

Fourth Session - Thirty-Eighth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable George Hickes
Speaker*

Vol. LVII No. 24 - 1:30 p.m., Monday, December 5, 2005

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Eighth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
AGLUGUB, Cris	The Maples	N.D.P.
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	N.D.P.
BRICK, Marilyn	St. Norbert	N.D.P.
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CULLEN, Cliff	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
CUMMINGS, Glen	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary, Hon.	Concordia	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	P.C.
HAWRANIK, Gerald	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
HICKES, George, Hon.	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri	Fort Garry	N.D.P.
JENNISSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
MURRAY, Stuart	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	N.D.P.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack	Southdale	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Carman	P.C.
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
ROWAT, Leanne	Minnedosa	P.C.
SALE, Tim, Hon.	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Wellington	N.D.P.
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
SMITH, Scott, Hon.	Brandon West	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
SWAN, Andrew	Minto	N.D.P.
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	P.C.
<i>Vacant</i>	Fort Whyte	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, December 5, 2005

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYER

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PETITIONS

Provincial Road 340

Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Minnedosa): I wish to present the following petition to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

These are the reasons for this petition:

The hard surfacing of the unpaved portion of PR 340, south of Canadian Forces Base Shilo towards Wawanesa, would address the last few neglected kilometres of this road and increase the safety of motorists who travel on it.

Heavy traffic has increased on PR 340 due to the many large farms involved in potato and hog production, agricultural-related businesses, Hutterite colonies and the Maple Leaf plant in Brandon. A fully paved road would support local business and lessen the damage to vehicles.

Annual average traffic volumes on PR 340 are increasing with commuter traffic from Wawanesa, Stockton, Nesbitt and surrounding farms to Shilo and Brandon.

The arrival of the Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry in 2004 and increased employment at the Maple Leaf plant in Brandon means there has been an influx of new families in the area. Improving the rural highway infrastructure in this location will be an additional reason for these families and others to settle and stay in the area.

Access to the Criddle-Vane Homestead Provincial Park would be greatly enhanced.

PR 340 is an alternate route for many motorists travelling to Brandon coming off PTH 2 east and to Winnipeg via the Trans-Canada Highway No. 1. This upgrade would also ease the traffic congestion on PTH 10.

All Manitobans deserve a safe and well-maintained rural highway infrastructure.

We petition the Manitoba Legislative Assembly as follows:

To request the Minister of Transportation and Government Services (Mr. Lemieux) to consider hard surfacing of the unpaved portion of PR 340, south of Canadian Forces Base Shilo, towards Wawanesa.

This petition signed by Dave Mooney, Shane Wilton, Alf Arnold and many, many others.

Mr. Speaker: In accordance with our Rule 132(6), when petitions are read they are deemed to be received by the House.

Crocus Investment Fund

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): To the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

The background to this petition is as follows:

The Manitoba Government was made aware of serious problems involving the Crocus Fund back in 2001.

As a direct result of the government ignoring the red flags back in 2001, over 33 000 Crocus investors lost over \$60 million.

Manitoba's provincial auditor stated "We believe the department was aware of the red flags at Crocus and failed to follow up on those in a timely way."

The relationship between some union leaders, the Premier (Mr. Doer) and the NDP seems to be the primary reason as for why the government ignored the red flags.

We petition the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba as follows:

To request the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba to consider the need to seek clarification on why the government did not act on fixing the Crocus Fund back in 2001.

Signed by Rudy Alvaran, Emma Tan and Guia Alvaran.

* (13:35)

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Oscar Lathlin (Minister of Aboriginal and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report for the Communities

Economic Development Fund for the year ending March 31, '05.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us today students from Sansome School. These students are under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Briggs, and are the guests of the honourable Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Murray).

Also seated in the public gallery are Progressive Conservative constituency assistants.

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here today.

Also in the public gallery we have with us from Dr. D. W. Penner School 23 Grade 6 students under the direction of Mr. Harry Bell. These students are in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Family Services and Housing (Ms. Melnick).

Also in the public gallery we have with us from Gordon Bell High School Life Skills Department, 8 students under the direction of Mrs. Maxine Bell. This group is located in the constituency of the honourable Member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer).

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Public Schools Student Safety

Mr. Stuart Murray (Leader of the Official Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, students at Shaftesbury High School in Winnipeg were terrorized by a group of teenage intruders who entered their school and violently assaulted them. This brazen attack occurred in the middle of the day. Parents are telling us that they are afraid. Their primary concern, as it should be the concern of this government, is for the safety of our children. It is the responsibility of this NDP government to ensure that our schools are equipped and prepared to deal with all intruders who prey upon our students. Our students' lives are being put in danger.

What action is the Premier (Mr. Doer) going to take to ensure that when our students are at school that their safety is guaranteed?

Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Education, Citizenship and Youth): Well, Mr. Speaker, I

would like to state, first and foremost, that it is the most important issue for the people on this side of the House as well that student safety is a very important issue for government. Having said that, we have been working with a number of initiatives with our partners in the Safe Schools Charter. The Safe Schools Charter requires an emergency response plan, and in the event that events such as the one that took place on Friday occur, we expect that the staff at this school and the school division will be reviewing the situation to see how the emergency response plan worked. We also have been providing assistance with the Education, Citizenship and Youth staff to ensure that the emergency response plans work as well.

Mr. Murray: Well, Mr. Speaker, members on that side of the House would recognize that it was us on this side of the House that demanded a Safe Schools summit. That was an initiative that we took. This is a very serious issue, and we know that students deserve to be safe in our schools. Students need this peace of mind. Frankly, so do the parents need the same peace of mind.

Friday's incident clearly indicates that we must get tough on gangs, Mr. Speaker, not only in our streets but in our schools. Our community safety plan that we developed, Enough is Enough!, is designed to send a strong message that violent activity will not be tolerated in our schools. We called for a greater public police presence in our schools, including the placement of retired police officers within our schools, because we on this side of this House are not prepared to stand by as youth violence escalates not only in the streets but in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, when will this NDP Premier (Mr. Doer) make our schools safer? When will he make this a priority and provide leadership and the resources to ensure the safety of these schools?

* (13:40)

Mr. Bjornson: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member recognizes that it is indeed a community issue, and right now, in the community, there are police officers at the school addressing the concerns that were raised and being identified and getting students and community participating in the investigative process.

There are counsellors available to assist students and teachers if they would like to discuss the impacts of the events that transpired on Friday. We recognize this as a community initiative. *Working Together: Safe Caring Schools, Families and Communities* is

one of the documents that we have produced in support.

A Whole School Approach to Safety and Belonging is one of the documents that we put in to show support. Safe Schools Manitoba is an initiative by this side of the government. All these initiatives are being brought forward to assist in issues exactly like this, Mr. Speaker, and we will continue to work with our partners to ensure that schools are a safe learning environment.

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, this minister, this member of the government, stands and reads a response. People are entering into our schools in the middle of the day. That is the issue. This government is doing nothing on that. We hear lip-service from this government all the time.

Despite passing legislation a year and a half ago, this government is only providing the Safe Schools co-ordinating with part-time funding. When will this NDP government make this priority an issue? When will they make this issue a priority? I am sorry. When will they provide the proper resources required to schools to prevent these children from being terrified during the middle of the day?

Mr. Bjornson: Well, Mr. Speaker, again, with respect to the incident on Friday, I would first of all like to thank the teachers who put themselves at risk and the administrators who put themselves at risk and the support staff that put themselves at risk, put themselves in harm's way to ensure the safety of the students in the school on Friday.

This is a community issue. We have worked with a number of different stakeholders in the community. We will continue to work with the stakeholders in the community, Mr. Speaker. Our commitment has been clear with the Safe Schools Charter, with the code of conduct, with establishing Safe Schools Manitoba, with working with multidisciplinary, multijurisdictional groups, co-ordinated efforts to ensure that students are safe in our schools. It is something that has been first and foremost when we took office and since we formed government, and I will not remind members opposite of their record on the same issue.

Safe Schools Codes of Conduct

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, violence is escalating in our schools. On Friday a group of teens invaded Shaftesbury High School, terrorized students and threatened to return.

One student was struck in the head with a gun and others were sprayed with mace.

For the past year, Mr. Speaker, our side of the House has been pushing the Safe Schools agenda. However, this Minister of Education has refused to provide us with the Safe Schools codes of conduct. We want to see if the safety measures are set at the same and consistent levels across this province. I would ask the minister, who has refused us on three or four occasions to table those codes of conduct, if he will table them now.

Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Education, Citizenship and Youth): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite has requested these on three occasions and on three occasions she has been provided with the information as to why we do not provide her with those codes of conduct.

It is very clear, Mr. Speaker. Now the member opposite says for the last year they have been pushing the Safe Schools agenda. We have been pushing it for six years. Members opposite did nothing for 11 with respect to the Safe Schools agenda.

Our commitment has included legislation. It has included the codes of conduct, the emergency response plans. It has included partnership with a number of different community organizations. It has included consultation with a number of different community organizations. Members opposite were very dismissive of that consultation, one member saying, "consult, consult, consult," another member standing up in the House and saying, "Ignore all that, we have a better idea," and there was a third member opposite who said, "It is a waste of time."

Mrs. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education says that he has this plan in place and it is working. Well, if it is working, why are we seeing increasing violence in our schools? Teachers and students at Shaftesbury High School were in danger on Friday.

* (13:45)

The minister passed Safe Schools legislation one and a half years ago that says these schools must have an emergency response plan in place to deal with these situations. He refuses to table the codes of conduct. Will he tell us today and guarantee us today that every single school in Manitoba has an emergency response plan in place and that schools know how to use them?

Mr. Bjornson: Mr. Speaker, I have said it in the House, and I will say it again, all schools in Manitoba have codes of conduct. The member opposite talked about being very specific.

While the member opposite talks about prescriptive ideas around how we deal with issues in the schools as far as school safety is concerned, what we have said from day one is we are going to consult with the stakeholders. Administrators and teachers and the community know their students best. They know how to develop the codes of conduct. They know how to develop the emergency response plans. They know what is best for their community. In the event that these emergency response plans do not address the specifics of an incident, then they take a look at that emergency response plan and see how they can do yet a better job of ensuring that our schools are safe. We are not being prescriptive. We are allowing schools and partners to develop what works best in their community, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Driedger: Mr. Speaker, what he has done is he has dumped the responsibility for school safety on to the schools. He is not showing any leadership in this issue at all. We have the codes of conduct here from the ones that we could get. This minister is wrong when he says that they are all finalized. Very few of them actually, in fact, only about half are finalized. This minister is not showing any leadership and responsibility. Kids with guns entered a school on Friday.

I would like to ask him today: When is he going to do his job and show leadership on this issue so that kids, parents and teachers all know that our schools are safe? When is he going to do what he is supposed to do?

Mr. Bjornson: Mr. Speaker, teachers, parents and the community have been saying for a long time now, we need to make our schools a safe environment. In fact, they were saying long before 1999, when we took office, and we started to enact a number of different initiatives to make schools a safe environment. Members opposite had a long time to do something about school safety but they chose to ignore it. We have brought forward legislation. We have a number of different resources in place.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Bjornson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have a number of initiatives, a number of partnerships, with different non-profit, non-government organizations,

a number of interjurisdictional activities that we have been engaged in, a number of interdepartmental organizations that we have been engaged in in making our schools a safer place. We have been involved in this process for six years. Members opposite had 11 years. They chose to do nothing.

Public Schools Student Safety

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): The Minister of Education has been studying for six years, but he has done nothing on this particular issue. Manitoba Progressive Conservatives put forward a plan to bring more security and better safety co-ordination to schools through the use of retired police officers. This is about protecting the students, and it is about protecting teachers, Mr. Speaker.

Schools should be used and should not be concerned about having drug sales in the hallways. They should not be used for gang recruitment. They should not be used for acts of violence. I want to ask this Minister of Justice today if he is going to accept our plan, use the retired officers and ensure that there is safety in schools again in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I know that members of the opposition had some ideas. I am glad that many are already in place or underway in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of police in schools, I am pleased because I do not think I have had this opportunity to confirm to the House that the Police in Schools program in the school division of Winnipeg has been reconfirmed for a further three-year period as a result of the involvement of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Smith).

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to confirm, I do not think I have had that opportunity, to advise the House that, as a result of provincial funding, there is now a school resource officer of Police in Schools in the city of Brandon, and I have early indications that it has been most successful.

Mr. Goertzen: It has taken six years for this minister to go from a pilot project to reconfirm, for another year, a program. We are talking about having retired police officers, not a handful that they have in a program, sprinkled across the city in a couple of schools, rotating around from time to time. This is a serious problem.

We need a detachment of retired officers going to the schools, ensuring that there is protection for students, co-ordinating safety and making sure the drugs are getting out of the schools, making sure that the gangs are not going into the schools and getting the weapons out of the schools. We put forward a plan and I want the minister to adopt it today.

* (13:50)

Will he today give us a commitment that he will use these retired officers, as we suggested, and put forward a real force to ensure that there is protection in the schools for our students and for our teachers?

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, I believe the member might not understand the Winnipeg School Division program that we partnered with along with Winnipeg Police Service. It is for a further three-year period during the course of which we will evaluate it to make sure that we build on the strengths and eliminate the shortcomings.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite should also know that, in this current year's budget, we have allocated 23 new positions directly to the City of Winnipeg Police Service, and two weeks ago, members might not have seen that, two weeks ago, we announced in partnership with the City of Winnipeg a further 23 officers. That is, in one year, 46 new police officer positions for the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Goertzen: He is confirming a program that clearly has not been working over the last number of years, Mr. Speaker, that is the issue.

At the time when we should be talking about reading, writing and arithmetic, we are talking about gangs, drugs and pistol-whipping in the school. It is completely unacceptable. Parents, teachers and students have the right to expect when their kids are going to school that it is going to be a safe environment and a good learning environment.

The Minister of Justice has talked tough. He has talked about putting forward a program that has not worked in the past number of years. He needs to have real resources, dedicated resources. We know that we could use retired officers to ensure there was a real presence in the schools, to co-ordinate the safety, to co-ordinate real safety within the schools. I want him to confirm and to commit that he will put forward the Progressive Conservative plan and get those retired officers into the schools, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mackintosh: Mr. Speaker, it is passing strange that when we, in 1996, asked the former administration sitting on this side of the House to implement a police in schools program they said no. I am glad they are Johnny-come-latelies on this. Finally, they seem to have some interest in getting police officers in our schools. We have put police officers in our schools. We are adding police officers to our schools, and with the new resources to the City of Winnipeg Police Service, I look forward to further discussions with Winnipeg Police Service on where those officers will be deployed.

To continue my question, Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate as well members opposite do not seem to recognize and acknowledge the work of Winnipeg Police Service when it comes to action in schools. There is the program Take Action in Schools. There is a school resource unit in addition to the SROs who are deployed in 12 elementary schools in Winnipeg. Thank you.

Safe Schools Conservative Party Recommendations

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): Mr. Speaker, parents in the Tuxedo area as well as parents in Manitoba deserve to know that their children are safe when they are at school. After Friday's violent attack at Shaftesbury High School, one parent said about his son, and I quote, "I just want to see him make it to Grade 12."

Students need a safe environment to learn and grow. What is stopping the Minister of Justice from taking the suggestions our party has put forward? Is it his pride or his inability to see this as a serious priority for Manitobans?

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, when the Filmon government was asked to get serious about police in schools, when a proposal—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Mackintosh: Someone is embarrassed today.

Indeed, when we came into office, we brought forward the idea of police officers who were to be stationed in the schools, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased that, as a result of efforts across departments involving the community, most important of all, involving Winnipeg Police Service, we now have police in schools in Winnipeg. It has now expanded beyond Winnipeg, and we will have further

discussions in terms of further deployment of Winnipeg police officers. I remind members opposite that it is this government that put police in schools. It is this government that has paid 46 new officer positions in Winnipeg Police Service in one year.

*(13:55)

Mrs. Stefanson: Mr. Speaker, this Minister of Education and this government has had six years to deal with this problem, and they have done nothing to provide a safe environment for our children and for teachers in our schools. Shame on them.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has failed to ensure that there is safety for young people both on our streets and in our schools. Providing security is important for school safety but schools cannot do it alone. When children are threatened with weapons in our schools it is an issue of justice and of safety. The Minister of Justice has allowed the situation to worsen under his watch. Why will he not dedicate the resources needed to keep our students and our teachers safe in our schools?

Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Education, Citizenship and Youth): Mr. Speaker, I personally know that teachers put themselves at risk on a daily basis. They put themselves in harm's way to protect the students, and they have done that time and time again. They have done that for decades.

The difference between then and now is that now we have a government that has a Safe Schools Charter, and now we have a government that requires codes of conduct. We have a government that requires emergency response planning. We have a government that has been funding schools appropriately and providing them with additional resources, Mr. Speaker. We have been working with funding guidance counsellors at a level that has not been seen before in early middle years. We are working with a number of different initiatives, with a number of different departments, to make our schools safer places. This is not the practice of members opposite, 11 years, nothing.

Mrs. Stefanson: Manitobans deserve more than the empty rhetoric and broken promises offered by this minister and this government. Mr. Speaker, Manitobans want action, and they want and deserve it now. Enough is enough. The attack on Friday brought attention to a problem that has been growing under this NDP government. Today some students are afraid to go to school, and their parents feel powerless to protect their children.

Our party has brought forward ideas to help prevent violence on our streets and in our schools. Will the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) let parents and students know that there is real hope and commit to our plan of action today, right now?

Mr. Bjornson: Mr. Speaker, the member wants to talk about leadership. We have demonstrated leadership on this issue since we have been elected, since 1999. That leadership has manifested a number of different programs that we have brought forward. Our commitment starts before the students are in school with respect to student behaviour and student safety with the Triple P Positive Parenting Program which, long term, will be addressing conduct disorder, with the Roots of Empathy program and with the number of different initiatives we have brought forward. That is leadership.

Mr. Speaker, leadership is the codes of conduct in the Safe Schools Charter, leadership is the emergency response plan, leadership is also providing resources to the schools. Members opposite were funding schools in such a way that there were fewer teachers in the schools and fewer kids in the schools, fewer resources in the schools. This government is about resources funding—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Public Schools Employee Safety

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Self-congratulatory comments serve little purpose in ensuring that there is some protection for our students and our teachers. Mr. Speaker, a high school principal in Selkirk was injured earlier this year when trying to break up a fight between students. In 2003, a teacher suffered serious brain injury when attacked in his school by a trespassing intruder. These are just two instances of where teachers have been injured when they have intervened on behalf of their students.

I want to ask the Minister of Education whether or not he is prepared to provide the kind of support and leadership to our schools, our teachers, our support staff that will allow them to work in their environment safely and without fear of being injured or hurt on the job.

Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Education, Citizenship and Youth): Mr. Speaker, we are providing the supports to teachers, to support staff, to parents and to students. In fact, teachers, parents, students and support staff have been part of that

dialogue that we have been having for a couple of years now towards the development of the Safe Schools Charter, towards the development of the codes of conduct, towards the development of emergency response plans. They have been part of that consultation process from day one. The difference between now and then is we listened to what the teachers, parents and students had to say. Members opposite chose not to.

* (14:00)

When we were teachers in 1993, when I was a teacher, we started to request more support for issues of violence and safety in the schools. Members opposite had a different agenda for schools. It was cutting funding to schools, it was underresourcing schools, and they chose to do nothing on this very important issue of school safety. We have a plan; we have a policy and we have action. The members opposite have nothing.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, this minister keeps harping back to 1999 when we did not have guns in school. We did not face those issues. He is responsible today and he has to take responsibility. The Safe Schools legislation was passed a year and a half ago, and the onus has been placed on school boards, principals, teachers and support staff. There are no protocols, no strategies or plans in place today to help teachers or support staff deal with these violent situations in our schools.

When will this minister provide the leadership, the direction, and develop the protocols that will assist teachers and support staff in dealing with violence and the presence of weapons in our schools, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Bjornson: Mr. Speaker, members opposite had their heads in the sand for 11 years. Members opposite seem to think that none of these problems existed while they were in government. You know the audacity for them to suggest so. These things are happening in our schools and that is why the lobby started then. The difference between then and now? We are listening; we are working with teachers and we are working with the community. We are working with parents to ensure that our schools are safe environments.

We produced a number of documents to support the initiation of a number of different initiatives in the schools. We have documents to support parents. We have the safe schools advertising. We have provided information on bullying. We are doing all

kinds of things. Members opposite, if they want a letter and a list of all the things we are doing, plus the response that we are receiving from the community, we can provide that for the members opposite. I know what happens when we talk about leadership, and the Teachers' Society congratulated this government about leadership. I shared that with the members opposite and they took that press release and they ripped it up.

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, it is sad that the minister is not only embarrassing himself but his colleagues as well. When incidents such that occurred at Shaftesbury High School, the memory of the tragedy of Columbine is brought forefront to our minds. No parent, no student, no teacher would ever want to have a tragedy such as Columbine to reoccur. That is why we on this side of the House are somewhat passionate about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister very seriously, once again, whether he will take this matter seriously and the issue of school violence, and give teachers, their assistants and the support staff in our schools the kind of help they need by developing protocols for the protection of teachers, support staff and those who work in our schools.

Mr. Bjornson: Mr. Speaker, we are providing those supports. We are providing a number of different initiatives; Safe Schools Manitoba, and Dr. Mary Hall has been engaged in a number of community forums and has talked in a number of school divisions as requested to do so by the school divisions. School divisions hold professional development days where they do deal with these issues. We have a lot of school divisions that are sharing the best practice and the most effective practices to address issues that arise as they may, and how it relates to their emergency response plans and to their procedures through the codes of conduct.

Again, the leadership comes from the community as well. We work with our partners. We have established leadership with respect to the Safe Schools Charter making it law. We work with our partners to develop what best and effective practice is to address this issue that has been very important on this side of the House.

Wally Fox-Decent Professional Conduct

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. I assume the minister has had the opportunity to review the

Workers Compensation Board file as it pertains to my questions of last week. For the minister's information, in late March of 2001, Becky Barrett, the then-Minister of Labour was informed of specific allegations regarding the professional conduct of the WCB chairman, Wally Fox-Decent. These serious allegations included concerns about management interference and corporate governance at the WCB.

My question for the minister: Could the minister inform this House if her department ever investigated these very serious allegations?

Hon. Nancy Allan (Minister of Labour and Immigration): I think it is important to clarify, Mr. Speaker, that the WCB is an arm's-length agency that reports to the Minister of Labour. I think it is important to remind members opposite that the Auditor General is conducting an audit into the WCB, and we expect that report to be done soon. When that report is completed, that report will be made public.

Mr. Cullen: Quite correctly, the minister is responsible for the Workers Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker, these allegations were raised by then-president and chief executive officer of the Workers Compensation Board so they should have been taken seriously at that time. My question for the minister: Could the minister explain why her department did not investigate these very serious allegations?

Ms. Allan: I think it is important to remember that the WCB is an arm's-length agency and it reports, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, not the department.

There is a review being done by the Auditor General. He has all of the information, and I am very pleased to say that any information that the Auditor General required from my office we certainly co-operated. We expect that this report will contain recommendations for the WCB, for my office, and we will take those recommendations very seriously. In Bill 25, we strengthened the governance of the WCB, and we are interested in any recommendations that will provide a stronger governance structure for the WCB.

Mr. Cullen: I remind the minister that these allegations were made back in 2001. It was quite clear that this NDP government did not treat these allegations seriously. Shortly after these issues were raised, the author, then-president and CEO, was fired. The subject of the complaint, Wally Fox-Decent, continued on with his role as chairman of the

board. He was also appointed by this NDP government to mediate in a number of high-profile labour disputes as well as chair a number of government committees.

My question again for the minister is why did her government ignore these serious allegations, and why did she ignore these red flags.

Ms. Allan: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, but I just want to remind members opposite that Mr. Wally Fox-Decent, the chair of the Workers Compensation Board, was hired by the previous government. There were five ministers of Labour who worked under Mr. Wally Fox-Decent, and I just want to remind—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Ms. Allan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The office of the Auditor General is conducting a review into the WCB, and we will be very interested in receiving his recommendations if there are any recommendations in that report to strengthen governance.

Climate Change Initiative Inclusion of Agriculture

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry. The minister is concerned about the future of the Dow Chemical strawboard plant in Elie. In discussions with the minister, I understand he is frustrated by the fact that agriculture is not included in the Canadian agreements with respect to assigning and trading credits for greenhouse gas emissions. The result is that making straw into board to reduce greenhouse gases instead of burning the straw and creating lots of greenhouse gases does not receive appropriate credit under the Canadian climate change agreements.

Can the Minister of Industry explain why agriculture is not included in the climate change agreement, and why he is having trouble with support to make straw into board instead of the straw being burned and creating problems for Winnipeggers?

* (14:10)

Hon. Jim Rondeau (Minister of Industry, Economic Development and Mines): Mr. Speaker, we as a government would work with any company that wishes to be strong, build and grow in Manitoba. I believe that it is important that our government will

work with the Elie plant or any plant in their economic development. As far as the Kyoto climate change, the Province of Manitoba, the Industry Department, does not control the Kyoto Accord. What we would like to do is work with any company, whether it is the Dow Bioproducts or any company, to talk about expansions staying here and creating jobs in Manitoba, as we would as per normal arrangement.

Mr. Gerrard: Clearly, agriculture is not adequately in these agreements, and yet it was this government which was involved in negotiating the cross-Canada agreements. Why did the minister's government not work harder to make sure that the situation with straw was included? Will the minister's government, with the Premier (Mr. Doer) as a co-host of the Climate Leaders' Summit, be making sure that agriculture is included in the summit report due tomorrow, or will the minister's NDP government once again show its disregard for agriculture and for the beneficial effects of the Elie strawboard plant to reduce greenhouse gases?

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see the David Suzuki Foundation recently related Manitoba's climate change plan is the best in Canada. Our Power Smart government partnership moved us from ninth to first in the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance ranking. "First with an A in setting the gold standards," says executive director, Peter Love. Last week, *Business-Week* magazine ranked Manitoba's climate change as No. 1 for regional governments in the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, the specific issue of agriculture and carbon sinks, and how carbon sinks are going to be baseline for inclusion or exclusion in the Kyoto Accord, is an international issue which has been very difficult to get the mathematics on so that the baselines for the carbon sinks are properly established so that then there can be carbon credits. That work is still going on internationally and the—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Bill 11 Public Consultation

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Yes, Mr. Speaker, one of the pillars of this Throne Speech is that bizarre policy in regard to the cross-subsidization of electrical users with natural gas users. There are so many problems I just do not have enough time to be able to expand on just how bizarre

this Premier (Mr. Doer) has entered into bad public policy.

In fact, I am going to indicate to you that Bill 11 is not going to pass between now and the end of this session unless this government is prepared to extend the sitting days, Mr. Speaker. Unless the government is prepared to extend the sitting days, it will not pass.

The question that I have to the minister responsible for this bill is will he ensure to members of this House that any sort of consultation beyond second reading would include rural Manitoba by ensuring that a standing committee will go to Thompson, will go to Brandon to hear just how badly flawed this piece of legislation or crap—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Tim Sale (Minister of Health): As I was saying in my previous answer, Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is no cross-subsidization. Hydro maintains a balancing—*[interjection]* Hydro maintains a hedging account in which there is a positive balance of some \$22 million currently. We are expecting that that hedging account will provide sufficient resources to smooth the price hike which otherwise would have meant seniors and others on fixed incomes would face an increase of more than 20 percent in the winter without any chance to provide planning for that.

The intent of this bill is not only to smooth rates so that increases are gradual, it is to provide resources along with Canada so that people's need for heating fuel, propane, natural gas or electricity is reduced by investment in the efficiency of their housing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will take this opportunity to remind members to pick their words carefully when they are either raising an issue or answering a question. There are certain words that are not acceptable in this Chamber.

Manitoba Economy Unemployment Rate

Ms. Kerri Irvin-Ross (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I have noticed in the Fort Garry community that constituents have more opportunities to participate in Manitoba's strong economy. Could the Minister of Industry, Economic Development and Mines share with the House the latest report on Manitoba's jobless rate?

Hon. Jim Rondeau (Minister of Industry, Economic Development and Mines): Today, Mr.

Speaker, I am pleased to inform all members about the Stats Canada recent survey which said that Manitoba had an unemployment rate of 4.2 percent, a level that has not been seen since April 1976.

The city of Winnipeg had a rate of 3.8 percent, and for the members opposite who say that we are not doing a lot about the additional jobs, there are over 7000 new, private-sector jobs created in the last year, and, over the last 5.9 years, Manitoba's labour force has grown by an average annual rate of 6150, nearly three times the record of members opposite.

Safe Schools Codes of Conduct

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education has, on several occasions, indicated that the codes of conduct were all completed, yet he has refused to provide us with copies of that on numerous occasions. Our own analysis of this shows that, of the 38 school divisions out there, only 17 have fully completed their codes of conduct. Can the minister please explain why he is misleading us with his information?

Hon. Peter Bjornson (Minister of Education, Citizenship and Youth): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the codes of conduct, all schools have submitted codes of conduct. That is what I have said in the House. With respect to the codes of conduct, they are not a static document because in the event that there are things that might arise where the codes of conduct need to be changed then they change the code of conduct accordingly.

This is done through consultation. This is done through review of the policies and procedures that are put in place, Mr. Speaker. We wanted to make sure that all school divisions had codes of conduct that dealt with a variety of issues, unlike members opposite.

I remember working with a number of teachers back in 1990's on drug and alcohol education and drug and alcohol policies. We could not assume that all schools would have policies on drug and alcohol and response plans for students who might be at risk because of those behaviours. We worked with the teachers. We worked with the communities. The codes of conduct are not a static document. They are documents that change to respond to the different needs.

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

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Volunteerism

Ms. Bonnie Korzeniowski (St. James): Mr. Speaker, every day in Manitoba and around the world volunteers and staff working in thousands of voluntary sector organizations are actively involved in making a difference, improving their communities and the lives of others in Canada and abroad.

Manitobans are well known throughout the world as people who are willing to volunteer to assist others. This is our way. The voluntary sector is one of the three pillars that constitute Canadian society, together with the public and private sector. Our quality of life, our economic strength and the vitality of our democratic institutions depend on the vibrancy of these independent sectors and the support they provide to one another.

Manitobans working overseas as volunteers have come from all professions and backgrounds touching virtually all aspects of society from social justice, human rights education, environment, health and faith, to arts and culture, sports, recreation, business and government. Volunteers work alongside counterparts in partner countries, share their knowledge and skills to deliver critical services, advocate for common causes and support sustainable economic and community development worldwide.

On their return, they increase awareness of development issues among Manitobans. In this way, volunteers are not only enriching the lives of others, but they are cultivating a way of being in the world that fosters co-operation, education and civic values.

The Government of Manitoba values the contribution made by Manitoba volunteers. International volunteering forges bonds between and among Canadians and their counterparts abroad, creating the basis for meaningful co-operation, action and results around common goals. It fosters the development of social networks with change in Manitoba, Canada and around the world, mobilizing support for and action in regard to common global concerns such as HIV-AIDS, environmental degradation or debt relief.

Mr. Speaker, today is International Volunteer Day and throughout Manitoba the extraordinary people who invest their lives in improving the world are being celebrated. I ask members here today to join me in applauding their efforts and thank them for their commitment. Thank you.

* (14:20)

Family Doctor Week

Mrs. Bonnie Mitchelson (River East): It is my privilege today to announce that the College of Family Physicians of Canada has declared the week of December 5 to 11 as Family Doctor Week in Canada.

Every day family doctors diagnose and treat illnesses and injury, promote disease prevention and good health, co-ordinate care and advocate on behalf of their patients. They not only provide primary medical care but, in many communities, also secondary and tertiary care working from their offices, hospitals, patients' homes, personal care homes and other community facilities.

Public surveys repeatedly show that Canadians hold family doctors in high regard for the quality of care they provide and in addition to patient care family doctors are involved in teaching students and residents in medical schools across Canada and in conducting research that is a valuable contribution to the practice of family medicine.

Manitoba owes a debt of gratitude to its family doctors, and it gives me great pleasure to thank our family doctors for the work they do every day and for their contribution to Manitoba's health care system. I would like to ask all members of the Legislature to join me in thanking our family doctors and supporting Family Doctor Week in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I know I will not have enough time, but, with leave, I was wondering if I might just table and have it recorded in Hansard the Declaration of Commitment of Our Values which has been signed by the College of Family Physicians in Manitoba. If I could have leave, if that could just be tabled, I would appreciate it for the record.

Some Honourable Members: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Just for clarification, the leave that was granted has been leave to not only table but for that to go into the Hansard.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Okay. That is for clarification.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DECLARATION OF COMMITMENT

OUR VALUES

As family physicians and members of the College of Family Physicians of Canada, we value: the trust placed in us by our patients, our peers and our communities; the privilege of being the personal physicians for the individuals and families who are our patients; the role we play in meeting the changing health care needs of the people of Canada; and the importance of our College motto, "In study lies our strength", which inspires us to maintain the highest standards of practice, teaching, research and life-long learning.

OUR PRINCIPLES

As family physicians who care for patients, teach students and conduct research, we are guided by our College's Principles of Family Medicine: The patient-doctor relationship and the needs of our patients are central to all we do. We are skilled clinicians—providing and co-ordinating a broad range of evidence-based health care for individuals and families throughout their lives. We are community-based physicians—responding to patient and community needs through our offices, hospitals, patients' homes and other community settings. We are a resource to our practice populations—promoting health to prevent illness, providing and explaining health information, collaborating with and facilitating access to other caregivers and advocating for patients throughout the health care system.

OUR COMMITMENT

*On this, the 50th Anniversary
of the founding of
THE COLLEGE OF
FAMILY PHYSICIANS OF CANADA*

We recommit our Chapter and its members to the values and principles of the College of Family Physicians of Canada which define the discipline of family medicine.

United Nations Climate Change Conference

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, over the past week I was very pleased to attend, on behalf of our province, the United Nations Climate Change Conference and global negotiations happening in Montréal. To my knowledge, I was the only provincial or territorial-elected official at the event at this particular time. Of course, our Premier is out in

Montréal right now continuing his leadership on this very important global issue. In particular, our Premier will be co-hosting a Climate Leaders' Summit with Québec Premier Jean Charest, happening in the next couple of days, and this event will bring together multiple provinces and states from subnational governments addressing the question of what our subnational government is doing to fix climate change.

Manitoba, I am very proud to report, is a global, not just a national, but a global leader in this respect. Indeed, at the opening plenary session of the United Nations conference, with 189 nations represented, Manitoba was singled out twice by opening speeches for the phenomenal work that is happening in our province. Some of these issues and opportunities would include clean hydro power developed with little or no flooding and in full partnership with local communities; wind power, another clean source and another 1000 megawatts which has recently been asked for by our government; incredible conservation initiatives are also underway; and, of course, geothermal heat pumps, ethanol and biodiesel all fit the bill as well. Benefits from this will be flowing to all parts of our province not just down in the south.

Local, national and international organizations are recognizing our leadership role. The David Suzuki Foundation, of course, has found that Manitoba's climate change plan is the best in the country. We also have gone from ninth to first in the national energy efficiency rankings. Just this past week, *BusinessWeek* magazine said our plan for climate change was the best regional government's initiative in the entire world. Mr. Speaker, our government is very proud of its record and equally excited about future opportunities to come. Thank you very much.

CFS of Western Manitoba Foundation

Mrs. Leanne Rowat (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of attending a gala dinner hosted by the Child and Family Services of Western Manitoba Foundation. The member from Turtle Mountain also accompanied me to this event. It was a wonderful event and was a great way for the foundation to raise thousands of dollars for a truly worthy cause.

It is amazing to think that this community-based organization has been helping to serve the Westman area for over 100 years. The CFS of Western Manitoba Foundation has now grown to include 80

permanent staff, and they champion the causes of helping deal with issues of child abuse, neglect, sexual abuse, adoption, employment and many others. They offer an indispensable service to the community, and they deserve great thanks for doing it.

The keynote speaker at the gala dinner was a truly inspiring individual, Mr. Alvin Law. Mr. Law was born in the early 1960s at a time when the drug thalidomide was prescribed to help expecting mothers deal with morning sickness. As we now know, this drug caused birth deformities in more than 13 000 children, and Mr. Law was one of those affected. The effects of this drug was Mr. Law was born without his arms and doctors predicted his quality of life would be severely limited. I am pleased to say that Mr. Law has conquered his adversities to become an inspiring story and a great success, now speaking professionally to 150 000 people every year.

I would like to take this opportunity to say what a wonderful event was hosted by the Child and Family Services of Western Manitoba Foundation. The gala dinner both raised a great deal of funds for a worthy cause and proved to be great entertainment for all who attended.

My thanks go out to all those involved in staging this event and Mr. Law for delivering the keynote address. I wish the foundation continued success into the future. Thank you.

Children of the Earth School

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the exceptional efforts of a high school in the North End. That high school is Children of the Earth School. Their commitment to excellence in education and to the Aboriginal communities of Winnipeg has made this high school one of the 10 best in Canada according to a recent *Maclean's* magazine report.

It is well known that Winnipeg has the highest urban Aboriginal population in Canada and that Aboriginal people have been historically disadvantaged. This shameful history barred many Aboriginals from achieving the successes, assessing the education opportunities and realizing the goals that were opened to others. However, through the hard work of schools such as Children of the Earth and people such as Principal Lorne Belmore and Guidance Counsellor Pat Mousseau these historic barriers are being broken down. In such an

environment as Children of the Earth School, students can rise to the challenge and meet the high expectations placed on them. For this, *Maclean's* recognized in their report the exceptional nature of this school. With a 200-plus student body, nearly all of whom are of Aboriginal ancestry, the school places special emphasis on instilling pride in the heritage of the students and in the school itself.

The students follow the normal curriculum that is supplemented by cultural, linguistic and musical components. While Children of the Earth School is not a language immersion school, there is a language requirement for all of the four years of the program to ensure the preservation of their languages. The curriculum also ensures opportunities are there to develop a sense of pride in being Aboriginal. This unique school, with its unique curriculum, is a shining success. Fully 75 percent of its graduates go on to post-secondary education, becoming contributing citizens, mentors and leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this House recognize the incredible efforts made by the students and teachers of the Children of the Earth School and congratulate them on being named one of the 10 best high schools in Canada.

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Morris, on a point of order? Is it a point of order?

Mrs. Mavis Taillieu (Morris): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to correct the record from last week. On December 1, I made a private member's statement regarding the Sanford Collegiate senior boys' volleyball team winning the provincial championships. I missed one team member, and I would like to add his name to Hansard. His name is Marcus Wiens. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order raised by the honourable Member for Morris, she does not have a point of order, but we will let her put that name on the record.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you please call Bill 11 and then the rest of the bills listed for debate on second readings, to be followed by second reading Bill 19.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

Bill 11—The Winter Heating Cost Control Act

Mr. Speaker: To resume debate on second reading of Bill 11, The Winter Heating Cost Control Act, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach).

What is the will of the House?

Is it the will of the House for the bill to remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Russell? *[Agreed]*

It is also standing in the name of the honourable Member for Elmwood, who has six minutes remaining.

* (14:30)

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to put my comments on Bill 11. I know at the outset that the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) was quite worked up about this bill. In fact, he is threatening to keep us here through Christmas and beyond if things do not go his way. As we have told him many, many times, all he has to do is elect a few more members, and he will have things going his way. But until that day occurs, he has to content himself with the situation as it is.

Which brings me to the point about the Liberal Party's position over the years on hydro development in this province. You know, 20 years ago, when the previous Howard Pawley government started up the Limestone project, which had been mothballed by the Tories of Sterling Lyon, the NDP government fired up the project again and proceeded to build it one billion dollars under budget. The Liberal leader of the day called the project lemonstone, ridiculed the province, went throughout the province referring to it as lemonstone. So that is the long-standing legacy of the Liberal Party to hydro development in this province.

For example, Mr. Speaker, in Montréal, there is a United Nations Climate Change Conference going on. The Member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) was there last week. As a matter of fact, Manitoba has been recognized as a leader in this area. For example, the David Suzuki Foundation, in October 2005, said, "Manitoba's climate change plan is the best of all the provincial and territorial plans." In fact, the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance, December '04, said that "Manitoba, which ranked first, with an A, is setting the gold standard for the rest of the country." So,

clearly, these comments bode well for the direction that this province is going.

For example, Manitoba is Canada's leader in energy efficiency. We have one of the largest wind farms in Canada, the 99-megawatt farm at St. Leon. We plan to increase the production of wind power over the next number of years to the 1000-megawatt range. We are the hub of geothermal activity in Canada. We have 30 percent of Canada's heat pumps installed, and we have trained more than half of the country's installers. I want to point out to the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) that, in fact, when the Waverley West development gets under way next year, we are going to see an explosion of geothermal development because that is the kind of area that you install geothermal heat pumps in, is new development and new construction because its costs are prohibitive trying to instal it in existing installations.

We are, Mr. Speaker, planning to build a new generation of hydro development. To the Member for Inkster, he should know that the recent agreement with Ontario will see hydro exports replace coal-generated greenhouse gases in Ontario at a rate equivalent to taking 500 000 vehicles off the road. We are also the leading advocate for an east-west power grid, which was a vision that has been supported by this government, which was hardly talked about prior to this government forming office. We are also pursuing a hydrogen centre of expertise in this province, which is the first of its kind in Manitoba.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I had to note, and I did not realize this, but that Manitoba Hydro has recently installed a hydrogen electrolyzer at its Dorsey station on the outskirts of Winnipeg. This is the world's first hybrid internal combustion engine bus that has been made by Manitoba's New Flyer Industries and tested with fuelling technology by another Manitoba firm, Kraus Global.

So the Member for Inkster would do well to pay attention to this information. I also referred him the other day, when he was making these outlandish allegations, these grassy knoll conspiracy theories, you know, I say to him that, rather than staking out that grassy knoll, he should be helping his constituents by informing them of the programs that Manitoba Hydro offers to them, his constituents. Manitoba offers a huge amount of programs, and he would be making much better use of his time and performing a productive function by sending out

information about how people can access these programs, rather than trying to stir people up on all sorts of other issues that he jumps back and forth from.

But I have Manitoba Hydro documents here which are available to him on the Power Smart program. The date on it was November 1. It was only a month and a few days old. If the member would take the time to look at the information, he would see that, in fact, a high efficient furnace, the cost of heating is \$1,018 a year and that the cost of an electric furnace heating with baseboards is \$1,096, and, in fact, the better choice in that would be geothermal which would be only \$439 a year.

But Hydro goes on to point out to people that, in fact, while this may be the case, people are not going to spend huge amounts of money to upgrade their electrical panels in their houses.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to speak to Bill 11, which should more appropriately be named "little socialist playing with big Crown corporations." I can remember back in the dirty eighties of the Howard Pawley administration—and I can just see the whole Legislature cringe when we start bringing up the Howard Pawley days—that was a time when we saw socialist engineering at its worst. That is where the Howard Pawley government—in fact, there are a few from the benches left today that were involved with that government, and what they did was that they started to play with big Crown corporations.

I can remember Manitoba Public Insurance corporation, and it was the same kind of thing as we see with Bill 11. What they tried to do was loot all the money, which they did, and try to hide the rising costs of MPI, of insurance. What happened was there were a couple of years of severe claims against the corporation which then brought in a very, very dramatic increase in MPI rates, in fact so high that there was an incredible outcry from the public in regard to the rise in the rates that precipitated the absolute collapse, the crumbling of the NDP government of the day, the Howard Pawley government.

It was not just MPI that was the problem. They went through Crown corporation after Crown corporation and basically systematically bankrupted each one of them by getting involved and micro-

managing the corporations. I was a student at the time at university and watched from afar as the Pawley-Doer government mismanaged issues. For those who remember MTX where they had contracts in Saudi Arabia where they allowed or disallowed certain individuals to work for the corporation, there were all kinds of mismanagement. There were all kinds of poor, poor, poor decisions that were made, and the Howard Pawley government mismanaged each one of these issues.

Certainly, you can see that the members of the former Pawley government that still sit on the benches are very sensitive on this issue because they are heckling in a dramatic way and—*[interjection]*

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Elmwood, on a point of order.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, the member should know and understand that it was Don Orchard, former minister in the Tory government, who actually got us involved in MTX in the first place, signed all the documents, got us involved in the sands of Saudi Arabia where we proceeded to lose this money and then a couple of years later came around and tried to claim credit for uncovering this big disaster that he helped create in the first place.

* (14:40)

Mr. Speaker: On the point of order raised by the honourable Member for Elmwood, he does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts, and I will remind members once again, the purpose of points of order are to point out to the Speaker a breach of a rule or departure of Manitoba practices, not to be used for debate.

* * *

Mr. Schuler: Thank you very much for that wise ruling, Mr. Speaker. The sensitivity is quite high on that side, clearly, because we can see where the bungling and mismanagement is always part of that NDP socialist cycle that takes place and which will eventually bring us to the debate on Bill 11.

We saw the mismanagement of Manitoba Telephone System, which was basically completely and totally bankrupted under the Howard Pawley regime and the socialist members on the other side. They crippled the Crown corporation to the point that it basically was worth less than the debt that it was carrying. It was, in real terms, bankrupt. It was basically worth less by the time the Howard Pawley

NDP socialists, the Howard Pawley-Doer government was finished with the corporation. It is a fear when we sit on this side and we watch the Howard Pawley-Doer government type of politicians playing with Crown corporations, Crown corporations that under the Filmon government were brought back into shape.

I looked at the Workers Compensation. I can remember when I got into business with my little retail store, we were paying over \$1,200 in Workers Compensation rates because of the Howard Pawley-Doer government mismanaging of the Workers Compensation Board. It was shameful, really, because why would a little retail operation which had no claims, never would unless somebody robbed the store and hurt an individual and thus they would go onto Workers Compensation, but basically there was no reason.

By the time the 1999 election came around, my retail operation was paying not \$1,200, but less than \$200 for Workers Compensation. That is how efficiently and how properly and how good the Filmon government was able to run the Crown corporations, that was responsive to business, that responded to business interests, because you have to remember that more than \$1,000 was a direct hit to the bottom line of retail.

I give the ministers who helped to run that Crown corporation a lot of credit. It was the Howard Pawley-Doer government that had almost bankrupted the Workers Compensation Board, and it took a lot of work, took lots of work, to get it back on its feet. Now we can see it has not been but six years and again, Workers Compensation Board, back into mismanagement, back at the Auditor's office, back on the front pages of newspapers with scandal and whatnot, because of the mismanagement of the Howard Pawley-Doer government style of administration of Crown corporations.

We saw during the 1990s, where we had that can-do attitude brought back to Manitoba where Crown corporations were seen as servants, where they were seen as servants to the public and not servants to the Doer government, to the NDP. That is the difference in philosophy. In fact, I can remember sitting with former Premier Filmon and he said he always wanted to ensure that every Crown corporation had a contingency fund that would allow the corporation to go for three years without excessive rate increases.

As an engineer, as somebody who was very interested in the finances and the proper funding of Crown corporations, the servants of the people, that they would serve the public in such a way that they would not be faced with a catastrophic rate increase if there was a bad year, they were supposed to survive three years without substantial heavy rate increases.

What have we seen as of late? We have seen the Howard Pawley-style Doer government come forward and, Crown corporation by Crown corporation, has looted all of the Crown corporations of their contingency funds. All the savings accounts are being looted by the Howard Pawley-style Doer government and now we have in front of us Bill 11.

In fact, I suspect the day will come when, in fact, it is an argument that I have made to a lot of people, I believe that we are getting close to the point, after this Howard Pawley-style of Doer government, that by the time they are done I will call for the nationalization of Manitoba Hydro where we will have to struggle and fight to buy back our oil patch, our hydro patch, from all the lending institutions which the NDP, the Doer government, has sold off right under our feet. We will be at the point where the debt load of Manitoba Hydro will be so high that we will not own it, the lending institutions will own it. That is how far this socialist government will have gotten Manitoba Hydro. They are finagling and playing with the Crown corporations. The servants of the people are being so bankrupted, so maligned, that we will, in the end, not own them. In fact, they will be owned by others, by financial institutions, and that is a record, that is a historical cycle, that we see under the Howard Pawley-style of Doer government when it comes to Crown corporations.

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

I believe that we have a great need in this province for strong Crown corporations. We should have Crown corporations that are there, that are strong, that are servants to the people and not servants to the Doer government. They should be viewed as being a service provider to the province and not an instant teller machine of the Doer government, and that is the way that this government has gone through policy development of Crown corporations. We have seen it before when the Howard Pawley-style Doer government, first thing they get in, they want to start cleaning out MPI's contingency fund and funding everything but what

the Crown corporation was supposed to do and we have seen it consistently done.

We have seen them clean out the contingency fund of the Workers Compensation Board and, for the first time in years, we have actually seen Workers Compensation Board rates increasing. That is because of the Howard Pawley-style Doer government approach to dealing with Crown corporations. We are very concerned on this side of the House that the asset, the servant to the people that MPI became, that provided an amazing, amazing service to us as a public, where rates were going down, where it was very well-protected by contingency funds, we have seen where this government has done a great disservice to MPI and to the public. By the time this government is done we will see MPI back into those huge increases because of mismanagement.

Now we have a new scheme by the Howard Pawley-style Doer government where they are going to take the ratepayers from Manitoba Hydro and have them subsidize Ralph Klein. Yes, Mr. Speaker, you heard me correctly. I will put it on the record one more time so that you understand; it is not bad enough that we are the toast of the financial institutions around the globe because of the heavy debt load we have on Manitoba Hydro, that we are basically selling our birthright out from under Manitobans. Under this Doer government, we are selling Manitoba Hydro to all financial institutions across the world. If that is not bad enough, now the Doer government has come up with an even better scheme of helping to fund surpluses in Alberta. That is just the most unbelievable thing. When I heard it the first time I actually thought that the government had misspoken itself, that what they are actually going to do—

An Honourable Member: Trying to help your buddy Ralph.

* (14:50)

Mr. Schuler: Members opposite say they are going to help their buddy Ralph but, Mr. Speaker, Alberta and Ralph Klein do not need the members opposite's help. They are flush with cash in Alberta. They do not need another \$135-million subsidy.

What we should be doing is building a Manitoba Hydro that is strong and that serves Manitobans. Instead, what we are doing, instead what the Doer NDP government is doing is it is going to take \$135 million from Hydro ratepayers and it is going to walk

it across Saskatchewan and it is going to go to the throne of King Ralph and it is going to say, "Here you go, Premier of Alberta. Here, you need \$135 million more from Manitobans. Here you go."

This is how we are going to run our province. Instead of building Manitoba, this NDP government, this Doer government is going to help to build Alberta. I believe it is bad public policy to be making and it falls in line with what we have seen over the years. It is the Howard Pawley-style of Doer government in dealing with Crown corporations and we are clearly concerned.

Bill 11, which was introduced November 16, will prohibit any further increases in natural gas prices for customers of Centra Gas during the '05-06 winter heating season and allows the government to limit such price increases until '06-07. Oh, wait a minute. So that is only until 2007. What would be happening in that time period? *[interjection]* Oh, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) seems to know the answer. What would that be? *[interjection]* Oh, a provincial election. No, Mr. Speaker, say it ain't so. Say it ain't so that this could maybe have some provincial politics interwoven into it where this Howard Pawley-style Doer government could actually be trying to finagle with public money their re-election. No. Could that be it?

That is even more scary than the fact that they are emulating their *grise éminence*, the former Premier Howard Pawley. Not just are they going down that wrong path of playing with Crown corporations, they are now going to try to play this in such a way that it helps them out in the next provincial election, and that will be done on the backs of the ratepayers of Manitoba Hydro. To the tune of \$135 million, they will try to buy their next election and that is very unfortunate.

That is very unfortunate because, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba Hydro is there for all. It is supposed to be a Crown corporation that serves the entire province. Whether from the furthest reaches of up north all the way down to the corners in southern Manitoba, whether you go east or west, it should be a Crown corporation that serves all of Manitoba.

I view it as the Hydro patch, the equivalence of the oil patch in Alberta. In fact, I would say to this House that long after the oil patch is gone, Manitoba should still have its Hydro patch, but if we go along with this Howard Pawley-style Doer government which is selling off the Crown corporation to big lenders in and around North America and giving

huge subsidies to Ralph Klein in Alberta, if we continue down that path, we will not have a Crown corporation for Manitobans. It will be a Crown corporation for everybody but Manitobans. It will no longer be there to help serve the best interests of Manitobans. It will be there to serve big financial institutions and King Ralph in Alberta, whom this government seems to be so bent and determined to be funding.

I look to the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) who has over the years had a reputation of being an environmentalist, but I read a letter of his to the editor over the weekend and I am deeply saddened. I now understand why the Green Party is getting such traction in Manitoba. The Green Party is going to eventually step into the vacuum that the NDP has left on the environmental side.

How unfortunate it is that this member from Wolseley who has fought for and stood up and championed environmental issues is now turning his back on these very individuals. In fact, there is that great premier, one of the *grise éminence* of the NDP party, the Right Honourable Ed Schreyer, who called this a terrible idea and said it is wrong-headed. It is the Right Honourable Ed Schreyer who said that this is bad for the environment, and the Member for Wolseley, instead of saying, "I am with Ed," is opposed to what the former premier says, an individual of great knowledge on these issues. In fact, it was the Right Honourable Ed Schreyer who came out in front of this.

I know members opposite will not necessarily take it from this humble servant, but they should at least listen to what their former premier has to say on this issue. He said that he felt this was a very, very bad idea. I think one should quote exactly. Schreyer calls the plan "perverse." Those are his words, not mine, and did so in the *Winnipeg Free Press* on November 18. He also called it, and I am quoting here for the Member for Wolseley, "the most retrograde step the government could possible take." He is arguing against the environmental implications of a non-renewable energy source subsidizing a renewable one. That is unfortunate. I thought for sure that the formerly green, environmentally friendly member from Wolseley would have been heard, like say, for instance, the members from Radisson and Transcona were heard on the new hog slaughtering plant.

Now, I disagree with those two members, but I understand that they have issues, and they stood up

for their constituents. In fact, I indicated to those proponents of the hog slaughtering plant that they did have the wrong location, they should move it about five miles east, which would be a far superior location. I would take it in my constituency any day, but, alas, they chose that location. But the members from Radisson and Transcona, they stood up on conviction and they let their voices be heard. Where is the member from Wolseley? He has become the apologist, Mr. Speaker. If you have not heard anything so outrageous, he stabbed the environment in the back, even when the *grise éminence* of the NDP party stood up and said, "the most retrograde step the government could possibly take." They are the Right Honourable Ed Schreyer's words who says that this is a bad idea.

The Member for Wolseley, the one who used to have credentials in the environment movement, turned his back and went so far as to stab the environmental movement in the back. It is amazing. The voters from Wolseley sent this member to change the Legislature, and what happened? The Legislature changed the member from Wolseley. They sent an environmentalist here to this Chamber, and they got back an apologist for the wrong side. This member is going to face, I suspect, a Green candidate and is going to have to answer for that. He will have to answer for how he stabbed the environmental movement in the back, and that is just very unfortunate. In fact, I cannot imagine that the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) can now shake David Suzuki's hand and look him in the eye. That will be a sad moment, a sad moment when the Member for Wolseley will go up to David Suzuki and will hang his head, put his hand out and see if David Suzuki will even acknowledge him after that back stab that was given to the David Suzukis of the world, the environmentalists.

* (15:00)

Mr. Speaker, this bill is wrought with all kinds of land mines, all kinds of ironies for the NDP, and it is unfortunate. It is unfortunate because, as the former premier said about the cross-subsidization, "It is perverse," he called it. What the government is going to do is they are going to either raise Manitoba Hydro rates, which now they have backed down on that one. They cower in fear out of all the poor decisions they make so they are cowering on that.

But, they are going to take money out of Manitoba Hydro and they are going to put it into an account. Then they are going to subsidize natural gas

rates so that the gas rates do not increase and unfortunately, for Manitobans, if gas rates continue to increase, because it is a non-renewable resource, eventually the price will continue to increase. What happens after that rate freeze or cross-subsidy comes to an end? What happens? Do they then raise hydro rates even more and how are they going to do this? I know, of course, that will be after a provincial election. Their motto is do not worry about it after the provincial election, or the Conservatives will and it will more than likely be the Conservatives who will have to deal with this issue.

It is a real concern to us on this side of the House because, really, they are going to create a slush fund. Any time a left-wing government, a socialist government, or, in this case, the Howard Pawley-style Doer government, starts creating slush funds within a corporation, you then know that there is the potential for serious problems. I say this for the good of all members, and there are some young, idealistic members on that side who smile brightly and clap and cheer like the trained seals that they are and, you know, it is cute to see. However, I warn these young, idealistic members, look at history. When NDP governments start creating slush funds in corporations, look out, it is a dangerous time. It is what undoes NDP governments. Look at what happened to the Howard Pawley-Doer government back in the eighties. They just could not keep it all straight. They just could not keep the lid on all of it, and finally, it blew up on them and they were faced with a substantial defeat.

I know that I, with many of the young members on the other side, where there are young members in this House, we do not remember all the ins and outs of the Howard Pawley-Doer government days, but we are clearly concerned and, I have a feeling, so are members on the opposite side. They are concerned with this legislation because it is also a problem for the rural areas. Many, many areas, northern Manitoba, outside of the Perimeter Highway, there are some towns, given, that do have gas, but there are 550 000 Manitoba Hydro users who do not have Centra Gas. That is clearly a problem. It is bad for the agriculture; it is bad for the North. This is a bad decision.

Any time socialists start to play with Crown corporations, it is a sad day for Manitoba. We saw that from the Howard Pawley-Doer government days. This is bad legislation. It scares Manitobans. It scares Hydro users. It scares all of us. It scares environmentalists. It scares the Right Honourable Ed

Schreyer. Even he cannot stomach what is going on. He calls it perverse. He calls it retrograde. I would suggest that the NDP members, the young members on the other side like myself, should stand with me and others and say, "I am with Ed on this issue. We should rethink this and look at it a different way to deal with this issue." Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any other speakers?

Bill 11, will it continue standing in the name of the honourable Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach). Agreed? [*Agreed*]

Bill 4—The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate on second reading, Bill 4, The Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la manutention et le transport des marchandises dangereuses, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

Stand?

Some Honourable Members: Stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Stand.

Bill 12—The Highways and Transportation Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resume debate on Bill 12, The Highways and Transportation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la voirie et le transport, standing in the name of the Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

Stand?

Some Honourable Members: Stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It will continue standing in the name of the Member for Pembina.

Bill 13—The Conservation Districts Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resume debate on the motion of the honourable Minister for Water Stewardship (Mr. Ashton), Bill 13, The Conservation Districts Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les districts de conservation.

It is still open. Open debate on this one.

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach), that we adjourn debate.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 15—The Emergency Measures Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Trade (Mr. Smith), Bill 15, The Emergency Measures Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les mesures d'urgence, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

Some Honourable Members: Stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Stand. The bill will continue, and remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina.

Bill 16—The Corporations Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), Bill 16, The Corporations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les corporations, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Faurchou).

Stand?

Some Honourable Members: Stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The bill will continue, and remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

Bill 17—The Securities Amendment Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), Bill 17, The Securities Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les valeurs mobilières, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

What is the wish of the House on this one, Bill 17? Stand?

An Honourable Member: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: Stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Stand. The bill will continue, and remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina.

Bill 18—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Countermeasures Against Impaired Drivers and Other Offenders)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh), Bill 18, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Countermeasures Against Impaired Drivers and

Other Offenders); Loi modifiant le Code de la route (contre-mesures visant les personnes ayant conduit avec les facultés affaiblies et d'autres contrevenants), standing in the honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

* (15:10)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did want to put a few words on the record in regard to Bill 18 before it ultimately goes to committee.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have noticed over the last two and a half, three years is that the Minister of Justice tends to look at issues in which he believes there is fairly decent ground support, public support, on certain initiatives and quite often he will, in fact, act on some of them. This is one of those pieces of legislation in which the Minister of Justice has seen fit to take some action on, and, if you read through the bill, as I have, you will see that it is not really a controversial bill. You know, heaven forbid the Minister of Justice bringing in a bill that might cause a little bit of controversy. Here we have a bill that, in essence, I believe, addresses a concern in regard to drinking and driving. We all know in terms of what the public perception is of drinking and driving, it is something that is just not tolerated. Many years ago, I think that there was a change of attitude, and today what we see is that youth, to all of our communities, all of our social economic strata of individuals, say, "Hey, look this is not something that is good today, to drink and drive," and I say youth because, you know, I really pay tribute to those who demonstrated the leadership where we saw incorporated into our schools, in particular, our high schools, this whole safe grad concept. I really believe that it is initiatives like that that ultimately have led to a change of the mindset.

It was not that long ago, Mr. Speaker, where individuals would be, whether they are at work or at a party or a social gathering in which they would consume a great deal of alcohol, get behind the wheel of a car, whether they had children in the car or minors in the car was absolutely irrelevant, they would get in the car and they would drive. That was something that was happening on a regular basis. You compare that to today, and you will see that there is a 180-degree turn in terms of what public perception on that issue really is.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

I think that is wonderful. That is the type of thing in which, if there are things that we can do inside this Legislature to promote that new mindset, Mr. Speaker, that we should do it, that there is no reason why we should not support initiatives that continue in the promoting of that mindset. That is what I see with this particular bill. The minister is attempting to reinforce that drinking and driving, that there is a consequence if you drink and drive. When we look at individuals, whether they are young offenders or they are individuals that receive charges down in stateside that, in fact, the suspensions and the consequences would, in fact, be taken into account and this legislation enables that to occur. For that reason, I think that it is safe to say that we support this bill in terms of going to committee, but I would like to challenge the Minister of Justice to start dealing with some of the more difficult issues in our province dealing with justice.

I know I have had the opportunity to ask a couple of questions in regard to what is the department, what is the minister, doing to deal with some of the problems, some real problems, in our society. In particular, I am going to make reference to the North End because it is an area in which I live and travel through every day, Mr. Speaker, and I am growing more and more concerned that these are neighbourhoods that continue to deteriorate in many ways. I think that there is some correlation in terms of income and in crime and poverty and dysfunctional families, and this government has not been successful at dealing with those issues.

As much as we like to see legislation of this nature, Mr. Speaker, I think that the minister needs to give more attention to some of those issues that are really having a negative impact on our communities. I just do not see that presence, at least in North End Winnipeg, and I suspect that one might be able to articulate that that is the case throughout the province.

There are many examples of it, Mr. Speaker. In fact, a lot of those criminals, if I can put it that way, the ones who are stealing the cars, you will find that they quite often have been drinking or they are on some sort of drug, whether it is crystal meth or cocaine or whatever it might be. I think that more and more we are seeing residents in fear in terms of walking in the communities in which they live.

I think government needs to do more about that. You know, alcohol is one thing. What about other drugs that are out there, Mr. Speaker, that are

causing serious problems within our police force, being able to support them in terms of providing the resources necessary to identify drugs or individuals who are taking drugs or consuming drugs and driving? I know I have had the opportunity, as I am sure other members have, to talk to some of our finest officers, and they are growing concerned, more and more concerned about their abilities to be able to have the resources necessary to attack those who are taking some form of drugs, and then getting behind the steering wheel.

So it is easy for us to hit issues like alcohol and driving because it is pretty much straightforward. We know how breathalysers work, and what we see is a government that is wanting to expand in that area, but I do believe that we need to be more aggressive in other areas, Mr. Speaker. That is where we would call upon the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) to do something, because at the end of the day when we look at the actual number of people, let us say in this piece of legislation, that will be dealt with, we are talking about a relatively small number, but it is an important message still to get out.

It reminds me, you know, of a bill that we had last session. Members might recall the bill where additional court actions would be taken if you have a child in your car and you have been drinking and driving, Mr. Speaker. Again, how does one oppose something of that nature? It is legislation which, yes, makes a lot of sense; let us do it. Having said that, there were some flaws to it, issues of, for example, if you are a drunk driver and you are going over Salter and you hit another vehicle, there could be a child in there. So why is it that that driver is treated differently than the driver who is intoxicated who has a child passenger or an elderly infirm individual or someone with Alzheimer's or other sorts of medical conditions?

These are the types of things which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) much like today has something and he says, "Well, this is where I maybe have that press conference, put out that release, show that we are being proactive," but at the end of the day, even though it does reinforce a relatively positive mindset that goes against drinking and driving, it is not as substantial as the minister tries to imply, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, I could argue that, well, how does this bill or how does the legislation take into consideration immigrants, Mr. Speaker? We get thousands of immigrants that come to our province

every year. I suspect some of those might even have some sort of an alcohol-related incident back in their home country. This legislation does not address that issue.

* (15:20)

Again, I would argue that maybe that issue is just as big, maybe even possibly bigger, Mr. Speaker, than what this bill is attempting to do. Who knows? Maybe next year the Minister of Justice might bring in some legislation to deal with that.

I think that we have to look at the bigger picture here, as opposed to trying to do things in a piecemeal way and then almost like challenge the opposition, "You know, here is a piece of legislation; let us see you vote against this legislation," and then put it before us. Well, Mr. Speaker, I, for one, do not have a problem with supporting this legislation because, as I say, at the end of the day, it helps and it supports a mindset which is very positive toward anti-drinking and driving. So how can someone not support it?

But, at the same time, I think that there is a responsibility on individuals like myself to express to the government that they need to do more, that this is not good enough, Mr. Speaker. If the government really wanted to be able to take more of a proactive approach, whether it is driving in general and other substances that are being used and then a person getting behind the wheel, or just dealing with the broader issue of crime, as the Minister of Justice, I would like to see more legislation or more support or resources, enforcement of dealing with some of the situations that we have today, some of those things that are affecting far more people. The government really is not doing the types of things that it could be doing.

Today is a good example of that. For example, we had the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) reinforce the police officers again, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know how many times we have heard about the police officers, whether it is the Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger) or the Premier (Mr. Doer) of our province. Dealing with some of these issues takes a lot more than just making a general platitude that you will repeat year after year. Eventually, yes, there will be some more police officers but, in good part, the ones that they are talking about today are more phantom police officers. I think that is the terminology that the member from Steinbach was using. I think that there is merit to that particular statement, in the sense that we are not seeing the increases as the government

tries to give the image or the impression that they are acting on, and we see more police officers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of this bill going to committee. The reason, as I say, for it is because I believe a majority of the constituents, a vast majority of the constituents which I represent, realize that it is wrong to drink and drive, and that is the bottom line. When we have legislation before us that does anything in terms of reinforcing that mindset, I think that there is an obligation on all of us to speak in favour of and, ultimately, allow it to go to committee, and if there are individuals that provide input at that stage, that would be wonderful.

But, again, I put the challenge out to the Minister of Justice to do more at dealing in terms of some of those grassroots issues that have to be dealt with that he is ultimately responsible for, Mr. Speaker, because I truly do believe things are, in fact, getting worse. They have not been getting better over the last number of years, and until we have a government that is prepared to actually take action, and some of those actions might not be popular, but it is the right thing to do. That is where you look to a government to demonstrate leadership and to do what is right, not just to do what is popular. I will give them full marks in terms if this is and will be a popular bill in this sense, and I suspect that you will find very few, if any, that would not support it.

With those few words, we are prepared to see the bill go to committee. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is second reading of Bill 18, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Countermeasures Against Impaired Rivers and Other Offenders).

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? *[Agreed]*

SECOND READINGS

Bill 19—The Agri-Food and Rural Development Council Act

Mr. Speaker: Second reading, Bill 19, The Agri-Food and Rural Development Council Act.

Hon. Rosann Wowchuk (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers), that Bill 19, The Agri-Food and Rural

Development Council Act, be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of the House.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has been advised of the bill, and I table the message.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: There is a message from the Lieutenant-Governor, and it has also been tabled.

Ms. Wowchuk: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to move this new piece of legislation to establish an Agri-Food and Rural Development Council, which will act as an advisory council to the Minister of Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, this new council will provide a think-tank type of forum for me and for any future ministers to consult with and to envision the long-term needs of rural and northern Manitobans and, also, agriculture producers, the secondary food sector and other rural industries. The council's mandate is consistent with our government's commitment to meaningful consultation with stakeholders. It is also important to use these insights to enhance the departmental long-term strategy approaches for both opportunities and challenges that are out there.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that I look to this group for their innovative ideas and options that help us build Manitoba's competitive advantage in agriculture and the agri-food sector and to work towards a vibrant rural community. The council members that will be appointed will examine agricultural and rural economics and explore new ideas for economic growth and partnership. Council's ideas and recommendations will be brought forward and will help inform the department on long-term strategic plans.

To accomplish these goals, appointees to the council will be Manitobans who have demonstrated collectively, collaboratively to be able to think outside the box. They will have breadth of understanding for long-term opportunities and challenges. But I can tell you that this will not be a lobby group and it will not have formal representation of organizations.

Mr. Speaker, as you look at how agriculture has changed and how the rural communities have changed, there are many opportunities there. But, in reality, some people are moving forward and some are not. When you look at where this government has gone on wind energy, ethanol energy, biodiesels, the nutraceutical industry, there are many opportunities.

But I believe that there are people who can think outside the box and even help us further advance and take advantage of our many natural products that we have in this province and help to have further economic growth both in rural and northern Manitoba. So I look very forward to working with this council.

I heard someone say that this should have happened sooner and, indeed, it probably should have. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this act also repeals The Agricultural Productivity Council Act, which first received Royal Assent in 1966, but was re-enacted in 1987 to comply with the requirements of all legislation to be in both French and English. Initially, The Agricultural Productivity Council Act which was put in place, I look at the members opposite and wonder why, when they were in government, they did not act on a piece of legislation that would have allowed them to put in place a council that would advise on agriculture production.

This council is much broader, Mr. Speaker. That is why we have had to, rather than just try to amend the act, we are bringing in a new act because this council will not only advise on primary production, it will also advise on value-added, which has been a primary goal of this government, to increase value-added production and all of the other new initiatives that are out there. So I hope that members opposite will recognize the importance of this piece of legislation and will support it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

* (15:30)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I did want to put a few words on the record with regard to Bill 19. You know, I do not necessarily share all the enthusiasm that the minister has expressed in regard to Bill 19.

The biggest concern that I have right off, Mr. Speaker, is the make-up of the committee. This minister or this government has made the decision that there is an unlimited number of people that could be appointed to this council, and they are all appointments from the minister. There is no indication or no guarantee of appointments from organizations that are out there in rural Manitoba. Just given the importance of an advisory council, if it is going to be a legitimate advisory council to the department, one would think that it would have some sort of an appointment procedure that would ensure

that a person's qualifications would be taken into consideration to ensure that the representation would, in fact, be diverse.

We have some excellent, excellent groups that are out there. I know, whether it is myself or the Leader of the Manitoba Liberal Party spends—in particular, I know the leader of my party, Mr. Speaker, spends a phenomenal amount of time meeting with, going over correspondence from the many different rural, agricultural-based groups that are out there. I do not understand, and I would ask, and I would have liked to have heard comments from the minister responsible for this bill to explain why it is that we inside this Legislature should allow her to determine everyone that is going to sit on this advisory committee.

Well, I have a difficult time with that. You know, in essence, what she is going to do is she is going to say, "Well, I want these eight people," or she could say, "I want these 18 people." There is no set number either, Mr. Speaker. In terms of how often they are going to meet, well, again, it will be up to the co-chairs. Who are the co-chairs? Well, those are appointed by the minister. So you have this advisory council that is going to be there to advise the administration, and it seems to me that the minister has left this council to be very wide open to being very, very political. I do not believe that that is in the long-term best interest of the department. I believe that we should have some trust and value our many different community groups that are out there that have competent and capable individuals that would have been just as qualified as the Minister of Agriculture's (Ms. Wowchuk) choices and would have been better to be on the committee. It would have given more legitimacy, I would argue, to the council.

I know that, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I would do if there was a change in government is I would be reviewing this particular council, and I would be saying, "Why is it that these people make up this committee?" First of all, you have got to find out how many there are. Are these going to be just nothing much than a bunch of New Democrats? We do not know. We do not know in terms of what sort of qualifications they are going to have. We do know that they will receive some sort of an honorarium. I do believe that there will be a great deal of political patronage to it. I believe that the association with the political party will have more clout than the type of work that they have.

You know, to a certain degree, in today's democratic society, you are going to see some patronage, Mr. Speaker. But what I object to, whether it is provincial or federal, is excessive abuse of patronage. This is something that we have concerns with. What we are saying is that we have one board or one council that is being created by this government, and every one of those appointments is going to, in fact, be from this minister. Why? What do you have against organizations like Keystone and the many other rural organizations that are out there? If this council is supposed to be advising the Ministry of Agriculture, why would we not enable those rural, in particular, communities, those volunteers, in part, others that receive some form of honorarium, why do we not acknowledge the expertise that is out there today and say, "As an organization, you are going to have an appointment onto this council," and put a limit on the number of positions? You cannot say, "Well, for this minister, we want to have a council of four," and another minister comes in, they are going to say, "Well, we want a council of 54."

There is no direction at all inside this legislation. Is the idea good? Well, I suspect that the idea is good. That is why we are okay with it going to the committee stage, but, having said that, Mr. Speaker, we question it in terms of why it is that the minister has chosen to leave it so wide open, as opposed to—*[interjection]* Well, as the member from Steinbach points out, there was another appointment that was in the judicial system where there was a bit of a conflict, a possible conflict of interest. The point is that, if you want to give credibility to some of these councils that you are creating, you have to do it in such a way that you take some of those appointments out of the minister's responsibility and empower some of those organizations that we have in our province to fill some of those spots. Then, ultimately, I think that what you would have is a more effective council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you did that, I suspect that there is also a better chance that the council will survive through different administrations. Otherwise, what is the difference? If I know I have a committee inside my constituency and we deal with education and those are all individuals who—should they be receiving some sort of an honorarium, too, which they are not? Many MLAs have different types of committees. Many ministers have a group of individuals that they meet with. There are all sorts of people who have an interest in being on a committee,

but when you bring in legislation that gives legislative mandate to a committee, I think that we have to be a little bit more careful in the make-up of the legislation and give more due diligence as to what is the best way to move ahead.

When it comes to agriculture, we saw a matter of urgent public importance introduced into this Legislature dealing with world trade, Mr. Speaker. The government did not want to debate it, so they shot it down. Well, then, we see a few days later a resolution that is brought forward, and it is expected that everyone would get behind that resolution so that we could, if I can use my leader's comments, speak with one voice in the province on this critical issue, given what that industry has gone through over the last little while. We did, and that resolution actually passed with unanimous support.

The reason why I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that what I have witnessed is a government that does not like opposition ideas unless they can have the full credit, if they cannot have the credit for it. So that is why, can you imagine sitting around a table and, "Oh, my goodness, someone from the Keystone Agricultural community, their rep said that this is the way the government should go," and they say, "Oh, geez, no, we cannot. This has got to be an NDP idea, so we better not. It has to be an NDP appointment, after all. Then we can take full credit for the ideas."

* (15:40)

You can just imagine the panic had they had more independent members being present on those boards, Mr. Speaker, or on this particular council, individuals who were not going to be held to account by only this government, but sit and participate in some of those other rural organizations, and would be held in account in terms of some of their comments and what it is that they are saying and the type of advice that they are developing for the Ministry of Agriculture. There, I guess, is one of the fundamental differences with this party that is in current government, and that is that they do not value outside ideas. If the idea is not a New Democratic idea, they tend to shy away from it. *[interjection]* Well, that is an example that would work against you, so maybe I will leave that one. One member indicated the Good Samaritan bill. To me, that is proof in point.

The Leader of the Manitoba Liberal Party, through working with the resources that we have,

came up with what I would classify as a brilliant idea, Mr. Speaker, something that should be acted on, the Good Samaritan legislation, and introduced it, only to find out days later, someone on the government benches kind of saw it on the Order Paper, and said, "Oh, that is a good one; we should do it," and then they introduce it. It kind of just reinforces the points that I am talking about, and that is that, look—[*interjection*] Well, someone said, "Well, we are stealing ideas." My argument is that no one owns a good idea. It takes leadership to be able to recognize good ideas and to get behind those ideas.

Really and truly, I would welcome comments from the government on this bill, and, if they could indicate to me why it is that the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk) should be the only individual that appoints people to this council. Why do some of these other rural organizations, Mr. Speaker, have no role in playing? No doubt some of them will stand up and say, "The minister is going to consult with them," and so forth. We call that lip service. If you really wanted to enable them, you would allow certain positions or certain community-based groups in that agricultural sector to have appointments to the council if, in fact, you really wanted to make a strong statement.

But, having said that, as I indicated, this is a bill in which, in principle, will see it go to committee and see if there are other opinions that are expressed on it. We would welcome that comment in particular. I would be very interested in government members standing up and defending why it is that they have to appoint all. I must say not all government councils and boards are all government appointees. There are a good number where, in essence, what it is that I am talking about. So there is, I believe, a credibility factor here, and I would like to hear government members defend this bill with respect to what it is that I have been talking about. If, in fact, they really saw the merit for giving more credibility to this council, the government might be best advised to make a few amendments to the legislation.

So, with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I will end my comments. Thank you.

Mr. Peter Dyck (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson), that we adjourn debate.

Motion agreed to.

CONCURRENCE AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 2—The Private Investigators and Security Guards Amendment Act

Hon. Gord Mackintosh (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger), that Bill 2, The Private Investigators and Security Guards Amendment Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Mr. Speaker, I rise to put a few words on the record regarding this particular piece of legislation. Certainly, I know this bill has had the opportunity to go forward to committee and to have some comments made there, particularly by written submission. I understand that there were some suggestions that were put forward by the Retail Council regarding the legislation. I think it is important when you look at legislation to ensure that, in fact, the legislation is set out in a way that it will be fair and equitable to all parties. Certainly, we look at and we recognize the fact that there is a good reason for this kind of legislation when you are dealing with the safety of individuals, when you are dealing with the protection of individuals. The third reading, I think, comes on an appropriate day, a day that was dominated in the earlier Question Period regarding issues of safety and regarding issues of security.

That particular line of questioning dealt with a school, Mr. Speaker, where there was clearly not the kind of safety, in the Shaftesbury School just prior to the weekend, that parents would expect that students deserve and certainly that teachers within that school deserve. So security is a very topical issue here today, and training falls into that. You know, when we were discussing the issue of security and safety earlier today, we talked about appropriate levels of people within the school system that would have that training that was set out to ensure that there were people to deal with these issues. [*interjection*] I know that the Minister of Education (Mr. Bjornson) has something to say. [*interjection*] The Member for Wolseley (Mr. Altemeyer) does too, although that is usually not as significant. But I know that the Education Minister—[*interjection*] Oh, now we have got the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger)

squawking from his seat. Apparently, this rock has hit a few dogs.

But, when I look at the Minister of Education, and we talk about the need to have safety within the schools, it boils down to training, Mr. Speaker. We brought forward the idea of having retired officers that would go forward in the schools and would set forward that training and would ensure that all the teachers have the kind of base level of training for security to do systematic checks, to ensure that the schools are designed well, to ensure that there are locked doors or that sort of thing, so it all relates to training and security. We have, in retired officers, people who understand the system, know about security, understand the law, know what the appropriate way is to go about getting good information, know what is important. So I wonder why the government would not look at that kind of initiative. When we talk about this legislation, they talk about the issue of security, but when you look at other areas, like the school system, they do not want to have that same kind of level of expertise operating within a school.

The legislation that we are debating here today on third reading relates somewhat maybe to bars, or that kind of an event, Mr. Speaker, and there is a need for security there. But why would they be focussed only on that side of security but not want to have secure schools? It seems that there is unbalance when it comes to the legislative agenda of this government. On the one hand, they want to bring forward legislation to deal with security in bars in these kinds of establishments but do not want to deal with the issue of security within schools. You know, the idea of retired officers, I think, is an appropriate one because we know that there are shortages of police officers within the province of Manitoba. We also recognize that a large part of that shortage is due to the actions, or perhaps the inactions of the current government, an inability to plan to ensure that there was a suitable force there to replace the outgoing ones. We have all known about the demographics that we face within society in general, in particular, within the police force. We know that there are many officers who are outgoing from the police force, so why not tap into that resource?

* (15:50)

You have to be careful, obviously, Mr. Speaker, where that assignment is. Perhaps it relates as well to the legislation in terms of who could be doing training for security guards. But the notion of having

officers perhaps retiring from the RCMP service after 30 or 35 years, or retiring from the Winnipeg Police force after serving for 30 or 35 years, and then going into some kind of a full squad service or doing regular patrols, that is certainly nothing that finds appeal with retiring officers.

I have the opportunity to talk to many of them over the course of the last number of months, and they say, "You know what? In terms of that sort of service, we have already done our time and it is not something that we would find to be desirable, to be valuable, to go back and to do that kind of heavy lifting within law enforcement," Mr. Speaker, but to look at schools, that is certainly something different. It gives an opportunity, maybe, a chance they did not always have within the force to be proactive, to find a way to make a difference on the base level with young people, to ensure there are preventative measures put in place and not just simply a reactionary measure which is often the case with law enforcement. We know that law enforcement is quite often frustrated by the fact that they are just reacting to issues and not able to take a proactive stance on a number of issues.

So one wonders, in terms of the training, for this particular piece of legislation, when you are dealing with security officers in a number of different venues, why this government also would not take a similar approach and say, "Yes, we want to also look at how it is that we can ensure our schools and the young people within those schools are also safe." When you look at a legislative agenda, and there have been comments, certainly, made both here in the Legislature and outside of the Legislature about the kind of weak legislative agenda that has been put forward by this government, the media have commented—*[interjection]*

Well, the member from Selkirk might want to listen to some of the media reports from today that comment on the fact that his government is putting forward very few pieces of legislation. I am glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of other people outside the Legislature who recognize the fact that this government is kind of, well, I would like to say running out of steam, although I am never sure when they really ever had the steam to begin with.

So maybe it is not so much that the government is running out of steam, more to the fact that—

An Honourable Member: You actually have to wake up.

Mr. Goertzen: Well, I see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Selinger) says that he has just woken up or something along those lines, but I know, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the issue of this government running out of steam, that this is another clear indication that they look at bringing forward or they bring forward legislation regarding security guards, but they are not willing to bring forward legislation.

An Honourable Member: Where is that wind turbine when you need one?

Mr. Goertzen: I am glad that the member now for Wolseley is talking about wind turbines, Mr. Speaker. He wants to cross-subsidize certain pieces of Hydro and gas, and he wants to support areas that are not really energy efficient in terms of the environment, and yet he talks about wind turbines. So I would caution the member, because I certainly know there are people within the Wolseley area who would be very, very concerned with the comments that he makes from his seat, and, perhaps, more publicly.

An Honourable Member: You have no supporters in Wolseley.

Mr. Goertzen: Well, in fact, I would correct the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), because there is a growing base of Conservative supporters, not just in Wolseley, but, indeed, throughout all of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, as they see the misdirection of this government.

One of those areas of misdirection is the unbalance, the unbalance that they have—

An Honourable Member: They are meeting in a telephone booth in Flin Flon.

Mr. Goertzen: Well, Mr. Speaker, apparently there is a meeting in a telephone booth in Flin Flon. That is because they are calling for good government. They are on the phone and saying, "It is time. It is time that we finally have good government in Manitoba. It is time to change things up."

When you deal with the legislative agenda, there needs to be balance throughout it. So I suggest that this is a good piece of legislation in terms of it addresses a need, it addresses a void that was, perhaps, there. I have some cautions for the government in terms of how it deals with certain pieces of the training aspect. I want to ensure that the training is done in a way that allows a number of different bidders of who the appropriate trainers will

be, what the kind of training these in-house security guards have, but one wonders why the government, then, is so reluctant, so reluctant to look at this kind of a measure for security in other areas.

I wonder why it is that the Minister of Education (Mr. Bjornson), perhaps, when he saw this particular piece of legislation, that the light bulb did not go off in his head and that he did not recognize then that, in fact, there was also a parallel piece of legislation that could possibly come forward, or did not have to be done by legislation, they could have simply done that within a regulation or through appropriations, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that there was funding in place for security within our schools.

It is not too late, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, for the government to address this issue. While I would certainly say that six years is too long to wait to have security within schools, it is still not too late in the sense that it is better to do it now than not to act on this.

So, when we look at this particular piece of legislation, I would encourage the government not to look at it kind of in a vacuum, not to look at it necessarily as a stand-alone piece of legislation. You know, there are a lot of other areas, Mr. Speaker, that I could touch on in terms of how it is the legislation regarding in-house security guards could be considered in different pieces and different measures.

You know, recently, I think it was about a week ago, I raised the issue in the media regarding having testing of blood, Mr. Speaker. This was in relation to first responders. I have seen it now in the NDP-held Saskatchewan government where they have seen the wisdom of this sort of legislation in Ontario and a number of other jurisdictions in Manitoba where they have said, "You know what? We have paramedics, are the most critical example, who are out there working and doing their jobs and at times they come into contact with bodily fluid or with blood from somebody whom they are helping in the course of their work." It is not a common occurrence, but it does happen from time to time, and these paramedics have said, "It would be important for us to be able to get those bodily fluids or blood tested to ensure that they do not have certain sorts of diseases." That peace of mind would be important for them, because the alternative is waiting months and months to ensure that they themselves have not contracted a disease because they were in contact with blood that may have been contaminated. I think that that peace of mind is valuable. I think that peace of mind is

something that first responders and paramedics in the province of Manitoba deserve to have.

I raised the issue a week or two ago, and the Minister of Health (Mr. Sale) kind of summarily dismissed it and said that it was not workable, even though it is working in other jurisdictions. I suspect, I perhaps more than suspect, that the Minister of Health has received a number of calls regarding this, being concerned about the fact that he dismissed legislation that I know the paramedics here in Manitoba have been working on and have been discussing.

You relate that perhaps to Good Samaritans and in-house security guards, which is germane to this particular piece of legislation. The suggestion has been made by myself and by others, and certainly I know that it is the case in many other jurisdictions that Good Samaritans who are acting in a heartfelt way and are helping individuals out. One could use the example of a car accident, and you help the individual out of the car, and in the context of that work you find yourself with blood or other kind of bodily samples on you. Now that is a perfect example where some pieces or legislation or other areas of Canada would allow that blood to be tested to give that Good Samaritan peace of mind, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that they have not been infected as well with that particular disease that may or not be within the blood. It is a peace-of-mind piece of legislation.

In-house security guards might be another place in relation to this legislation that could be used and could be considered whether or not it would be an appropriate place to have those kinds of measures in place, Mr. Speaker. So when you look at one piece of legislation it is interesting how it leads to other ideas in other areas.

I would have thought that a government that is sort of gasping for air because it is so short of ideas to better Manitoba because it is so short of real initiatives to make a change for the better in the province of Manitoba that they would have taken a piece of legislation like this which might not seem overly substantive in and of itself even though it has merit and importance, Mr. Speaker, might have looked at a piece of legislation like this and said, "Now where can we go from here and what other things could we look at," whether it was security within schools or whether it is the other kind of parallel legislation that I am talking about in terms of testing blood for those who are involved with Good

Samaritan acts or perhaps first responders. We did not see it from this government and time and time again we do not see that sort of initiative and that sort of uptake in terms of what other kinds of legislation could be brought forward, but we do know that there is a growing need.

* (16:00)

We do know, Mr. Speaker, that there is, in fact, a growing need for this kind of coverage and to ensure that in-house security guards have the appropriate training, and they are also covered. It is somewhat unfortunate, I suppose, that this need grows within the province of Manitoba, but, in fact, it does grow each and every day.

It is not because there are more events necessarily, because those events are growing in size, that the in-house security guards, as they are referenced in this particular piece of legislation, need to have greater and greater training, or that there needs to be some sort of insurance mechanism for the individuals who are employing them. I think the need comes because of the nature of the society that we are living in, the nature of how things are going in Manitoba.

You know, we have seen the increase of violence here in the province of Manitoba and particularly under the watch, or the non-watch, of this NDP government. We have seen the Hells Angels come into the province in November of 2000. They came in under the watch of this government. I know the patchover ceremony happened when they were in government. More recently, we saw the Bandidos move into the province of Manitoba. In fact, there has been a spread of street gangs in the province. If I have my statistics correct, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the number—*[interjection]*—and I commend the Minister of Conservation (Mr. Struthers) for saying that he is certain that I have my facts correct. When I see that the number of gang members have doubled from 1500 at one point in the late 1990s to 3000 under this government, there is a doubling of the number of gang members that have come in under this NDP government's watch.

It is not surprising, then, that we hear reports from the police in the city of Winnipeg that, in fact, they are not even really tracking gang members anymore, that they not even really bothering to look to see who the gang members are who are coming in and who they might be. That is not something that any of us should be proud of, that the police find themselves so overwhelmed with new gangs and new

gang members coming into the province that, in fact, they do not have the resources anymore, at this particular time, to track them, that they are so overwhelmed with the other things that are going on and they are so overwhelmed by the number, the new number of gangs and gang members coming into the province that they are no longer able to track that particular—[interjection]

Well, the Minister of Industry (Mr. Rondeau) finds this topic funny. I think it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because it really is not a laughing matter, that new gang members are not something that we should be proud of in Manitoba. Perhaps the Minister of Industry is using this as his new brand. He is looking for ideas, and he is going to send off to New York, perhaps he will fly over to New York anytime soon, again, to see, and "the gangs all here" could be the new slogan. He could have "murder capital of Canada." All of those things do not do us any good here in the province of Manitoba, but they continue, and they continue under this government's watch.

So it is no wonder that legislation like this needs to come forward in terms of in-house training of security guards. It is no wonder this legislation is necessary because of the violence that we see, because of the impact that we have of gang members that are really permeating throughout the province. You know, I have heard reports virtually now from every part of the province, whether it is in The Pas, whether it is in Thompson, areas that the members, I know, pay good lip service about wanting to represent and care about, but in fact do not really back up that lip service with real action.

The concerns come from communities like The Pas and Thompson, but are not limited to them. Certainly, throughout the province of Manitoba, in Winnipeg and rural areas they are dealing with gang issues. They are dealing with this sort of unprecedented violence, the level of violence, the nature of violence that has come because of the gangs here in Manitoba. They are looking for new initiatives from this government, not a response. This particular piece of legislation, again, although it has merit, it has some importance, I think could be a considered response to the unprecedented level of violence that we have in the province.

You know, I saw last week the statistics regarding the Youth Criminal Justice Act and the fact that there are very, very few young people who are being put into incarceration as a result of serious crimes. I think that all of us recognize that, when

there are significant acts of violence, when there are very adult acts of criminal behaviour being used or being done, there should, in fact, be very adult consequences to that criminal behaviour. But that is not the case under the Youth Criminal Justice Act, Mr. Speaker. I know that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) would go on, and has gone on at times, about the flaws in the Youth Criminal Justice Act, and I concur with some of those comments. I have certainly said on the occasions that I have had to do so that there do need to be changes to the Youth Criminal Justice Act. There should not necessarily be a presumption against certain kinds of sentences, as there is. There does need to be, as one of the principles of sentencing, the factor of deterrence, because I do believe that certain sentences do deter individuals from committing crime either specifically to the individual who has committed that crime or generally to society as a whole.

But the need, then, Mr. Speaker, goes beyond looking at the Youth Criminal Justice Act. The Minister of Justice certainly does have some authority and some power when dealing with young people and the violence that comes from certain issues and the need for this legislation as a result. The Minister of Justice does have certain powers and certain authority. When young people are released on probation or conditions, it falls upon him to ensure that those conditions are being met, to ensure that there are people, the proper resources in place to ensure that young people are being tracked and to ensure those conditions that the court has rightfully put on.

You know, the court, I think, makes a determination about certain conditions and then expects that there is going to be that follow-through and the resources are going to be in place on the government side. But time and time again we see that individuals who are on conditional sentences or young people who are out on certain conditions of release do not have those conditions followed.

I brought forward suggestions regarding electronic monitoring and other issues that the government has simply decided to ignore, that the government has simply decided are not truly important to them. Instead, they decide to bring forward what some might consider, it has been reported in the media, light measures of legislation, a light legislative agenda. Instead of dealing with the sometimes difficult and thorny issues that we have within our society, that are related to crime, that are related to violence, this government takes another

route. They take what is called, I think, the path of least political resistance because they do not want to deal with the real issues.

So they mount and they mount and they mount over time, whether it is the problem that mounts with the skyrocketing and unprecedented debt that we have in the province of Manitoba, over \$20 billion, or whether it relates to the increased crime that we have time and time again. The fact is that this government comes in from time to time, into the Legislature, but truly does not bring in real measures or real pieces of legislation that would deal with the problems that we have in the province of Manitoba.

I do not think that it is a crime, to excuse the pun, Mr. Speaker, to admit that there are problems in Manitoba that need to be addressed. Time and time again I hear members opposite point this way and talk about how the sky is falling and try to make light of that. I hear, again, the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) echoing his party's line. He does not seem to want to let go of that old mantra. He wants to continue to sing from the songbook that his leader, the Premier (Mr. Doer), has put in front of him.

But, in reality, Mr. Speaker, there is also the other side that needs to be done. There is also the opposite side, that there needs to be a recognition from the government that there truly are significant issues and problems in the province of Manitoba. This issue of everything is rosy and pie in the sky does not wash with Manitobans because they see it every day. They hear about the violence, whether it is regarding what happened in Shaftesbury High School just prior to the weekend with a young person having a gun in a school and whether there is violence that happened there. They read about it and they hear about it and they know that this is happening.

Whether it is regarding the growing drug problem in Manitoba, and, certainly, within my own community, I continue to hear concerns about the availability of certain drugs and how it is that these drugs are getting into the community. I would applaud the residents of the Steinbach constituency who have said, "We are not going to put blinders on. We are not going to look at this as a problem necessarily. We are going to try to find the solution to something that is going on. We are not going to say that raising the issue brings negative light to us, but, in fact, dealing with the issue means that we are doing something positive."

That is what this government really needs to do when it is looking at what is going on and the issues of crime in the province of Manitoba. They need to recognize that admitting that there are issues related to violence and young people, admitting that there are issues related to gangs and to drugs is not something that they should necessarily shy away from and not talk about. But they should be addressing the fact that there are real, real concerns with certain areas in the province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

* (16:10)

I think if they did that, if they admitted that there are a lot of difficulties in the province, that people would look upon them in a more favourable light. I think, in fact, they look upon all of us in a more favourable light if they saw that politicians were recognizing that, in fact, there are some difficult issues that need to be dealt with and that need to be tackled.

So, when we look at pieces of legislation like this regarding in-house security, it is not a poor piece of legislation, it is not a piece of legislation that is going to find a great deal of opposition here in the Legislature, but it is symptomatic of what this government is doing. It is symptomatic of the fact that they are not dealing with the heavy and the weighty issues that are facing the province of Manitoba. They are not dealing with issues that face young people in our province. They are not dealing with the issues that are causing a number of young people within our province that find themselves in despair and who, perhaps, could be part of a lost generation, Mr. Speaker.

Those are the sort of issues that I would challenge this government to look at when it is dealing with budgetary issues or whether it is dealing with Throne Speech issues, they should not shy away from those sort of difficult issues. I think, in fact, not that the public in general would not look at raising these concerns as being a weakness of the government, but they might look at raising those concerns as being a positive, that it would reflect well on all of us if they saw legislators who were saying, "Yes, these issues are out there and, yes, we are going to find a way to deal with it in an appropriate way."

So, Mr. Speaker, I know that this legislation that was brought here by the government regarding in-

house security is a necessary piece of legislation because of the activities that we see that are going on, whether it is activities with concerts, whether it is activities in establishments, in bars, but there is an increased level of activity and, as a result, there is a need for an increased level of security, and that you simply cannot look at the one issue of security and not look at the other issue of why it is that it is needed. I would challenge the government as it looks at this particular piece of legislation to find other pieces of legislation. I have already mentioned the one regarding testing of blood or of bodily samples that would be good for our police officers in the province of Manitoba. The paramedics are looking for that. Other jurisdictions have said that it is appropriate and that it is valuable legislation.

I would challenge them as well to look at parallel pieces of legislation that would complement this whether it is regarding safety in schools, Mr. Speaker, that is not just the safety in establishments touches such as bars or other areas, but there is a need to protect children who are in schools because I think that young people, and parents in particular, deserve to know that when they drop their child off at the door they are going to be secure and that they are going to find safety and sanctuary within those schools. They can be there to do what is expected of them, they can learn and they can ensure that they get the best education possible without fear of violence entering their school. It needs to be a safe zone.

So, while the government has addressed this particular issue, I think there are also greater issues that it needs to look at in the future. I know my time is running short, and I look forward to—well, I see the Member for Minto (Mr. Swan) wants to put some words on the record, and I look forward to hearing his comments because I know that he will want to add to this debate. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Honourable Members: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence, third reading, Bill 2, The Private Investigators and Security Guards Amendment Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? [*Agreed*]

Bill 3—The Enforcement of Canadian Judgments Act

Hon. Diane McGifford (Minister of Advanced Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, I move, that Bill 3, The Enforcement—

Mr. Speaker: Seconded by.

Ms. McGifford: Pardon me, seconded by the Minister of Labour and Immigration (Ms. Allan), that Bill 3, The Enforcement of Canadian Judgments Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Justice, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: Any speakers on concurrence and third reading?

Mr. Kelvin Goertzen (Steinbach): Mr. Speaker, I rise to put a few words on the record regarding this piece of legislation. I apologize. It was my understanding that—it certainly looked like the Member for Minto (Mr. Swan) was going to be speaking on the last piece of legislation, but I know that he was called down by his government and asked not to speak to the legislation because that is certainly how things are done on the democratic side of the House.

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

An Honourable Member: The New Democratic side.

Mr. Goertzen: On the New Democratic side of the House. They seem to have taken the democratic part out of their moniker.

But, you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do think it is important that a number of words are put on the record regarding this particular piece of legislation, and I hope that this time around that members opposite of the government will see that it is important enough to rise and to address certain issues related to this legislation. If they felt it was important enough to bring forward the legislation in the House, I would also hope that they find it important enough to stand up and to speak about the legislation and try to put on the record why it is important that Manitobans have this.

I know this is a bill that will find general acceptance in the House, again, but it should not just pass without some words of caution. I know when you look at legislation like this, it flows from, it comes from—the Uniform Law Commission has put

forward this kind of legislation and has said that it is important, that there needs to be a uniform set of rules regarding enforcement of judgments, particularly protection orders, across Canada, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that those pieces of legislation will, in fact, be helpful in protecting people who find themselves in difficult and abusive relationships. I commend those who are involved with the Uniform Law Commission who bring forward these kinds of legislation.

In fact, it is interesting because I was speaking not too long ago, minutes ago, actually, I think, regarding the possibility of having legislation to test blood for paramedics and for police officers and for Good Samaritans perhaps, and that, too, was a piece of legislation that was considered by the Uniform Law Commission, and they saw that it would be something that could be valuable. So, on the one hand, we have in this particular piece of legislation the government saying, "Yes, we are going to adopt the recommendation from the Uniform Law Commission," but, on the other hand, on the other suggestion that I put forward, they decided, no, that they would not go forward with that legislation.

I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the government, when it looks towards this, I think that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh), in the briefing that we had regarding the legislation, said that this was the first of its kind, that we were the first jurisdiction going ahead in Canada. You know, I think that is a positive thing. I do not mind standing up and saying that it is positive that we are the first jurisdiction to look at something. Too often in Manitoba and particularly under the direction of this NDP government we tend to be the last jurisdiction that falls in line with certain important pieces of legislation.

But there is, in fact, a need to ensure that the laws across our country find equitable measures in the different jurisdictions, because even though there are lines on a map, there are borders with jurisdictions, I would expect that most Canadians would believe that there is, in fact, regarding the laws in Canada, a greater sense of uniformity, that, in fact, if they have a judgment that is made in a court in Vancouver, that if they move to the province of Manitoba or they find themselves in Manitoba for some length of time, most Canadians would expect that the judgment that was rendered in that court in Vancouver would be equally applicable here in the province of Manitoba.

* (16:20)

That is not because they do not recognize, of course, that there are different jurisdictions. It is not because they do not recognize the fact that there are different provinces. But I think what it is is there is a feeling within the country that the law in one jurisdiction will be more or less the same in another jurisdiction in the country of Canada, and that you will be able to apply and have that same judgment that was rendered in one area applicable in another.

I think that that is a very reasonable expectation for citizens to have, and it is important that all governments work together, then, to ensure that that reasonable expectation finds its way to fruition, Mr. Speaker. In fact, when you are dealing with the law, we know that the protection orders that often come, and I recognize it is largely for women who find themselves in abusive situations, that the protection orders that come for them are vitally important and that the threat, just because they remove themselves from a particular province, that it does not mean that the threat that they were under that gave way to the initiative of the protection order does not follow them.

So we have with us in the Legislature a reminder, a very visual reminder, of the difficulty that there is with domestic violence in the province, not just here in Manitoba but in other provinces as well, and that there have been victims of that domestic violence. So I think that it is incumbent upon all of us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the Legislature to find a way to ensure that those who are in these difficult relationships have the protection, not just in the jurisdiction where the individual order was granted but, really, throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

So I commend the Uniform Law Commission for bringing this forward, and I am glad that the government has looked at it and said that this would be a valuable piece of legislation to add.

Similar to the comments that I made regarding the last piece of legislation, I also think it opens up an opportunity, an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for the government to say, "Well, we have this legislation, but what else could we have to complement the legislation to ensure that it is meaningful, to ensure that it is helpful?" One of the concerns that I hear time and time again, and I have certainly heard it before I was asked to serve as the Justice critic for

our party, I heard it as an MLA in a variety of other roles in the past, that they have protection orders but they are not being enforced. Certainly, I know within the legal profession, when you talk to individuals who are involved with the enforcement of these orders or the granting of them, they recognize that there are not enough people over there to ensure that these pieces of paper, which is essentially what they are, that these orders, in fact, have the enforcement behind them.

In some ways, protection orders that do not have a lot of meaning behind them because there are not enough people to enforce those orders, Mr. Speaker, can be harmful in and of themselves, when people have a false reliance when the individual who is involved in an abusive relationship walks out of court and thinks that they have been successful in getting some sort of a protection order against an individual that they are worried about or that they are concerned about. When they walk out of court and feel that this piece of paper or this particular ruling will now give them the safety and the security that they lacked within the context of their relationship before, and it does not come to fruition, if it does not really happen, that in itself can be dangerous. We know that that is why it is important that the government not just bring forward legislation like this, not just put something on the books to, again, give even a greater sense of false security, but ensures that there is enforcement of these orders.

There are a number of ways, Mr. Speaker, that that can be done. Clearly, one of the most obvious ways is regarding law enforcement. Members of the New Democratic Party here in Manitoba may be getting tired of me talking about law enforcement and the lack of law enforcement and the lack of resources. They may be getting weary of hearing me stand day after day and calling for more support for the good men and women that we have in our municipal police forces and serving in the national police force. They may wish that I would sit down and stop asking questions regarding the lack of resources that we have.

But I know that members on that side I know that, whether it is the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) or the Member for Minto (Mr. Swan) or the Minister of Agriculture (Ms. Wowchuk), where I know there is a shortage of officers in her area, I know that they will not stand up and ask these questions. I know that they will not stand up for their communities when there is a lack of officers, that it falls to us as opposition members and as

Conservatives to stand up and ask these questions. I know that it falls to this side of the House to say, "We will stand with the men and women of law enforcement and work for them to have the real resources so that they can do their job," because we know, we know when talking to officers throughout the province, Mr. Speaker, that they are frustrated.

They are frustrated because they do not have resources. They are frustrated because when they start a particular shift they have a list, a laundry list of orders that need to be enforced, of probation and conditional orders that need to be checked on, and they simply cannot do it all. We know of officers who end up double-shifting and spending more and more time working at the job because there is a shortage of other officers because a secondment has not been filled or because a sick leave has not been filled or because a mat leave or a stress leave has not been filled. That is the record of this government, unfulfilled, or a phantom officer patrolling, a phantom force, if you will, patrolling the highways in Manitoba.

So it relates very directly to this particular piece of legislation, and it relates because, if you do not have those officers in place to ensure that the orders that are given, the protection orders, if you do not have officers or if you just have phantom officers that the Member for Selkirk refers to them as, if you just have those phantom officers there, it gives a very false sense of security.

So I would encourage the government, while this legislation may in and of itself be positive, it is a bit like setting up the framework of a home but not really having the walls to fill it out. Here we need our officers on the street to ensure that when a call comes in from somebody in a domestic situation, when somebody is in need, is in peril, that an officer is able to respond and not just to take the call. We know that there are officers sometimes who can be radioed in different areas of the province about a distress call, but they, in fact, have to get to the actual scene or the actual area where the incident is taking place. Now, with the reorganization of the D-Division here in the province of Manitoba, we see that there are less and less officers that are being forced to police greater and greater areas. So I take the calls from the area of the Minister of Agriculture and I take the calls from the area of the Member for Selkirk where these constituents are saying, "You know, I have tried to call my representative, but they do not find this to be an imperative issue or they blame another level of government."

They point somewhere else, Mr. Speaker, when, in fact, we know that this government has failed to plan for those officers. They did not request officers, whether it was last year that they made the announcement but then forgot to put in the order. You know, they were so busy. It is a bit like going home and saying, "I am going to be ordering out for food." You tell your family that, but then you forget to put in the order.

That is really what happened when it comes to our RCMP officers. I would encourage perhaps the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) to look for his second annual Homer Simpson award, and perhaps it should be given to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) for that faux pas. *[interjection]* The Member for Tuxedo (Mrs. Stefanson) brings up a good point, that there are so many issues with this government it could almost be a monthly award, that it probably could be almost a weekly award for the Homer Simpson award. I would certainly ask the Member for Inkster to take that advice that has been given with all the right spirit into consideration.

But, when it relates to this particular piece of legislation, it simply will not be enough to have legislation on the books without those officers in place. *[interjection]* I know the Member for Selkirk would like me to move on from this issue. It is very sensitive. I know that, in his own area, I heard it again in Selkirk that in that detachment they are short of officers again. It happens time and time again. I raised it I think in the summer session of the Legislature with the Member for Selkirk, and I said, "You know, they are screaming for officers in Selkirk."

One of the good things that we have, or one of the things—I am not sure if it is always good, Mr. Speaker—that we have here in the Legislature is an ability within Question Period for members of the government on the eighth question, seventh question, to stand up and ask a question of their government. I know today the Member for Selkirk asked a question to the Health Minister, and that is important because apparently the communication does not exist within the NDP government to have questions of caucus members answered. I know the Member for Selkirk has a difficult time getting an audience with the Minister of Health. I tell him, "Get in line," because there are many of us here in the Legislature who cannot get our correspondence responded to. We cannot get answers from the Minister of Health.

* (16:30)

So I do not begrudge the government members from getting up and having to ask questions, because they cannot get an audience with their own ministers or cannot get answers. It is hard to blame them, as the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) points out, but I would ask that the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), and I leave this as a challenge—I know that there are only three days left in this session, Mr. Speaker, unless the Member for Inkster gets his way, perhaps, and extends the session, that there are only—

An Honourable Member: You never know.

Mr. Goertzen: We never know. Funnier things have happened here. With only three days left, I would challenge the Member for Selkirk to look at putting forward a question regarding the lack of officers here in the province of Manitoba. I know that his own constituents would applaud him, I think, for asking that question. They would applaud him for ensuring that those kinds of issues are brought forward, and it relates not just to the safety in the Selkirk area or other areas of the province of Manitoba, but it relates very directly to this particular piece of legislation because, without those officers, without those men and women on the front line ready to respond to the 911 calls that come in on domestic violence, what good is the legislation? Are we simply putting forward another false hope for women who are in difficult relationships, who are in abusive relationships, who fear for their lives because of relationships? Are we simply saying to them, yes, something is being done, but in fact it truly is not being done, Mr. Speaker?

I would challenge this government to look at it, whether there are other areas. I know areas of maintenance enforcement. I have brought this up with the government and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) on a number of different occasions, about maintenance enforcement. When I do deal with issues of maintenance enforcement, it is a resource issue. You know, I have told this story before of a constituent of mine who phoned, a constituent assistant of mine actually, who phoned in to maintenance enforcement and found out that the message said, "If your issue is urgent, leave a message; we will get back to you within seven days."

Seven days, Mr. Speaker, and that is the kind of thing we see where the government says, "Well, we have set up all these mechanisms, and we have set up all these different approaches and approvals that will ensure that something gets done on an important issue like maintenance enforcement." But, in fact,

when you look at it, when you step back, when you kind of separate the forest from the trees, what you see is that there is legislation in place, and there is something on the books, but in fact what happens in reality is quite different.

You know, I do not cast aspersions easily on members opposite, certainly not my way here in the Legislature, but I would assume that every member here in the Legislature, I know that every member here in the Legislature wants to ensure that there is safety for people who are in abusive relationships. I truly believe that. I really do. But what concerns me then, Mr. Speaker, is that the government, when it puts forward legislation like this, does not ensure the resources are there to make it happen. That is an issue that is not simply a concern of the federal government.

I know that an Auditor-General's report came out of Ottawa shortly before the federal election was called, another Sheila Fraser report was issued in Ottawa, and in that report, it dealt specifically with the RCMP and it dealt specifically with the shortage of RCMP throughout Canada, Mr. Speaker.

They certainly laid a lot of blame at the feet of the Liberal government for their inability to manage certain issues such as training, and blame should be ascribed where blame is deserved, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to these particular issues, but it is funny because the minister of safety, I believe that is her title, Anne McLellan, the Liberal minister, also said that there was no unfulfilled request for officers in the province of Manitoba.

That was in direct response to a question that was posed to her, and the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), who I suspect is doing his level best to try to defend his brethren in Ottawa, who are under all sorts of problems these days in the federal election, I suspect he raises the issue because he knows, Mr. Speaker, that there is something funny going on when the minister responsible on the federal level says that the provincial minister has nothing to complain about because there are no unfulfilled requests for officers.

You know, we now recognize here in the province of Manitoba that the reason there are no unfulfilled requests for officers is because the request was never really put forward, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Justice somehow did not find a way between the Throne Speech being introduced, not this last Throne Speech, but the prior Throne Speech where these officers were announced, did not find

the time between that November Throne Speech and the March Budget to pick up the phone and say, "We are looking for 28 more officers for rural Manitoba."

You know, I do not know if the calling card for the minister was filled, but it is one of the reasons why the Homer Simpson award would seem so appropriate because all he really had to do was to pick up the phone and say we are looking for 28 more officers. I understand that there are now almost weekly graduation classes going on at the depot in Saskatchewan—

An Honourable Member: The Bart Simpson one.

Mr. Goertzen: The Member for Inkster says maybe the Minister of Justice (Mr. Mackintosh) should get the Bart Simpson award. I do not want to short-change the minister because I truly think he is deserving of the full-fledged Homer Simpson award. I do not think he deserves a—*[interjection]* and I know the Minister of Water Stewardship (Mr. Ashton) has some chirping to do from his own seat and he has other broader issues. I know him and his family are busy splitting the votes up north and waiting for another Liberal member of the federal government to come in in that area.

So, while he is dealing with those sort of issues, those sort of political issues, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to deal with the important—

An Honourable Member: It will not be a Tory that is out there.

Mr. Goertzen: Well, and the Minister of Water Stewardship says it will not be a Conservative out there and that is probably a fair bet. In this federal election I would suggest that they have done more harm in terms of bringing in a Liberal than good but, you know, that is funny because that is how things go in the New Democratic Party. There was a member there, Bev Desjarlais, who decided to speak out on an issue and heaven forbid that in the New Democratic Party, if somebody would come out and speak out on a particular issue, you know, that Bev Desjarlais would actually be punished for speaking on issues. *[interjection]*

Well, and it is true, the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) points out that the Member for Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg) is really the example of how things are run in the New Democratic Party. He cannot speak out on issues that are important to his constituents. He cannot go into Rossmere and truly speak his heart on issues, because Bev Desjarlais is the example. Bev is the example of what happens

when the New Democrats speak out on a particular issue.

So, when it relates to this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very relevant. *[interjection]* The Minister of Water Stewardship is concerned because I am bringing up the issue of RCMP officers and it does relate very clearly to Bill 3 because, in fact, when you are dealing with the issue of enforcement, when you are dealing with—*[interjection]* The Minister of Water Stewardship says he is being helpful. He is being helpful in getting a Liberal elected in his northern riding; now he is being helpful with us here in the southern part of the province. But I think where he could truly be helpful is going into Cabinet and saying to his Minister of Justice, "We need RCMP officers. We need them in northern Manitoba, yes, but we need them also throughout southern Manitoba as well, where they are starving for officers and where there has been a redistribution so that officers have to police greater and greater areas."

If the Minister of Water Stewardship (Mr. Ashton) would spend some time going to his Cabinet and saying, "These are important issues, so this enforcement order that we are bringing in under Bill 3 could truly be enforced." That would be important, but we know that those issues will not be raised by the Member for Rossmere because he has been silenced. He has been silenced by his caucus. You know, there is the odd time he gets up to say some sort of a statement on some sort of an issue, but he truly does not want to bring forward these issues.

An Honourable Member: Some sort of an issue.

Mr. Goertzen: Well, I did not see the Member for Rossmere at the museum this weekend at their Touch of Christmas. I wish he would have been there, but I know he did not want to come because there were a number of people there who would not have been of his political persuasion and he is not used to venturing into those kinds of areas.

So he falls in line with his government because he does not want to—he has seen the example of Bev Desjarlais in the northern part of Manitoba, so he is quiet. He has been co-opted into saying nothing, Mr. Speaker, about the fact we do not have RCMP officers here in the province of Manitoba. *[interjection]* Well, and I am glad that the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) raises the issue of the federal member for Provencher because I do not know if there has been a bigger advocate for more police officers and more resources than the member

of Provencher, the former Attorney General here in this House, who brought forward a number of initiatives in getting new officers.

* (16:40)

So I would encourage all the members here in this Chamber, whether it is the Member for Selkirk, whether it is the Member for Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg), whether it is the Minister of Water Stewardship or whether it is the Deputy Premier (Ms. Wowchuk) herself who does not seem to want to raise these kinds of difficult issues that people in her community are talking about. I would ask them to go to their caucus or to their respective cabinets and say, "These are things that need to be addressed." and that it is just not enough to bring forward legislation to put on the books when you do not truly have this enforcement and not to be scared to be made an example like Bev Desjarlais was, not to be scared of the fact that the New Democrats do not have a real democratic part to their particular caucus.

They should stand up for their constituents. They should stand up and ensure that the issues are brought forward regarding the RCMP because it would benefit all Manitobans. I know that the Premier (Mr. Doer) has some kind of a Svengali hold over all of his caucus that they dare not speak a word, Mr. Speaker, on important issues like the RCMP.

It is one of those issues, I think, that all Manitobans would applaud members of this Legislature, again. It would say that you have all done the right thing in terms of trying to get more resources for our police so they can enforce these orders as speculated under Bill 3. I think there is almost unanimity—well, maybe not from the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). I think the Member for Inkster is actually on record as saying that we do not need any more police officers. I do not know if he was advocating for less officers, but he certainly was not advocating for more officers. He may have to write out a Homer Simpson award for himself next year, Mr. Speaker, if that sort of thing continues because I think that all Manitobans recognize that there is a need for more officers within the province.

I would encourage, Mr. Speaker, all the members opposite, and particularly all of those who have issues with a lack of officers in their jurisdictions, to come forward and say, "Now is the time that we are going to come together and do what is right for Manitoba. We will put aside political rhetoric for the day. We will put aside the fear of

being disciplined by the heavy hand of the Premier, by the Svengali-like figure that rules within the caucus or within the government." They will recognize that this is something broader than politics, that they will recognize this is something more than just partisan discussions, and look to having these real officers in place to ensure that women in difficult situations can get those orders enforced.

So, with this particular piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, I think it is critical that we do what all Canadians would ask us to do, to ensure that there is uniformity from coast to coast to coast on legislation. I know that Canadians would say it is the right thing to do. It is the sensible thing to do to have this sort of legislation to protect those living in vulnerable relationships. But they would also say take the extra step and make sure that the legislation is enforceable, that it is real, that it is truly going to make a difference by having the resources in place that are going to protect women, to ensure that our law enforcement is there to respond when the need is there, when the call goes out.

I know that my time now is short—*[interjection]* Well, if the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) wishes to give me leave, I am sure that I could fill up the next 15 minutes with comments. But I am glad that he has listened and he is sorry to hear that my speech is coming to an end. But, if he wishes to hear more about my ideas, I would be happy to go to the loge with him and discuss this further because I have a number of other ideas to better not only his community but, in fact, all of Manitoba. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is concurrence and third reading of Bill 3, The Enforcement of Canadian Judgments Act.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? *[Agreed]*

Bill 5—The Dental Hygienists Act

Hon. Diane McGifford (Minister of Advanced Education and Training): I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour and Immigration (Ms. Allan), that Bill 5, The Dental Hygienists Act, reported from the Standing Committee on Human Resources, be concurred in and be now read for a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a few words on the record on this act. I have listened over the last several years to dental hygienists and to dentists. We have paid attention to what was said at committee stage. We are ready to support this bill. We recognize that the dental hygienists want to have their ability to regulate their own profession. We also recognize that any time this comes through this is probably not going to be perfect, but that the problems can be worked out. I think that there were a number of important points that were made by dentists in discussion of this bill.

One of the big issues that we face in Manitoba right now is the major problem with early childhood decay, tooth decay, and this is because this problem is not being prevented adequately that we are ending up having to provide huge numbers of surgical procedures for children who are age two and three because there has not been the preventive approach that really should have been there, and in six years, this government has done very little in this area. It has been suggested that, you know, this bill might, in some way, be a solution but seeing as how many of the children that we are dealing with are found in northern and remote communities, I think there are going to be some real issues, as has been brought up at committee stage, in fact, as to whether we are actually going to get dental hygienists practising in these areas.

So the government, clearly, will need to monitor this rather carefully, that the government should not think that this is the solution which is going to solve this problem, that the reality is that this needs a focussed effort involving a lot of people to make sure that we are preventing early childhood tooth decay in this province, rather than having to submit children aged two and three in large numbers to dental surgery.

This measure which, indeed, we support and, as I have said, we will be watching closely to see how things work, we know that in most other provinces there is legislation to provide for self-regulatory bodies for dental hygienists and it is reasonable to do that here, although it, clearly, is more expensive for dental hygienists in this way. But the sense that I have is that most dental hygienists would rather pay the extra costs and have the self-regulatory profession and be able to have that empowerment that they desire.

It will nevertheless need pretty close working relationships with dentists, both in terms of when

people and how people are being supervised, and in terms of medical records, or dental records, as I should say, and there are these matters which, I am sure, can be worked out, as they have in other provinces.

So, with those comments and those concerns, we will look forward to this bill becoming law and seeing how it works. Thank you.

* (16:50)

Mrs. Heather Stefanson (Tuxedo): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, also, to speak to this Bill 5, The Dental Hygienists Act. I have spoken on this bill once before in second reading, and we had the opportunity for this bill to go to committee where we heard from a number of stakeholders in the industry who spoke very eloquently about an issue that they feel very, very passionately about, and, certainly, there were a number of dental hygienists. We also had the opportunity of having one of the dental hygienist classes out to committee as well, so it allowed them to see what the process is all about and how legislation is passed through this Legislature.

I think that is very important, Mr. Speaker, for students to come and have the ability to see how legislation is passed, something as important as this bill is to them and their future in our province. Again, we hope that they stay in our province and are able to seek job opportunities here as dental hygienists, but we certainly would encourage as many people as possible to come down and see the legislative process, how it works. I just want to thank all of them for coming out and being part of this very historic process for them.

Mr. Speaker, the college of dental hygienists actually exists in most other provinces across Canada. We are one of the last provinces to actually introduce this and bring this forward, and I am glad that it is finally taking place. Of course, the dentists do have some concerns with respect to the bill, but we are confident on this side of the House that, if there is an opportunity for all stakeholders to be at the table when the regulations are written—I would hope that all stakeholders have an opportunity to be a part of that process, including the dentists. I believe that they will, and that gives them their voice at the table. I think that is very important.

But I just want to talk to you a little bit about the dental hygienists. Dental hygienists themselves essentially promote oral health through education, assessment and treatment of teeth, Mr. Speaker, and

the practice of dental hygiene includes: No. 1, administering oral anaesthetic; No. 2, applying dental sealants; and also performing orthodontic and restorative procedures.

Essentially, this bill creates a college of dental hygienists for the province of Manitoba, and, Mr. Speaker, again, it is very similar to the College of Physicians and Surgeons and will be run in a very similar fashion and is something that we believe that the dental hygienists, they have the right as a profession to be managed by their own college and their own peers. So we think this is very important for the dental hygienists in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also creates a council to manage and conduct the business and affairs of this college, also, again, very important, and it does follow along the same as the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Again, it is very similar to what is taking place in other provinces as well. Again, I would add that I think it is unfortunate it took so long for this to come forward. We are one of the last provinces in Canada to bring a college forward for the dental hygienists, but I am glad that this government has woken up and realized the importance of passing this type of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the bill requires that one third of all members of council be appointed by the Minister of Health (Mr. Sale) to act as representatives of the public. We hope that he would consult with people in the industry before just randomly selecting what could often be some of his own friends to the board. We would hope that he would not politicize this and would listen to the various stakeholders in this community, the various dental hygienists, dentists and so on, the various stakeholders that will be affected by this legislation, that he listens carefully to those communities before he makes his selection to sit as their representative on the council.

Mr. Speaker, the bill includes a provision allowing for requirements of registration to be waived to allow a person who is authorized to practise dental hygiene in another jurisdiction in Canada or in the U.S. to practise dental hygiene in the province during an emergency. Again, that is really something that is put into other acts. It is in the College of Physicians and Surgeons and other colleges of this type of nature where emergency situations can take place in provinces, and when we need to rely on the resources of other provinces to help overcome an emergency situation here in Manitoba. So that is a very standard thing to be put

into legislation and also very important, so that we can deal with the possibility of some sort of a pandemic or something along those lines that would have us call on our American friends to the south of us to come in and to help us through difficult times and to also look to other provinces where they will be able to help us out through what could be a difficult time.

Mr. Speaker, these are issues that I have spoken about time and time again in this Legislature, and I did in second reading, and I heard again the number of people, dental hygienists, et cetera, that came out to speak very passionately about this issue at committee. So those are some of the things that they covered in their presentations and some of the things that we have mentioned before in this House and the importance of bringing this legislation forward.

I would like to just tell you that I am concerned, extremely concerned, about the lack of attention that this government has given to the area of pediatric dental care. We have wait lists that are growing exponentially in this province when it comes to pediatric dental care and the need for children in our province who are waiting in pain for dental surgery. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is very important to mention this very fact and that we did have a private clinic that wanted to come forward and essentially eliminate that wait list for our province. The government could have entered into a contract with them and, as of today, each and every one of those children would have had their surgery and would no longer be waiting in pain.

I think it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that this government sees fit to only stick to their ideology and not look at what is in the best interest of patients. These are young, small children who are being forced to wait in pain for dental surgery. This government had an option, they had an opportunity, to work with the private sector to deliver these services to those children waiting in pain, yet they chose not to. I find that that is extremely, extremely

unfortunate when it comes to this government and when it comes to the Minister of Health who absolutely refuses at all costs to maneuver away from what his ideological beliefs are. We on this side of the House, we believe that our ideology, everyone's ideology, should be set aside for what is in the best interest of patients. In this case, the best interest of those patients, those children, is to get that surgical procedure done as soon as possible, to get them free of pain and to get them on living the kinds of lives that they should be living, going to school and playing with their family and their friends and free of pain.

So I would say that I think this government is somewhat heartless when it comes to the children of our province. It is particularly the infants who are waiting in pain for these surgeries. As the Member for River Heights (Mr. Gerrard) mentioned earlier, he mentioned the importance of preventative measures and teaching children how to properly brush their teeth. I think that that is, certainly, a very, very important part of what we are teaching our children in our province as well, the importance of preventing cavities, preventing gum disease, preventing all of those things. Mr. Speaker, that is why it is so important for this type of legislation, that we have this legislation so that dental hygienists can do what they love to do and that is help children and prevent children from contracting things like gum disease and cavities and things that will, essentially, affect their everyday life in a negative way. So dental hygienists will teach those children how to properly brush their teeth, what things that they should not be drinking, too many sugary drinks—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have 20 minutes remaining.

The time being 5 p.m., this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

