee on Economic
Development, 5th Report
Tweed 5322

Standing Committee on
Law Amendments, 7th Report
Penner 5324

Tabling of Reports

March 31, 1997, Report of Amounts
Paid to Members of the Assembly
Stefanson 5326

1996-97 Annual Report, Manitoba
Horse Racing Commission
Downey 5326

11th Annual Report, Manitoba
Law Foundation
Toews 5326

Oral Questions

Education System
Doer; Downey; McIntosh 5326
Friesen; McIntosh 5327
Lamoureux; McIntosh 5331
Reid; McIntosh 5334

Bill 50
McGifford; McIntosh; Vodrey 5328
Cerilli; McIntosh 5333

Independent Schools
McGifford; McIntosh 5330
Cerilli; McIntosh 5333

Bill 55
Robinson; Newman 5330

Disaster Assistance
Wowchuk; Pitura 5335

Nonpolitical Statements

Energy and Environment Calendar
Newman 5337

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Concurrence in Reports

Standing Committee on Privileges
and Elections, 2nd Report
McCrae 5337

Motions of Condolence

William Kardash
Downey 5338
Martindale 5338
Doer 5339
Ashton 5340
Praznik 5341

Edward McGill
Downey 5342
Doer 4343
McCrae 5344

James Cowan
Downey 5345
Doer 5345
Reid 5345
Findlay 5346

James Thomas Mills
Downey 5347
Doer 5348

Debate on Government Motion

Mackintosh 5349
McCrae 5349

Third Readings

	Mihychuk	5386		
	Friesen	5388		
Bill 24, Personal Property Security Amendment and Various Acts Amendment Act	Wowchuk	5391		
Lamoureux	5350		Bill 16, Council on Post-Secondary Education Amendment Act	
Bill 25, Proceeds of Crime Registration Act			Lamoureux	5394
Mackintosh	5350		Bill 39, Labour-Sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Act	
Lamoureux	5350		Sale	5395
Bill 26, Corporations Amendment Act			Bill 300, TD Trust Company and Central Guaranty Trust Company Act	5396
Doer	5351			
Lamoureux	5351		Bill 301, Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company, Montreal Trust Company of Canada and Montreal Trust Company Act	
Bill 27, Public Schools Amendment Act			Doer	5397
Friesen	5352		Bill 12, Manitoba Water Services Board Amendment Act	
Mihychuk	5353		Barrett	5398
Bill 29, Education Administration Amendment Act			C. Evans	5399
Sale	5358		Bill 33, Executions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	
Bill 55, Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act			Mackintosh	5401
Ashton	5360		Bill 36, Wildfires and Consequential Amendments Act	5408
Mihychuk	5362		Bill 42, Provincial Court Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	5410
Bill 30, Farm Practices Protection Amendment Act			Bill 43, Law Society Amendment Act	5410
Wowchuk	5364		Bill 44, Municipal Amendment Act	5411
Bill 31, Livestock and Livestock Products and Consequential Amendments Act			Bill 45, Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act	5411
Wowchuk	5366		Bill 53, Local Authorities Election Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	5413
Bill 34, City of Winnipeg Amendment and Municipal Amendment Act			Bill 56, Family Maintenance Amendment Act	
Doer	5367		Mackintosh	5414
Barrett	5370			
Bill 35, Condominium Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	5372			
Bill 37, Highway Traffic Amendment Act	5372			
Bill 40, Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation Amendment Act				
Sale	5372			
Bill 55, Manitoba Hydro Amendment Act				
Mihychuk	5376			
Bill 61, Sustainable Development and Consequential Amendments Act				
Struthers	5380			
Dewar	5383			

Bill 59, Conservation Agreements Act	5415
Bill 60, Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Amendment Act	5415
Report Stage	
Bill 27, Public Schools Amendment Act	5351
Bill 61, Sustainable Development and Consequential Amendments Act	5379
Bill 16, Council on Post-Secondary Education Amendment Act	5394
Bill 39, Labour-Sponsored Venture Capital Corporations Act	5395
Bill 300, TD Trust Company and Central Guaranty Trust Company Act	5396
Bill 301, Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company, Montreal Trust Company of Canada and Montreal Trust Company Act	5396
Bill 12, Manitoba Water Services Board Amendment Act	5398
Bill 33, Executions Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	5401
Bill 21, Jury Amendment Act	5407
Bill 36, Wildfires and Consequential Amendments Act	5407
Bill 38, Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2)	5408
Bill 41, Regional Health Authorities Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	
McCrae	5408
Ashton	5408
Sale	5409
Bill 42, Provincial Court Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	5410
Bill 43, Law Society Amendment Act	5410
Bill 45, Manitoba Evidence Amendment Act	5411

Bill 46, Criminal Injuries Compensation Amendment Act	5411
Bill 47, Adoption and Consequential Amendments Act	5412
Bill 50, Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy and Consequential Amendments Act	5412
Bill 51, Personal Health Information Act	5413
Bill 52, Statute Law Amendment Act, 1997	5413
Bill 53, Local Authorities Election Amendment and Consequential Amendments Act	5413
Bill 56, Family Maintenance Amendment Act	5414
Bill 58, Law Reform Commission Amendment Act	5414
Bill 59, Conservation Agreements Act	5415
Bill 60, Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Amendment Act	5415
Debate on Third Readings	
Bill 9, Public Utilities Board Amendment Act	
Doer	5374
Committee Report	
Standing Committee on Rules of the House, 1st Report	
Tweed	5402