



First Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS  
(HANSARD)**

---

39 Elizabeth II

---

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



**VOL. XXXIX No. 44 - 1:30 p.m., WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1990**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, December 12, 1990

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that the report of the committee be received.

**Motion agreed to.**

**Mrs. Dacquay:** I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Municipal Affairs.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Your Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs presents the following as their First Report.

Your committee met on Tuesday, December 4 at 10 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider matters relating to The Forks Renewal Corporation. Your committee also met on Tuesday, December 11, 1990, at 10 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider matters relating to North Portage Development Corporation. At the meeting on Tuesday, December 4, 1990, your committee elected Mrs. Dacquay as Chairperson.

Mr. Cam McLean, Chairperson of the Board of Directors; Mr. Nick Diakiw, Chief Executive Officer; Mr. Al Baronas, Vice-President; Mr. Sid Kroeker, Site Archeologist; Ms. Anna Shymanski, Accountant and Mr. Randy Cameron, General Manager, The Forks Market provided such information as was requested by Members of the committee with respect to the business of The Forks Renewal Corporation.

Dr. Arnold Naimark, Chairperson of the Board; Mr. Kent Smith, General Manager and Mr. Paul Webster, Chief Accountant provided such information as was requested by Members of the committee with respect to the business of North Portage Development Corporation.

Your committee reports that it has considered matters relating to The Forks Renewal Corporation and North Portage Development Corporation.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**Mrs. Dacquay:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the report of the committee be received.

**Motion agreed to.**

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### RCMP Services Premier's Position

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this week we raised questions about the Government's intent and contingencies dealing with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, many Manitobans have been calling us about their concern about the Government's plans and contingency plans for actually even looking at replacing the RCMP with a regional police force.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Manitoba said it would only be feasible if they did it all across western Canada, notwithstanding the loss of that symbol and vision of our country. We have since been informed that the Premier of Saskatchewan says it is absolutely a no go. It is not even an option for the Province of Saskatchewan.

My question then to the Premier is: Will he now reverse his position and withdraw the option of having a western Canadian police force to replace the RCMP in Manitoba?

\* (1335)

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, what we are saying is that first and foremost our desire is to have Manitoba policed by the RCMP at a rate that is reasonable to us. As a result of continuous offloading that has occurred that goes back to the last contract under the Trudeau administration in which more of the burden of police cost was transferred over to Manitoba, now we have a second thrust and a continuation of that in which more of the

burden of policing cost, some \$9 million per year, is proposed to be transferred to Manitoba.

We do not believe that is fair. We do not believe that is reasonable. We are saying to Ottawa that we are not prepared to accept it.

Of course, when you are faced with a Minister who says, that is it, take it or leave it, and will not even negotiate, then we have to have an alternative, so we are exploring a reasonable alternative. That is precisely what is the responsibility of any good Government, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Doer:** I would also note that even Premier Getty has stated that he is not looking at that situation, so it looks like the Premier is leading the charge in Ottawa by withdrawing their costs, even if the bad deal is accepted.

### Manitoba Representation

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** My question to the Premier is: If he has reached another roadblock with the federal Tories in Ottawa about the RCMP, Mr. Speaker, has he, on behalf of the Premiers of the country which he chairs, initiated a representation to the Prime Minister to overrule the Tory Minister who is being intransigent about policing with the municipalities in Canada that rely on the RCMP? Has he led that charge or are we being quiet again?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** You know, I find it more than a little hypocritical of the Leader of the Opposition, who every time in this House says, what is your contingency plan for? What are you going to do if? What are you going to do if? Why have you not planned for?

We are developing an alternative, Mr. Speaker, so that we do not have to deal with only one side of the coin with a unilateral decision which the federal Government is in a position to make. The only way in which we can avoid a unilateral decision, one that we disagree with, being made on us is to have an alternative plan. That is all we are doing, reviewing whether or not there is a possibility of an alternative plan being put forward to try and back the federal Government off its intransigent position.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, if the Premier knows that the cost per capita in Quebec and Ontario—(interjection)—well, we did not sign the first deal in 1980. Sterling Lyon did and Pierre Elliott Trudeau did.

### Premier's Position

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** My question to the Premier is: Given the cost benefits, why would the Premier be proposing an option that would cost us more money? Why would he be proposing an alternative that will be less of a standard in service? Instead of having a contingency plan in the back rooms, why is he not initiating a public fight with the Tory M.P.s in Manitoba and the Tory M.P.s in Ottawa—

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

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, obviously we would not be proposing it if it costs more. So we have to examine it to see whether or not it would cost more or whether or not it is technically and economically feasible. That is what we are into.

### Judicial System Prosecution Delays

**Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. Earlier in this Session it was revealed in this House that because of overcrowding and incompetence in the probation system, people on probation were not seeing probation officers.

Now we find that due to overcrowding, a major case, a case costing tens of thousands of dollars, has been thrown out due to unreasonable delay by this Minister's department. What measures will he take to deal with the obvious problems in the department and to ensure that justice in this province is not taken anymore into the area of disrepute? The public has lost confidence in this system.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I do not think the Honourable Member has been following what has been going on here in Manitoba, and I do not think he has been following what has been going on in Ontario.

The Honourable Member might do well to ask his Leader to ask Premier Rae to do something about the problems in Ontario where they faced the potential dismissal of some 50,000 to 80,000 cases, not just one, in Ontario.

I bring to the attention of the Honourable Member a recent headline in the Ottawa Citizen which says, Ottawa lawyers, judges, envy Winnipeg's success.

The story goes on to say, Winnipeg, the name evokes envy among Ottawa's lawyers and judges. The prairie city is being compared with Ottawa to demonstrate how a city similar in size to the nation's capital can deliver justice much faster. The comparison is being made at the request of the Supreme Court of Canada.

\* (1340)

**Mr. Chomlak:** Mr. Speaker, a very effective case of deflection by the Minister. How many times do delegations have to come from cities like Lynn Lake, Portage la Prairie and other centres? How many women's groups have to come before this Minister before justice is properly distributed in this province? How many more human tragedies before this Minister acts?

**Mr. McCrae:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member references a story on the front page of one of today's newspapers, and I would like to bring him up-to-date on that matter as well.

With respect to the specific matter to which he refers, each and every time the matter was set down for hearing, the Crown was ready to proceed with the hearing. The preliminary hearing was adjourned three times, once because of the sudden and unexpected death of one of the lawyers involved, and twice at the request of one of the other defence lawyers.

The Crown never requested any change of date. The Honourable Member might want to talk to the trial lawyers' association, for example, if he wants to see something done about these things that happen. Without the above mentioned events which were impossible to predict, there would not have been an unreasonable delay.

**Mr. Chomlak:** The law in this country says there are only three causes of delay, the accused, the Crown and the system. The court found the system and the Crown were at fault.

Mr. Speaker, will this Minister undertake to review this decision to ensure that we do not have a similar case in this province where the Charter is abused and the people of Manitoba again have to look to his ministry and his department and feel that justice is not being done?

**Mr. McCrae:** Mr. Speaker, the delay occurred in this case because of an extremely admittedly unusual and unfortunate set of coincidences which all happened to the same case. This case is not a typical example of cases under our control. It is one

case which is restricted to its own unique facts and may very fairly be expected not to happen again. It is an aberration.

I remind the Honourable Member that through our backlog reduction program, in the summer of 1989 we cleaned off a backlog—backlog cases numbering 20,000—between May and December of that year and have maintained very reasonable limits ever since that time. We are talking about one case in this particular example.

The Honourable Member might do well, if he is concerned about people's rights and so on, to make a representation to the people in Ontario where they do have the power to do something about something we have already done here in Manitoba.

### Remand Centre Construction Gasoline Seepage

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. The Liberal Party has been asking this Government to take steps to prevent further gasoline leaks from underground storage tanks for more than a year now.

This Government has been unwilling to listen to our suggestions. Today we have learned that work was stopped last week at the site of this Government's new remand centre because of high levels of gasoline contamination in the ground from the provincial garage which once occupied the site.

My question is for the Environment Minister. When was he informed about the gasoline contamination, and what is his department's assessment of the seepage? In particular, has it seeped north under the federal revenue building, has it seeped west under the new law courts building, has it seeped south under the Woodsworth Building?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I have not been informed of that situation, and I will ask for a report immediately.

### Remand Centre Construction Gasoline Seepage

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, this occurrence was noted at least a week ago, if not further back. My further question—and perhaps the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) knows more about this than the Minister of the Environment.

Workers on the site have informed us that there is between 56 percent and 100 percent saturation rates in at least two places. Given the high level of contamination and the obvious potential danger from this situation, why has this Government not made those findings public, and have they in fact provided for the tight security which is obviously necessary?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Government Services):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate it is factual that there has been extensive gas seepage taking place there from the time that the tanks were removed a number of years ago.

During the excavation that was taking place this was caught. It is being monitored by EMO people, by the people from Environment, and the situation is being—the reason why the project was stopped was because of the potential danger that was there. It is being monitored and controlled very closely. The seepage area will be excavated. It will be moved out of this city to allow it to be evaporated and then proper procedure will be followed.

\* (1345)

**Mr. Edwards:** Let me remind this Government of the laws by which they are bound, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister explain why the Minister of the Environment does not seem to know about this seepage when the law of this province states that the responsible authority, the owner of the property which is the province, is under an immediate obligation to inform the Environment Department to clean up this spill site to the satisfaction of the environment officers of this province?

**Mr. Driedger:** Mr. Speaker, from the time that we found out that there was a problem, the proper steps were taken and Environment was informed. The people were there within a fractional period of time. The people from Environment were there. It has been looked after in the proper procedure of the province.

### Health Care System User Fees

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns):** I have a question for the Premier on our national health care system. First we had the western Premiers at Lloydminster instructing their Finance Ministers to look at disentanglement for medicare. Then we had the Couvelier report recommending provincial

takeover. Now we see the Quebec Government going the next step, instituting user fees in hospitals, and the Alberta Health Minister saying that this route may be considered by her Government.

I want to ask the Premier if he, as Premier of this province, and as chair of the Premiers' Council, will he support the federal Government in suspending payments under the Canada health care Act to any province opting out of our national system and implementing or considering user fees?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct any erroneous impressions that are left by the Member for St. Johns who is wont to do that with her preamble.

The first error was that the western Premiers did not recommend the proposal that was put forward in the report that was filed by the western Finance Ministers. They said it was to be referred for further discussion. Number 2, we said very clearly that we disagreed with the comments of Mr. Couvelier. On the record I said so, the Minister of Finance—let her not leave any misapprehension on the report. Number 3, I have said publicly over and over again that we are opposed to the implementation of user fees in our health care system.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier is so taken up with misreading my comments that he has not answered the question. I want—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. It is not a time for debate.

### National Agenda

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns, kindly put her question, please.

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns):** I want to ask the Premier, since we now have this very serious situation with at least one province moving on user fees, will this Premier join with the federal Government in moving to suspend payments under the Canada Health Act to any province opting out of our national system and implementing user fees?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member's question is repeating a question which was previously asked and therefore out of order.

The Honourable Member, kindly rephrase her question, please.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Mr. Speaker, let me help out the Premier and table a report which will help put a clear position on record with respect to the impact

of federal withdrawal on our federal health care system, that paper just released by Judith Martin.

Let me ask the Premier what steps he has taken to get user fees, disentanglement and a two-tier medicare system off the national agenda?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, they are off the national agenda.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Leis:** I do not know how the Premier can say that given what is happening in Quebec and Alberta.

\* (1350)

### Manitoba Nurses' Union Negotiations

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns):** Let me just ask a question. I just want to ask the Premier about this Government's role in negotiations with the nurses of Manitoba.

Will the Premier order his Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to put this Government's monetary offer on the table today rather than wait until the last minute?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the New Democratic Party wants to make light of a serious issue. It is regrettable that they want to clown around in Question Period at a time when there are serious issues that have to be dealt with.

The fact of the matter is the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) I think does a disservice to the nurses when he makes funny remarks like that, a humorous remark.

The fact of the matter is that we do have a desire to resolve the issue with the nurses. Nobody in this province wants to have a conflict with respect to health care workers, and we are working very diligently to arrive at a solution, Mr. Speaker.

### Northern Tax Allowance Benefit Cutbacks

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

As you know, there have been changes to the Northern Tax Allowance benefits, and it is affecting the North in a very negative way. Has he been contacted by the federal Minister of Finance concerning those changes? What is he prepared to do for those people of northern Manitoba whose benefits will be cut back in just over two years?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I respond to this question because a lot of work has been done by the residents of northern Manitoba in making presentation to the federal ministry of Finance as well as the Ministers of Finance.

It would appear that the federal Government has listened to the people and has made some changes which are positive for the people of those northern communities.

### Benefit Cutbacks Review

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** The second question I have is for the same Minister of Finance.

Has the Minister reviewed those changes and the explanations as to why some communities will be cut off completely in three years, while others such as Flin Flon and The Pas will have benefits cut in half by 1994?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, let me respond that there has been a review by the Northern Affairs Ministers as it relates to those benefits.

I do not have the specific reasons why the federal Government did it, but the alternative would have been to have no tax breaks or no tax relief for those communities that have previously been identified as losing them.

They are getting some tax relief from the federal Government which I would expect most of those communities are at least grateful for, Mr. Speaker, maybe not as happy as they could have been with the total tax relief, but they are at least getting something that they did not have prior to the work done by the northern committee and the Governments involved.

**Mr. Lathlin:** Mr. Speaker, northern Manitobans would have been happier if the tax allowance benefits would have been left intact.

### Goods and Services Tax Manitoba Hydro Billing

**Mr. Oscar Lathlin (The Pas):** My final supplementary is to the Minister of Energy.

In view of the already high cost of living in the North, will the Minister review his policy of adding the GST to hydro bills, a charge that will cost many northern residents more than \$100 in heating bills this winter already?

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Hydro Act):** I remind the Member for The Pas that the Minister of Energy and Mines is not adding the GST to the hydro bills. The federal Government is adding that tax.

If Manitoba Hydro were to deduct that amount from the hydro bills, it would cost every Manitoba Hydro consumer that amount. Manitoba Hydro runs a break-even balance sheet, and they cannot afford to take on the cost of the GST rather than pass it on to the consumer.

\* (1355)

### Immigrant Physicians Internship Positions

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier.

During the election campaign the Premier made a commitment to encourage the immigration of skilled workers. Later he reaffirmed his position in this House.

In Manitoba we have between 16 and 20 trained, skilled physicians from countries such as Poland, the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia and the Phillipines. Most of them have passed their qualifying exams. They are being denied the right of practise.

Can the Premier tell us why they are being denied the internship position which is compulsory before they can practise medicine in this country?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, without accepting the preamble of the question from the Member for The Maples, I would be happy to look into the matter, because certainly we would not like to see an unreasonable or unfair denial of right to practise or be employed here in this province.

If he can provide me with information, I will be happy to look into the matter.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to give the Premier the information. These physicians are in the area of general practice, urology, internal medicine and cardiology.

### Immigrant Physicians Internship Positions

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples):** My next question is for the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health tell us, and justify in this House, why these people are not being allowed to have access to funding, which is about \$700,000, which

is being allowed for the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower for this similar reason?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend's premise and preamble to the question is not accurate.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Speaker, this Minister is well aware of these people. He has repeatedly denied any answer during the Estimates process.

I will ask the Premier then: Can he sit down with his Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and explain to him that the—how can he justify having a two-tier policy, two-system policy, one for the five specialized countries and one for the rest of the world?

How can you justify your policy of skilled immigration when you have these people who are already in this country, they are sweeping floors, they are working for hamburger stores, they are driving cabs, because your Minister is incompetent and insensitive to the immigration approach?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Speaker, for three successive Estimate processes we have discussed this issue with my honourable friend. For three successive Estimate processes my honourable friend has been given the clear and unequivocal answer to his question that the individuals he refers to, like other individuals who are trained in medicine, have access, especially in Manitoba, uniquely in Manitoba, to a one-year or a two-year residency program at the Faculty of Medicine, as required by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, in order to obtain their licence to practise medicine in Manitoba.

Any allegation my honourable friend makes of discrimination or any other issue is simply not accurate.

### GATT Negotiations Minister's Position

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Following the failure, suspension, collapse or whatever term we might want to use of the GATT talks last week, the nations around the world have an opportunity to reflect on the position that they took at the discussions with the view to finding some solutions rather than ranting and raving about putting restrictions and punishing the Europeans as Grant Devine has done in Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, he is even quoted as saying in the Financial Post that he wants to see an end to the crap and

corruption—corruption, he used. This is the Premier of Saskatchewan going on in Europe.

Rather than doing that, Mr. Speaker, what we should be dealing with here is reflecting on Canada's position in support of the U.S. in those talks.

In view of the fact that the Minister said that the issue of export subsidies was the primary concern to Canada's farmers which is essentially the American position, why did this Minister support the essentially American position, which included the 75 percent reduction in domestic subsidies, as well the tariffication of border measures and those issues as opposed to dealing with the issue of primary concern, which was export subsidies to Canadian farmers?

\* (1400)

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the country of Canada could hold its head very high when it was over at the GATT talks, because the 10 provinces had gotten together even though we have regional differences and considerable differences in the kind of production we have in agriculture and different views as to whether there should be supply management or an open-market system. The 10 provinces got together and supported one policy, the Canadian policy, which deals with export subsidies, border access and internal support. It did not support the American position.

Our position was unique and it identified exactly the problem area, export subsidies. The Canadian position was 100 percent removal of export subsidies. The American position was 90. The Cairns Group of countries' position was about 85 percent to 80 percent. The internal support, Canada said 50 percent reduction. The Americans said 70.

We are quite different. We are not supporting the American position. In fact all the countries of the world rallied around the Canadian position that export subsidies are first and foremost, border access second and internal supports third and have to be dealt with in the negotiation process in GATT. I will have to remind the Member that Canada uniquely put forth a very significant proposal that if every other country in the world followed, we would be in a good position today.

### Canada's Position

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, given that the real issue of concern to Canadian farmers is the issue of dumping of products on the market below the cost of production, the need for an international floor price, given that an international floor price for wheat is what is needed by Canadian farmers and the end of export subsidies—

**Mr. Speaker:** Question, please.

**Mr. Plohman:** I ask this Minister to table the Canadian position that was taken at GATT and Manitoba's response to that position so that all Manitoba farmers and the people in Manitoba will have access so they can study and look at that position and determine whether it was in their best interests.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely incredible that the Member has finally become aware that the issue was export subsidies—finally become aware. Our position, the Manitoba position, the Canadian position, has been in the press, has been publicized all over Canada for many months. I cannot understand why the Member cannot have read it somewhere.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, he has not tabled a position. I ask the Minister to do that.

Mr. Speaker, considering that an independent Canadian position is of primary importance to all Canadians, I would ask the Minister whether he would now support the position and advocate the position to the federal Government that the major points of Canada's platform at those discussions, if and when they resume, are that there should be tough anti-dumping laws, that there should be elimination of export subsidies, and there should be a minimum price of wheat established—

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

**Mr. Findlay:** Mr. Speaker, that has been the position of Canada, that export subsidies represent dumping and we are opposed to them. That is the position of the Cairns Group of countries, some 14 countries. That is the position of all the underdeveloped countries. Around the world that is the position of every country outside of Europe.

That is exactly the issue that is on the table and exactly the issue that will be pushed and stressed between now, when these talks resume and when the talks are actually being held.

### CKY Television Strike Government Position

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks we have seen an amazing conversion on behalf of the Premier and the Members of this Government in regard to labour disputes. They are honouring the picket line at CKY—the same Premier who has crossed other picket lines in the past, the PWA picket line a number of years ago.

What I would like to ask the Premier is: Is this the new policy of the provincial Government? Will the provincial Government be respecting all strikes, all picket lines and not be associating itself with replacement workers as has been the case in terms of the CKY strike?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the Member is referring to because I have not encountered a picket line with respect to the CKY strike.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Speaker, my question was in regard to the fact that the Government has been excluding replacement workers from its press conferences and has not been dealing with them which to my mind I thought was respecting the picket lines.

### Government Advertising Withdrawal

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** I will ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the Government is doing that, will it also withdraw its advertising, advertising through other agencies such as the Lotteries Foundation, from CKY for the duration of the strike? Will it respect that strike in that way as well?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** What we have said is that we will not do anything to prolong the strike, and we will not participate and take sides in the issue, Mr. Speaker. We have said that all of the information available to other outlets including feeds for instance from Question Period continue to be available to CKY. We will be available for interviews by management or regular workers. That is all part of the process.

We have said, by choice, that I for instance will not be interviewed on an individual basis by a replacement worker.

**Mr. Ashton:** My question was in regard to the advertising.

### Anti-Scab Legislation Government Support

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** My final question is: Since the Government finally recognizes that such actions do involve interfering in the strike situations, will they now support anti-scab legislation that will prevent this type of situation developing by preventing employers from hiring strikebreakers during the duration of a strike, Mr. Speaker? Will they support that legislation and live up to their recent conversion in terms of this issue?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I will not do what the NDP does, and that is to interject themselves to take sides and to participate and inflame strikes. That is the kind of thing that we have seen time and time again.

**An Honourable Member:** We support the FOS Bill, FOS, that takes away the inflaming.

**Mr. Filmon:** No, your own union people tell you that is an unwarranted intrusion into the free collective bargaining process. That is exactly what they have said many times. CUPE has said that, the nurses—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

### Winnipeg Public Libraries Inner City Funding

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

Three inner city branch libraries are in immediate danger of closing—the William, Brooklands and McPhillips branches. These libraries are particularly important to residents of the inner city because they lend books and provide other services free of charge to people who often cannot afford to pay for them.

The Weston Community Residents Association has written to the Minister to ask that funding for these libraries be continued so that these services remain available to people in the inner city.

My question to the Minister is: Will she today guarantee funding, as has been done in the past, to ensure that the residents who utilize these libraries will still have access to the books and services provided by these branches?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** Mr. Speaker, we as the provincial Government fund 11 percent of the city's library budget, and we block fund the City of Winnipeg. It is up to the City of Winnipeg to make

the decisions on how to run their library system and their libraries.

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, now that the federal GST is about to be applied to books, making them even less affordable to low income people, will the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation tell this House how these people are going to access these books, and what kinds of actions they can take to stop the reduction in the number of libraries and ensure that residents will have access to public services like those provided by these three inner city libraries and like those provided to citizens in the suburban areas of the city?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my first answer that we block fund the City of Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg and city councillors in Winnipeg have to make the decision on how they are going to best spend that money to serve all the citizens of the City of Winnipeg. If we made those decisions for City of Winnipeg councillors, we would not need a City Council.

\* (1410)

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, recently the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) announced a number of grants to fight illiteracy in response to the United Nations designation of 1990 as International Literacy Year.

Will the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation tell this House why her department is seemingly not committed to the UN designation and instead deliberately, by not funding these libraries, by not giving extra money to the city, is placing the future of these libraries and services to inner city people in jeopardy?

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

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Speaker, we provide 11 percent of the city's total overall library budget to fund all the library services that the City of Winnipeg wishes to provide.

### Liquor Import Fees Federal Consultations

**Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae).

On December 5 this Minister held a news conference to announce that the Manitoba economy was to be revived with the increase of liquor import fees as of December 9. Now we learn the

announcement was made before Canada Customs had been informed.

I ask this Minister: Did this Minister consult Ottawa as to this date that the increase was applied?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister involved in dialoguing with Ottawa with respect to this issue, certainly there have been major discussions between the provincial Government and Ottawa regarding collection of Manitoba liquor charges on large importations at the Manitoba-U.S. border.

During those discussions the province was assured that there would be no difficulty administrating Manitoba's new provision. The province therefore proceeded with the necessary regulation and pronouncements. Unfortunately at the last minute, after the Manitoba announcement was made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), the federal Government indicated that it had encountered a few technical problems which had to be overcome before collection of the new Manitoba charges could commence.

### Collection

**Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, when did this Minister request, what date did he request Canada Customs to impose the new charges?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Several weeks before the December 5 announcement.

### Revenue Loss

**Mr. Cliff Evans (Interlake):** As we understand that Canada Customs now is not collecting this tax until they get approval from headquarters, how much revenue have we lost this past week, and when will Customs have the approval to collect this tax?

**An Honourable Member:** It is the revenue you are worried about, is it, Cliff? I did not realize it was the revenue you were worried about.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, it is a great delight to see somebody from the Opposition bench even mention the word "revenue" and some concern around it.

Mr. Speaker, I am unable to answer the question as to the magnitude of foregone revenue at this point. Let me assure Members of the House that members of my staff were in Ottawa yesterday

dialoguing on this specific problem. I would hope that there would be a full announcement in the very near future.

**Mr. Speaker:** Time for Oral Questions has expired.

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

**Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have permission to make a non-political statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member have unanimous consent to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

**Mr. Carr:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Members of the House will know, today is the first day and tonight the second night of the Festival of Lights, the celebration of Hanukkah. This is a very important time for members of the Jewish faith. It is a time when children gather, often around the hearth if you are lucky enough to have one. We eat traditional foods, we sing and we dance and we celebrate the whole concept of family.

I do not think I could possibly be more eloquent about the religious significance of the holiday of Hanukkah than the inscription on the Menorah which is outside the rotunda of this building, and I would like to read it.

It says: The lights of the Hanukkah Menorah celebrate the rekindling of man's belief in God and his quest for religious freedom, the victory of faith over fear, of righteousness and justice over tyranny and oppression and of the triumph of light over darkness as realized in the story of the Miracle of Hanukkah and the wondrous cruse of oil which burned for eight days in the rededicated temple in Jerusalem in the year 3622 after creation.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my caucus and I am sure all Members of the House, we wish the Jewish community of Manitoba a Happy Hanukkah.

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** Mr. Speaker, might I have leave to make a non-political statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Minister have unanimous consent to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues on the Government side of the House to wish the community once again a very happy festive season.

As all Members know, we started a tradition last year of having a multicultural tree in the rotunda of the Legislature, where those from all different ethnic backgrounds could bring ornaments that were of special significance to their communities to hang on the tree. I am very pleased that the Jewish community, although it does not believe in Christmas, has had the opportunity to place its Menorah in the rotunda of the Legislature, so that we can celebrate all different ethnic backgrounds and cultures and realize and recognize that we are equal partners in this Manitoba society. Thank you.

**Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a non-political statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member have unanimous consent to make a non-political statement?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Martindale:** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our caucus, I would like to add our good wishes to those of the other two Parties, to all Members of the Jewish faith who are celebrating Hanukkah and wish, in the spirit of ecumenism, that all of them will have a happy Hanukkah. Thank you.

### Committee Changes

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some changes to the committees.

I move, seconded by the Member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik) for the Member for Portage La Prairie (Mr. Connery), the Member for Roblin-Russell (Mr. Derkach) for the Member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst).

I move, seconded by the Member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: the Member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render) for the Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery).

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I have committee instructions, but I will wait until later on today to refer certain Bills to Standing Committees.

Mr. Speaker, would you call the Bills in the following order, please: Bills 12, 25, 24, 26, and Bill 20.

## DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### BILL 12—THE LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik), Bill 12, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** This, Mr. Speaker, is not my first speech on the issue of final offer selection, and it will not be my last speech as well. I have spoken on this many times in this Legislature. I have dealt with this -(interjection)- well, for the Premier (Mr. Filmon), the problem is this Government just has not learned yet. We are going to keep on speaking on final offer selection until it gets it right.

The bottom line is, with this particular Bill, it has been in development for a number of years. I had the privilege of sitting, for example, in many caucus meetings and committee meetings with the late Mary Beth Dolin who was very much committed to bringing in final offer selection legislation and who, unfortunately, of course, passed away before she had that opportunity, but was a believer.

The need for this type of legislation is in addition to our labour relations system in Manitoba to give an option to the type of things that have happened over the last number of years in terms of labour relations. To give an option, Mr. Speaker, to the workers of this province.

I watched it in its course internally and, of course, was very pleased when our previous New Democratic Party Government introduced final offer selection and had it passed by this Legislature. I spoke then, Mr. Speaker. I have spoken each and every time this Bill has been before us in terms of its current form and its previous forms by the provincial Government. I will continue to speak on this particular Bill until the message finally gets through to the Conservatives and, yes, the Liberals as well, that this type of anti-labour, anti-worker action is just not acceptable in the Province of Manitoba, just absolutely not acceptable.

Each and every time that I have participated in this debate, it has become clearer and clearer to me that this symbolizes many of the differences between our political Parties. It is a symbol, if you like, of what the Parties are and what they stand for. Let us look at what this represents to the working people of this province.

We have the Conservative Government, the Government of the Day which is now once again seeking to repeal final offer selection. Why are they seeking to repeal final offer selection? Why are they seeking to repeal it? Let us look at why they are doing it. Is it because they feel it is not working? No, Mr. Speaker, they made the commitment to repeal it before they were elected. They made a commitment to the Chamber of Commerce. They did not want to be confused by the facts. They made a commitment to repeal it out of an ideological commitment to the Chamber of Commerce, out of an ideological position on labour relations issues that does not want working people to have access to this type of legislation.

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

\* (1420)

They would rather see lengthy strikes. They would rather see controversy in our workplace. They would rather see the kind of adversarial relationship we have in labour relations in Manitoba. That is where the Conservatives are coming from.

In my comments today, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will prove that by looking at the question as to whether it is working or not. I will demonstrate that it is indeed working. It is indeed working and does not deserve to be repealed by this Conservative Government. That is the Conservatives.

What about the Liberals? Their rhetoric is a little bit different in dealing with -(interjection)- yes, indeed, what about the Liberals? What about the Liberals? Their position is expressed differently in terms of rhetoric.

The former Liberal Labour Critic, the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) -(interjection)- where is he now indeed? The Member for St. James expressed his opposition to final offer selection earlier this Session by expressing to the House his feeling that it was an unbalanced and unnecessary piece of legislation. He tried to justify this by saying that he wished a consensus-oriented, co-operative

approach to labour relations, something he said the other two Parties did not support.

Madam Deputy Speaker, different rhetoric, but what is their bottom line position? What is the bottom line position of the Liberal Party? What was the position of the Liberal Party last time and the time before, and the time before that? When push came to shove, were they on the side of the working people of this province?

No, they stood shoulder to shoulder with the Conservative Party in seeking to repeal final offer selection. They stood with the same type of rhetoric that the Conservatives had used, that they had expressed to the Chamber of Commerce. They stood with them and said they would repeal final offer selection.

Let us not forget what happened in the last Session of the Legislature. The Liberals in true fashion did change their position somewhat. Did they change their bottom line position, Madam Deputy Speaker? No, they did not change their bottom-line position. They still, with an amendment they introduced, sought to repeal final offer selection, although a few months later than the Conservatives would have.

We all know what happened subsequently, the Conservatives could not live with that amendment by the Liberals and voted to defeat their own bill as amended, which led to final offer selection continuing in this province, but the bottom line was the same.

The bottom line with the Liberal Party once again, when it counted, when they had the numbers in this House to provide a majority, to save final offer selection, they did not, Madam Deputy Speaker, use the power of numbers to vote down the Conservative minority Government. Instead they played around with their position but stuck to the bottom line.

If there is any doubt as to where the Liberal Party stands, just look at their comments in this debate, whether it be the comments of the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), the comments of the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), the comments of the new Liberal Labour Critic, who seems to be following in the footsteps of the previous Liberal Labour Critic, and said quite clearly, and I quote from November 16, 1990: "I want to just start by saying that we support the repeal of final offer selection." That is the position of the Liberal Party.

Madam Deputy Speaker, they say right on. They have not learned a lesson, they have not listened to the working people of Manitoba. They are standing together with their other colleagues in the other old-line party in the Conservative Party in an anti-labour, an anti-worker position. -(interjection)-

Well, the Liberals are chirping from their seats that they do not have to listen. Indeed they did not listen to the many workers who came before the committee last time, the more than 120 people who registered before the committee. Shop floor workers who came in and spoke from the heart from their own personal experience and urged and pleaded with the Liberals. They pleaded with the Liberals to listen, to fight to save final offer selection, but it was not the Liberals who saved final offer selection, it was only the New Democratic Party with 12 Members that saved final offer selection from the claws of the Liberals and Conservatives.

Well, the more things change, the more they stay the same. Since we have last met to discuss this in the previous Session, we had even more experience with final offer selection. What I want to do is spend just a few moments in terms of dealing with that because I think it is important to deal with any suggestion, whether it be by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) or the Liberal Labour Critic that this legislation is not working.

I note for the information of Members and for the public that most of the debate on the part of the Liberals and Conservatives has not dealt with the experience with final offer selection. Both the Conservatives and the Liberals cling to the statements they keep bringing before the House.

Even the Premier (Mr. Filmon) just a few minutes ago brought before this House some suggestion that labour itself was divided on the issue that many of the unions opposed final offer selection. Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, that was the case. There were unions that expressed concern about final offer selection prior to its implementation, but the hearings last time we dealt with this matter earlier this year in the last Session, categorically proved that the bottom line was that the labour movement was united in saying, keep final offer selection. The Canadian Federation of Labour, the UFCW, a number of people came forward and said they were opposed to final offer selection before it was introduced, or had significant concerns, but having seen it in practice they had changed their mind

based on the evidence, and they supported final offer selection and did not want it repealed.

So let them not cling to that suggestion. As I said they do not take the time to deal with the experience with final offer selection because the fact is that final offer selection is doing exactly what the proponents of final offer selection said it would do.

The recent experience, and here I am taking information that is up to date as of November of this year, shows that there have been 99 applications. Well, let us just look at the experience. What was predicted would happen with the final offer selection? The proponents, the New Democratic Party Government said that, with the number of applications you will be dealing with, the vast majority would not go to the final stage, because final offer selection is fundamentally different from conventional arbitration. It leads to negotiations. It does not chill the negotiating process as does arbitration. What it does is it gives an incentive on the parties to settle.

What has the experience been? How many of the 99 applications have gone through to the final offer selector stage? How many? Seven. Well, let us deal with whether it is a biased piece of legislation. Has there been a bias in the settlements? Has there been a bias, Madam Deputy Speaker? Out of those seven, four have gone in favour of the employees and three have gone in favour of the employers. There is no bias. It could have been a four/three split the other way, but consistently, when there have been selector decisions, it has been proven that there is no inherent bias in the selector process.

Now let us deal with those seven. Let us deal with the 12 where a selector was appointed at the time. Let us deal with the total of 74 that reached an agreement without going the full length of the procedure, and deal with another argument put forth by the proponents of final offer selection, of which I indeed was one and continue to be, and that is that it would help prevent strikes by providing an option to strike. It does not take away the right to strike, it provides another option.

Well, I would refer Members of this House to the lengthy presentations in committee last Session, of shop floor workers, of people who negotiate on a regular basis on behalf of their unions. There were numerous presenters who said in the case of their particular bargaining unit, if it had not been for final offer selection it is very likely there would have been

a strike. In other words, final offer selection provided an alternative that helped prevent strikes.

\* (1430)

There will be some who perhaps do not understand the attitude of working people in terms of strikes. I know many in this House certainly do not. I do not know how many Members of this Legislature have ever been on strike, or taken the time to go to picket lines and talk to people who are on strike. It is a decision that no one takes lightly, and I know the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) received criticism today for visiting the picket line at a strike that is currently ongoing, the CKY strike.

I was there as well and I make no bones about it, because I have not only visited picket lines, I have walked picket lines as well. It was not an experience that I gave a great deal of significance to until I reached this Legislature. I had worked at Inco in Thompson, I went through the 1976 strike. I was on strike during the election in 1981, was elected in the middle of the strike. But it was not until I sat in that committee and listened to other people who had been through it that I realized that I had not forgotten, and that many other people had not forgotten what it is like to have to walk a picket line for a decent living, a fair settlement; what it is like in the case of the current strike with CKY to see replacement workers going through the picket lines on a daily basis taking away the jobs of the workers involved, taking away the jobs. No one who has been through that experience takes it lightly.

What people said in committee, people who had been through those types of situations such as in the Superstore strike, went through that situation said, if there is an option, please let us have that option. Let us have it available to us. They said, do not take away the right to strike, but provide it as an alternative, as an option, Madam Deputy Speaker.

I want to raise that because the bottom line is that working people do not want strikes unless they absolutely have to end up in a strike situation. That is why there was such support in the committee from unions and from grass-roots people, from shop floor people, saying, please give this Bill a chance.

The Liberals thought they had listened, but they did not get the message. The message was clear, Madam Deputy Speaker, the message from those people in the committee was to save final offer selection, but the Liberals in their flat-footed way of

trying to, find a middle ground, did nothing to shift their basic position.

They played around with the Bill. They played around with it, and they ended up in the situation where they satisfied no one, where they essentially did not abandon their bottom-line opposition to what we had said in terms of final offer selection. They did not listen truthfully to the people who came before that committee. They stuck to their previously determined course of action, and it was only through some tactical maneuvers on behalf of the working people that we, the New Democratic Party, brought in that we were able to save it.

As I was saying, final offer selection works. It works! It was brought in as an experiment. Indeed, it was new, innovative, and it was brought in with a sunset clause, and for the life of me I cannot understand why the Conservatives or the Liberals cannot allow it to live out its full course, because it is working. It is not creating disruptions in the workplace. It is providing an option, an alternative to strikes. It is working, Madam Deputy Speaker.

So I wanted to deal with that because the misperception that the Conservatives and Liberals have been trying to put forward but have not really had the courage to debate at any length in this debate is that somehow it is not working. It is working.

To quote the Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), it is working, why fix it? The bottom line is the figures show it works. The information shows it works. The Member for Swan River knows that, every Member of our caucus knows that. When are the Conservatives going to listen? When are the Liberals going to listen?

Let us not forget what is happening now. The Liberals have let it be known to the press—they are trying to say they changed, they are moving to the left. The only way they are moving to the left is they were over on this side of the benches, they moved a little bit further to the left because they are no longer the official Opposition but ideologically they are the same old, tired Liberal Party. They have not moved to the left.

When it came to the minimum wage increase recently, what did the Conservatives do? Six percent, 2 percent a year after three years. How did we do? We increased minimum wages by 33 percent over six years, more than 5 percent. That is the NDP record.

What did the Liberals say? Two Members of the Liberal Party said that was adequate. They said 30 cents is enough; they said 2 percent a year is adequate for minimum wage earners, the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) and the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock). Is that moving to the left? Is that recognizing what is happening, the reality of the situation out there, Madam Deputy Speaker? No it is not; it shows, once again, the Liberals have not learned on issues such as the minimum wage, and final offer selection, where do they stand on final offer selection, have they come back in and said they have changed, they have learned, they are moving to the left, they are going to listen and work on behalf of the working people?

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. I would remind all Honourable Members that the Member for Thompson has the floor and I would appreciate the co-operation of the other Members in remaining in their seats or carrying on private conversations either in the loge area or outside the Chamber.

**Mr. Ashton:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I realize there is some sensitivity on this, particularly on behalf of the Liberals, because where do they stand on final offer selection, have they changed? Have they come in and said, well, that was a different Liberal Party, this is a new Liberal Party, we no longer stand by what we said a year ago, we have changed our opinion and God knows, the Liberal Party has had a history of changing its mind, of not knowing its position on issues, but was there any ambiguity on this? Did they come in and say, we no longer are going to make campaign commitments, but only are interested in the Chamber of Commerce, that only reflect their position on issues such as final offer selection? Have they said, we have learned, we learned the lesson of the election on September 11; have they learned the lesson?

What a lesson indeed, Madam Deputy Speaker. I think they have to really look at what happened, to search their souls, to ask why they were knocked from 21 seats down to 7, why in areas where there are so many working people, whether it be the north end, in particular, of Winnipeg, or the core area, or in rural areas where, indeed, there are many people who watch the positions of Parties and the issues affecting working people? They have to ask themselves a question, why did that happen?

I want to say to them there is a very clear reason. The bottom line is when it came to the choice between the Conservatives, the traditional Party of big business, the Liberals who talk one way in between elections and another way after elections, who are still as much a pro-big business Party as the Conservatives, who receive more of their funding from big business than even the Conservatives do. That may be amazing to people in this Legislature, but they receive more money from corporations in the percent of their income than any Party in this Legislature. Which Party do they select in those seats, Madam Deputy Speaker? They selected the only Party that has consistently spoken for working people, whether in Government or in Opposition, the New Democratic Party.

Well, where do we go from here? Where do we go from here, Madam Deputy Speaker? We have tried desperately to get the Conservatives and the Liberals to listen, and they will not. I want to indicate what our goal has been right from the start, and I consider it to be a very noble goal, and that is to buy as much time for final offer selection as possible. That was our agenda when we lost the election in 1988 with 12 Members, 12 against what I have described as the gang of 45, the Conservative-Liberal alliance in this House on issues such as final offer selection. We fought in the first Session, we fought in the second Session.

I remember standing here in this place in January of this year and saying we will be here in January and we will be here in February, March, April and as long as it would take, and we you know we lived up to that commitment. We stood firm and we used our tactical ability, as an Opposition Party with only 12 Members, to stall it to the point now where final offer selection has had the opportunity to prove itself for nearly three years.

With the election of September 11, we recognize the different reality. This Conservative Government now has the majority, the technical majority. It can ram through legislation and mark my word, Madam Deputy Speaker, it is going to have to if we get any indication more of what their agenda is likely to be over the next number of years. They are going to be ramming through legislation in this Legislature through closure and whatever tactics they can and we recognize that, but we stood firm and we said to this Government that we would be here as long as it would take in this Session. We would delay the passage as long as possible of this Bill and the

repeal and that is why we have currently now the Government committing itself not to repeal this legislation until March 31.

I want to say to the Liberals, if it had been up to them, final offer selection would be dead as of December 31, and I want to show them the significance of having the repeal on March 31. Madam Deputy Speaker, not only will contracts that expire up to March 31 be eligible, but any contracts will be eligible for final offer selection under the first opportunity prior to a central strike situation.

\* (1440)

So March 31 is not three months, it is actually five months worth of contracts that are going to be affected, five months. How many contracts? Madam Deputy Speaker, 210 contracts, out of actually the number in that year. That is the majority. That five months gives them that ability to use final offer selection. How many workers? It is literally thousands of workers. It is in the tens of thousands.

Madam Deputy Speaker, if the Liberals had their way, final offer selection would die on December 31. Because the New Democratic Party has stuck to its guns, it will at least survive until March 31. For the Liberal Party, if they think this issue is over, and for the Conservative Party, I want to indicate that it does not matter what the Government says about when they will agree to repeal this legislation, our position will be clear.

We will oppose any repeal of final offer selection. We will oppose it now, and we will fight to reinstate final offer selection in the future. Final offer selection will not die through the passage through this Legislature of any Bill such as Bill 12. It will not die, it will continue. I pleaded with them not to kill it. We have worked hard to postpone the date of execution and we have done it successfully.

I turn to the Liberals and I turn to the Conservatives and I say, if there was ever a good time to repeal final offer selection, and I do not feel there ever would be, do they really believe that early next year is a good time?

Do they really believe that with January 1 saying the imposition of the GST on this country and the fundamental change that is going to bring in terms of economic circumstances and the fundamental impact that is going to have on labour relations, do they feel this is a good time to be getting rid of final offer selection? When we are looking at some very serious potential labour disputes, even the

Government knows there could be some serious disputes. There can be some very serious disputes.

Do they feel this is the time to be taking away this option to strikes? Is this a good time? I say, clearly, I say it three times, because the Member for Portage (Mr. Connery) is not listening, and I know I could say it a hundred times and he still will not learn, but the bottom line is this is not the time to be repealing final offer selection. In 1991, with the GST, the recession and the tough situation labour relations, it is not the time to be deleting this from our labour relations Act.

Well, if the Conservatives and Liberals have not shown any willingness to learn yet, we are going to give them one more opportunity. One more chance not to be repealing final offer selection legislation that is working at this time. We are going to give them one more chance. I hope they will listen. I particularly turn to the Liberals. I am turning to my left physically, politically I am turning to my right, Madam Deputy Speaker, but to the Liberals, you have one chance here, you have one chance. Are you going to join with us to seek some further delay of final offer selection? Are you going to join with us? Are you going to show any kind of understanding of the issues affecting working people, or are you going to stand with the Conservatives to ram through this particular Bill? Which way will you stand?

I want to explain to Members a motion that I am going to be moving that gives to the Liberals who may not have been through this before, and to the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), now is the time to stand in your place and support a very good motion. In parliamentary tradition it is the six-month hoist. By way of explanation to the Liberals, this is a great way for the Liberals who like to bend and twist and turn and try and shift their positions, and we have seen them do that before on other issues.

You do not have to throw away what you have said previously. You do not have to change your rhetoric on final offer selection. You can support this amendment, this resolution I will be bringing in and give final offer selection six more months before we proceed with the debate any further.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

It will give you a chance to see what will happen as of January 1 with the GST and with labour relations in this province. It will give you the chance to listen one more time to the working people of this province who sent you such a clear message on

September 11, a message you obviously have not received. It will give you one more chance, and I know when I talk to the—

**An Honourable Member:** Oh, they got the message.

**Mr. Ashton:** The Member is quite right, they got the message politically, but they have not got the message in terms of their thinking on issues. It has not changed their positions one bit.

I look at the Conservatives, and I know that they are not going to listen. There may be some who deep down have some idea that what they are doing is wrong. There may be some who are maybe even a bit nervous about making such a fundamental change in our legislation at such a time, but I know their position and they have been very clear. They were clear to the Chamber of Commerce. They have been clear in this Legislature. They have been clear that no matter whether final offer selection works or not they do not support it for ideological reasons. I respect that. I do not expect them to support this motion.

The Liberals, the so-called middle of the roaders. The ones always looking for something a little bit different. This is different. This gives you a way of not changing your position on final offer selection if you do not really want to. It buys more time. It allows you to go down the middle. It allows you to say whatever you want to people on one side or the other. You can try once again to be on both sides of the fence. It did not work last time. I do not think it will work this time, but if you really want to get on both sides of the fence, I think you can do this. I think you can do it with this resolution. It is a chance to prove us wrong. It is a challenge indeed. It is a challenge to the Liberal Party from the New Democratic Party to put substance to their words about concerns about working people.

I warn you, your votes will be recorded. I warn you that the same Members who took the message in the provincial election to people across this province—the Liberals do not stand for working people—will take the message out again if you vote against this particular resolution, so I ask you to think about it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "THAT" by substituting the following:

Bill 12, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, be not now read, but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), seconded by the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "THAT" and by substituting the following:

Bill 12, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, be not now read, but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. All those in favour of the amendment to the motion—

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the motion.

\* (1450)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. It was a debatable motion, but I have already called for the question on the amendment. -(interjection)- Order, please; order, please.

All those in favour of the amendment to the motion will please say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**Mr. Speaker:** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

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

**Mr. Ashton:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

\* (1500)

**Mr. Speaker:** Call in the Members.

The question before the House is on the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), seconded by the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "THAT" and by substituting the following: "Bill 12, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail, be not now read but that it be read a second time this day six months hence."

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

### YEAS

Ashton, Barrett, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Evans (Interlake), Evans (Brandon East), Friesen, Hickes, Lathlin, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wasylcia-Leis, Wowchuk.

### NAYS

Carr, Carstairs, Connery, Cummings, Dacquay, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gaudry, Gillshammer, Helwer, Lamoureux, Laurendeau, Manness, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Yeas 19, Nays 31.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the amendment to the motion lost.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** I am speaking on the Main Motion, Mr. Speaker.

We now see the Party of innovation of the two old-line Parties at the back, Mr. Speaker, they are here before us. We see the Party of the '90s that wants to attempt new things and experiment on behalf of the people of Manitoba, and we see the old-line Parties before us.

We have witnessed again today, in a very tangible way, the Party of the people of the Province of Manitoba versus the Party of the chambers of commerce, the Liberals and the Conservatives of this province, Mr. Speaker.

We have seen the Party demonstrated by the vote today that is really concerned about the recession and really concerned about the savagery that recession will have on working people. We have witnessed today the Party that cares about people directly affected by the recession, Mr. Speaker, and the Party that gives lip service to the communities and families and are willing to stand up for those people who need all the protection they can get, Mr. Speaker. That is what we have seen demonstrated again in this Chamber today, with the old-line Parties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what did the motion we just proposed propose in terms of the Province of Manitoba? What we said is abandon your old lines, abandon your old positions, abandon your old Party positions with the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce

and the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and look at the devastating effect of the recession, particularly in the first six months of 1991.

We know that the GST will put untold hardship onto people in this province. We know that the Tory high interest rates are putting untold burden on families. We know that there are 7,000 more unemployed people in this province than there was a month ago. We know that the lower portion of our society is getting clobbered by federal Tories, and the Liberals had a chance to join with us to give a little measure of comfort with another umbrella against the economy with another tool at their disposal called final offer selection to protect themselves, their families and their communities from the savagery of this recession.

I was very disappointed that we again had an opportunity to go in a non-partisan way to throw behind our former Party affiliations, in terms of the effect of the economy on people, and say, yes, let us let this thing go on another six months. Let us have a little protection for people. Let us bring it back in the spring next year and let us have the toughest months of this recession have a little protection for people.

Once again, we see that there is only one Party of innovations. Let me talk about that, Mr. Speaker, because final offer selection is an experiment. It is an innovation. -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker, if anyone wants to look at success and failure, I am willing to put this to an independent arbitrator and set aside this Bill until that arbitrator rules. Let us set it aside to Wally Fox-Decent.

**An Honourable Member:** He is busy right now.

**Mr. Doer:** Yes, he is busy, Mr. Speaker. We are willing to even let him evaluate the success and failure. We are so confident in the bottom-line numbers of the successes over the 36 months, we were still very confident of the success of this Bill to allow its repeal to be subject to the evaluation of a truly independent body, but nobody would allow that to happen. They had to repeal it first, or get rid of it first, because they know that it has been a success.

Mr. Speaker, the best evidence of that has been the Minister of Finance's (Mr. Manness) own budget document. The Minister of Finance in his budget document brags about the labour-management relations in the Province of Manitoba. He even goes so far as to take credit for 1989 in his own budget.

Now what is the coincidence of 1989? It is one of the first years of final offer selection operating in labour-management relations in Manitoba.

I am going to tell every Tory and every Liberal one fact of life, and I will defy anyone to disagree with this. I unfortunately believe, and we believe in our Party, that labour-management relations have been stabilized, strikes and lockouts have been stabilized, by this Bill, and 1989 is the set of figures that the Minister of Finance tabled in this Chamber, 1990, will even be lower.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) knows this even though he is participating as an employer in the largest, longest strike in the province with the casino workers. Ironically, 1990 will have lower days lost to strike and lockouts probably than 1989.

Mr. Speaker, let us make a prediction in 1991, because 1991 is the year that the Tories and the Liberals will repeal final offer selection using their majority, the tyranny of the majority to withdraw these rights for working people.

**An Honourable Member:** What was it when you were in the majority?

**Mr. Doer:** Well, we had a gang of 12 that stopped this tyranny of majorities for two years, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately—and I dedicate—

**An Honourable Member:** Fortunately you were in Government for six years.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) has to heckle because he knows the facts do not substantiate the case of the Government. He has to heckle because he has no legitimate argument against the necessity for keeping final offer selection, because the Minister of Northern Affairs, the Deputy Premier, the person at the right-hand side of the Premier (Mr. Filmon), on a daily basis, the Leader of his group in the Tory Caucus, in the Tory Government, knows well that 1991 unfortunately will have more days lost to strikes and lockouts than 1990 and 1989.

Mr. Speaker, you will be accountable. The ladies and gentlemen on the Conservative and Liberal side will be accountable for untold loss of production, untold loss of income, untold loss of purchasing power, untold loss in our economy because you do not believe in innovation. You believe in going back to the old ways. The old ways were only confrontation and fighting through strikes and lockouts; that was the only way to resolve our differences.

Mr. Speaker, the economy is changing. I want to remind Members of this Chamber that the economy in Canada, North America and the western world is changing. It is going from an industrial society to a communication society. It is moving from a manufacturing society to a service society, in fact a lot more quickly than Members on this side would have ever allowed to happen with the loss of 12,000 manufacturing jobs in Manitoba in the last 12 months, and the increase in service jobs of 9,000.

\* (1510)

We have satellite dishes, we have communication devices, we have on-line computers, we have different types of equipment and different types of work forces. That begs the question, do we want to innovate and experiment, or do we want to stay with the tried and true methods that worked 100 years ago? That is the question.

So what is wrong with a five-year innovation? This Bill was intended to be repealed automatically with a sunset clause in 1993, January. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has had a long enough time to be fully appreciated by all Members of management and labour and society. So what is wrong with innovation? What is wrong with experiments? Why did the Progressive Conservatives have to be 99 percent conservative and zero percent progressive?

There have been no innovations in the world from the Liberal Party. That is why they went back to the past with Jean Chretien. That is why they continue to go back to the past, back to the future. They should be in a Michael J. Fox movie, Mr. Speaker, not representing people in this Chamber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with innovation? What is wrong with something that works? Days lost to strikes and lockouts have gone down since this Bill has been introduced, so why is the Government repealing it? How far in bed is this Government with the Chamber of Commerce of Manitoba?

How far -(interjection)- it is a question. I am not making a statement. I am just asking this question because I raised that because both the Conservative Leader (Mr. Filmon) and the Liberal Leader (Mrs. Carstairs), did they make the promise to—

Mr. Speaker, both the two Leaders in the 1988 election made two promises to the Chambers of Commerce. One, they are going to repeal the health and post-secondary tax in three years. In fact, I think

the Premier (Mr. Filmon), the then Leader of the Opposition said he would do it in four years, and the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs), said, no, that is not good enough, we will get rid of that tax in three years, Filmon is flip-flopping, we will get rid of the health and post-secondary tax in three years, because we are more right-wing than you. We can give corporations tax breaks faster than the Tories. We will do it in one less year. That is the promise that was made at the Chamber of Commerce in 1988, March of 1988, by both the Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) and the Member for Tuxedo (Mr. Filmon). Interesting coincidence of seats is it not, that they were making those promises at the Chamber of Commerce and they vote the same way on a very, very—

Mr. Speaker, then they made a second promise with the same group at the Chamber of Commerce, the same promise to a special interest group who coincidentally funds their Parties at 58 percent for the Conservatives and 70 percent for the Liberals, in terms of the contributions. We only got 9 percent. Coincidentally, I know that is not tied to this Bill at all.

They made the second promise to repeal final offer selection at those two Chamber of Commerce dinners.

Mr. Speaker, those are the two promises. Now what did they do in the two promises? Well, on the first one they have removed some of the taxes from corporations, but, of course, they could not keep the promise. You did not have to be a rocket scientist to figure out they did not have the \$200 million to move. They did not keep their promise, they will not keep it in the next budget. They will not keep it in the budget after that. They will not keep it after the budget after that. They will not do it.

**An Honourable Member:** Do not test us.

**Mr. Doer:** Well, I will test you, Mr. Speaker, I will test you because you know what, it is your fourth budget this spring and that is the fourth year. That will be the end of your promise, because you will not get rid of \$195 million in revenue. -(interjection)-

It is okay, Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Labour—I wonder if he was up in Dauphin, maybe that can account for a couple of extra hundred votes in the last election. Every time he went door to door John got a bigger plurality.

Mr. Speaker, the second promise was to get rid of final offer selection. Well, the NDP has fought that

off for three years and we have fought it off for three years to show, to get those numbers in 1989 and 1990, to demonstrate the Tory-Liberal policies of labour-management relations will cost us production, will cost us misery and will cost us lost productivity and will cost our economy the opportunities that we need, and those are bottom lines. Let us get away from the rhetoric, let us just look at the bottom line.

There are statistics that companies and foreign countries use to evaluate a stable labour-management relationship, and I can tell you what they are. It is days lost to strike and lockout, and it is numbers not just kept in Manitoba; it is numbers collected and maintained in Geneva by the ILO and used by corporations and countries right across the trading world. You are going to go down in those numbers, Mr. Speaker. You are going down as you vote, and go down with this Bill. You are going down—

**An Honourable Member:** We will take our chances.

**Mr. Doer:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not worry about you people, you 30 people taking your chances. I worry about the 600,000 families, the one million people. They do not like gambling with Tories taking chances. That is what bothers me.

Mr. Speaker, is this just a labour-management issue? I wish some of the other Members were here today because some of them walked around in this Chamber with feminist buttons on their lapels the other day. I will not mention any names, but people were walking around with feminist buttons on and there is more to that issue, I would suggest, than just wearing a button on a day that is important. There is pay equity in the private sector for women who make 68 cents on the dollar for men. That is a feminist issue; that is a feminist issue 365 days of the year, not just one day of the year.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the women's coalitions of Manitoba, over 30 women's organizations have asked this Legislature to keep final offer selection. They have asked us not to repeal final offer selection. The women's organizations of this province have evaluated final offer selection and they have—well, the Member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) says not all of them. You are right. The Junior League did not take a position. The Junior League of Manitoba did not take a position, but it did not vote for the Government either. The Junior

League abstained, even the Junior League abstained from taking a position.

Thirty out of 36 women's organizations took a position to support the maintenance of final offer selection, and only six organizations did not vote for it; they abstained. Not one organization, not one women's organization, not one organization representing women in this province—and who are those organizations? The YWCA, the Women's Coalition of Manitoba, the Equal Rights Coalition, there are women's shelter organizations, a number of other women's groups all across this province. The Indigenous Women—the Minister responsible for Native Affairs (Mr. Downey)—the aboriginal Indigenous Women's organization of Manitoba does not support the position this Minister is taking. They take the position, women's organizations take the position the New Democratic Party is taking.

So it is nice to wear feminist buttons in this Chamber when you vote against women's organizations' recommendations. It is nice, you know, every time, a certain day, to take a position, but when we look at women's poverty, when we look at the fact that they make 68 cents on the dollar to men, when we look at the reasons for the poverty in terms of collective bargaining, when we look at the fact that women are ghettoed in the service sector and many of them are not represented by unions, Mr. Speaker, then there is a lot more to wearing a button. We believe it is fighting for women in the service sector 365 days of the year—365 days of the year.

\* (1520)

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, this is an innovation and an experiment and what is the alternative experiment or innovation for the Conservative Party? What are they doing for the large number of people in the service sector or the communications sector where the old ways of dealing with things that work quite well and are still working quite well today, which we supported? What is the alternative?

What is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) doing about it? What innovation is he bringing forward in this Chamber as an alternative to the innovation we brought forward? Has he got a better idea? Has he got another innovation? Is he going to put his head in the sand and pretend that the society is not changing, the economy is not changing? Or is he under control like his predecessor and his

predecessor before him of the old-line promise to the old-line Chamber of Commerce by the old-line Parties? Because I think innovation is a fair challenge to this Government.

If you have a better innovation, if you have a better idea, if you have a better way of keeping the days to strike and lockout, if you have a better way of keeping the strikes and lockout days down, bring it forward. You are bringing in something that will have the strikes and lockout days go up. You know that. Well, we will have a way to evaluate that, Mr. Speaker. The Minister shakes his head, but he knows I am right. I hope he is right; I hope I am wrong. I will stand up a year from now and apologize; I will publicly apologize if the days lost to strike and lockout in '91 are less than -(interjection)- Do not qualify it. Do not start qualifying it. We do not treat private sector workers differently than public sector workers. That is the difference again. We do not have to pass resolutions at our convention beating up nurses. That is the difference between us and the Tory Party. You go ahead. You beat up the nurses. We will stand with the nurses for fair wages and working conditions. That is what we will do.

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

We will not stand at our convention and dump all over the nurses of this province. Big brave Tories, right? They cannot stand up to Brian Mulroney for RCMP. They cannot stand up to Brian Mulroney on the CBC. They cannot stand up for medicare, but when it comes to nurses, oh, they are a real tough group of people. Oh, we are really going to show them there, Mr. Acting Speaker. -(interjection)- That is right. When it comes to dealing—Well I do not blame you for being sensitive. I would not be very proud of that resolution with the nurses either. When it comes to dealing with casino workers, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is going to shut them down. When it comes to dealing with Brian Mulroney, he will not even pick up the phone. Real tough Government, right?

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau):** Order please; order please.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Acting Speaker, it is always nice to engage in a little bit of an ideological and philosophical debate with the Members opposite and we enjoy that, but as I say -(interjection)- Well,

that is right. That is why I suggest to the Member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) and all Members if you have read the budget, your own budget, you will see in the appendix a number for 1989 of days lost from strike and lockout. It is a number by the way that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Mr. Ernst) takes to every country when he is talking about investment in Manitoba.

**An Honourable Member:** He even told the Pope, I am told. He even brought it up there in the audience he had.

**Mr. Doer:** Listen, as a former resident or participant of St. Paul's, I will not touch the statement from my colleague. As a person who was taught by the Jesuits for a few years, I do not dare say anything in the opposite.

Even the Pope, Mr. Acting Speaker, came to the shores of this country, calling on Canada to support the ILO resolution for fairer labour relations. Even the Pope would believe in innovation.

The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology (Mr. Ernst) goes across the world talking—

**An Honourable Member:** Tourism.

**Mr. Doer:** Tourism, well, whatever it is. I should not say Tourism because the way Tourism is going down in this province, Mr. Acting Speaker, you do not want to be responsible for Tourism with the shoddy record that has happened lately. -(interjection)-

Well, it is a little, old technique I learned from the former Member of Interlake, Billy Uruski.

We know that the Conservatives are ideologically bent on removing this clause. So then we go to the Liberals who do not have any ideology, and we ask the Liberals, who have had no beliefs at all, have no idea where they are going to go from one day to the next, to please read the Government's own budget. Please look at the facts.

We know the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) was out on a limb last year, Mr. Acting Speaker. We know the Member for St. James was out there talking like—I mean I remember the Minister of Labour being quiet in the cross-examination of witnesses before final offer selection and the Member for St. James was cross-examining line workers as if they were hostile witnesses. He took line workers from all across this province and treated it in a way that I have never seen in a public debate, in a public hearing. He was

badgering them. He was harassing them. He was trying to intimidate them in a committee, Mr. Acting Speaker, something that most Members of this Legislature do not do.

At the same time that was happening, the former Member for St. Vital was out meeting with the labour groups trying to cut a deal, Mr. Acting Speaker, out going to them saying, we are really pro-labour too, and he was saying, I can deliver this Liberal Caucus. If you do not criticize us too much, I can get the Liberals to change their minds.

So here is the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) out there talking, you know, harassing and haranguing workers and there—part of the Liberal Caucus had a saw and was just sawing away while the Member for St. James was way out there on the branch.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we thought this time around, they do not have that going on. They do not have, you know we do not have any two little groups going off in different directions again so—(interjection)—Well, I do not want to say that because it is unparliamentary, but we thought today that we gave the Liberals a perfect way out of their dilemma. They do not have any ideology. They do not have any belief. They do not know where they stand and we thought we gave them a good opportunity today.

At least stand up for those people in the recession, a six-month hoist, get us past the GST. They say they care about the GST. Get us past the recession. Get us past the savagery of the high interest rates. Get us past the savagery of the dollar. Get us past the 7,000 people who were unemployed last month compared to a month before. Get us past that period of time so at least when they do repeal it with the Tories, we can have hopefully the economy a little bit back on its feet. But the Liberals voted with their ideological cousins, the Conservative Party, Mr. Acting Speaker, just the same way they promised to the Chamber of Commerce to give tax breaks to corporations over three years. They are front and centre with the corporate branch, right with the Tories again with the hoist.

So this is a sad time for New Democrats because we have fought for three years to keep this Bill and we have shown that it works. We have shown that this Bill works and for that our caucus is very proud because when we go into the next provincial election, whenever that will be—

**An Honourable Member:** Oh, 1999.

**Mr. Doer:** Do not be so sure, Mr. Acting Speaker. When we go to the next provincial election, we will know how well the Tory-Liberal labour relations environment worked and how well the New Democratic environment worked. We will know how well the people's agenda worked and we will know how well the Liberal-Tory corporate agenda worked. We will be able to propose a people's labour management relations Act and we will let the Tories sit with the corporate labour relations Act. That I pledge you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Thank you very much.

\* (1530)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau):** The Honourable Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) to close debate.

**Hon. Darren Praznik (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I must admit to this House I quite enjoyed the speeches of the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) and the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) this afternoon in this Chamber. It is always nice to hear windy rhetoric bounce around from corner to corner. I say that because time and time again when we in this House, in this Party and the Liberal Party, members of the public listen to debate and arguments made by the New Democratic Party, they tend to couch their arguments over and over again in the people's agenda, or on the people's agenda and that they are working for working families and they couch their policies and their claims over and over again in those terms, trying, I think and I would submit to this House, to fool the people of Manitoba because time and time again what we see is the people's agenda in terms of the people of this province, they are not on that agenda. We have seen it time and time again when they are in power; that the greatest problem facing this province today is the \$500 million deficits they ran year after year while in power.

Mr. Acting Speaker, one of my first experiences in politics was sitting in that loge as Premier of the Youth Parliament between a Howard Pawley and a newly elected Member for Morris in 1981, the days before I had decided to become a Conservative, the days when I was still trying to make up my mind as to where I wanted to go to politically.

I remember my MLA, Howard Pawley, and the Member for Morris, discussing the province, the Member for Selkirk, the Premier, the newly elected

Premier, talking about the need for Governments to spend in times of recession, which we were in, to stimulate the economy. The Member for Selkirk acknowledged when times were good that was the time to pull some money out, to put it away, but did that happen? Did that happen when our economy took a run? Not at all.

The spending spree continued until today, which is 10 years ago today, this province was paying \$59 million, \$60 million a year in interest. We are now paying \$550 million a year in interest, like a cancer growing in our provincial budget. Who suffers, but the people of Manitoba. Who suffers? The very people ultimately that Party says it represents.

Mr. Acting Speaker, one day very soon Members opposite will have to come to grips with that problem. I am sure when they do, that their rhetoric will change greatly, when they realize the true problems facing the people of this province.

We have listened in the course of this debate to comment after comment by Members of the New Democratic Party that FOS works; that it is the great miracle to labour relations in this province. They point to statistics, they point to the cases. I dealt with those in my speech. They quite frankly say very little.

The vast majority of the cases where applications were made with FOS—two observations. One was they were made long before in the first window before a contract had even expired, before serious bargaining had even begun. In some cases—(interjection)—and the Member says, prevention, another tool, but not one that necessarily had any effect.

Mr. Acting Speaker, when you look at the result, those cases, the vast majority were settled before a selector either heard a case or made a decision. Members say it worked, and they point to our labour relations climate, yes, it is a good one. It was a good one before FOS, generally speaking. It was a good one during, and it will continue to be a good one. It will continue to be a good one.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I just would like to refer to Members opposite, to within the Department of Labour, the Conciliation and Mediation Branch without FOS has had an 85 percent success rate in settling disputes that it has been invited to become involved in. It does it without FOS.

Mr. Acting Speaker, so many of the cases or the examples of potential cases where FOS would be used have not materialized in reality, 70 percent of

the applications coming from the two unions that demanded the legislation, most of those applications becoming even before the serious bargaining had begun.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

What does it mean? It does not mean very much at all, quite frankly. It does not mean much at all. It certainly, to any strong analysis of those numbers, says very clearly, there is no conclusion that can be drawn, because the one thing none of us can do in this House is get into those negotiators' minds and know what happened and what made those negotiations come to conclusion. We can all have our suspicions one way or another, but we cannot truly know what happened in those situations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I listen to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) talk about principle, and how his party is principled. Well, what happened to his Party? What happened to their principles on the issue of free collective bargaining? I listen to current Members of the New Democratic Party take this position, make speeches day after day in this House, and I suspect because it has been a Party position it became one to solve a problem in their relationship with the labour movement of the day when they were in Government. Now they defend it, of course, and one can appreciate the partisan concerns that are involved in it. What happened to free collective bargaining?

Mr. Speaker, anyone who says it is strengthened by this, certainly indicates that they do not know a lot about collective bargaining. In closing debate today I would like to go back to some first principles, and I know there are many former Members of the New Democratic Party, either deceased or pushed out of that Party over the years, who these Members may dismiss as old fashioned, as out of sync with the modern New Democratic Party.

\* (1540)

I want to go back to Russ Paulley just for a moment, because he said something to the 1976, I believe, Manitoba Federation of Labour and I would like to quote him again because I think it is important to realize where we are coming from on this, an important principle. Mr. Paulley said, and I quote: Our present Labour Relations Act—referring to the pre-FOS Act—is very largely founded on the principle that the parties themselves by their own efforts, actions and sense of responsibility should resolve their differences themselves. Perhaps some

of you in the union movement disagree. I sympathize with a union which finds it lacks the strength to compel an employer to agree to its preferred terms of settlement, but there are great dangers in expecting legislation and Governments to deliver the goods. For one thing, Governments change. For another, the kind of legislation having any real effect would substitute state controls for free collective bargaining, lead to the abolition or reduction of important freedoms in our society and introduce a regimented system of wages, prices, profits, and investment decisions.

Finally, and I continue to quote the Honourable Russ Pauley, it would detract from the strength of the labour movement, the last thing I imagine the labour movement would want.

Where are those principles today on free collective bargaining? -(interjection)- Mr. Speaker, the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) says no one is imposing. Many times during the course of this debate Members opposite used as their defence of FOS the standard line that it prevents strike. I apologize for being a heckler. It is not my nature. I would ask them from this seat: Why would they not want equal compulsion for both employers and employees in the use of FOS if their objective is to prevent strike? You know what? That question has never been answered in the debate. In fact most Members thoroughly ignored my comments, and they have because quite frankly what they say when you take out what they want, is they want the cake and eat it too. You want a strike, but if it is not the right decision to strike, if it turns out to be a mistake, you want a means to get out of it, but we do not want the employer to have the same means to prevent a strike.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment Members of the Liberal Party. I would like to compliment today my colleague, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). When I listen to Members opposite in their debates, when I listen to their comments time and time again on other issues affecting working people and working families in Manitoba, what I see over and over again is a Party that refuses to recognize that we as legislators have a rule to maintain even balance, to not be the voice of specific interest groups in society, but to balance. When you go back to fundamental principle and you come back to free collective bargaining, FOS does not protect that principle of free collective bargaining.

I think it is important in our society when there are so many changes affecting our economy and people working in it, that free collective bargaining be protected as a fundamental principle. I do not think any Member opposite really, when they think about it, would like to get into a system where we are having forced settlement, and that is, in essence, what a selection is. It is not even an arbitration.

I feel very strongly on the principles that this Government has followed through on repealing this Bill. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is the right thing to do, and one does not solve some of the problems that have been brought out. I acknowledge there are some problems there with simple fixes, and that is what this was when it was introduced in its day.

Mr. Speaker, we have been through this debate many times. Tonight we will commence committee hearings, I would suspect. This issue has been before this Chamber many times, and I would just like one final time to put on this record that Members of this side of the House fully respect the position that Members of the New Democratic Party have taken. We recognize that when they went to the polls in 1988 and 1986 and 1990, as part of their package of campaign commitments to the people of this province, the maintenance of FOS was one of those principles. For them today to vote to repeal FOS would be a betrayal of their electors, and I fully recognize that.

Conversely, they should also respect the fact that Members of this Party went to the polls in 1986 and 1988 and 1990. We went to the people of Manitoba with the repeal of this particular measure as part of our package of policies and issue. The people of Manitoba, despite whatever we say in this Chamber in this debate, despite whatever is said in the committee tonight, have decided on this issue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is Bill 12, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? No, no. All those in favour please say aye. All those opposed will please say nay. In my opinion, the Ayes have it.

**Mr. Ashton:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Call in the Members.

\* (1600)

**Mr. Speaker:** The question before the House is second reading of Bill 12, The Labour Relations

Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail.

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

### YEAS

Carr, Carstairs, Connery, Cummings, Dacquay, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gaudry, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Lamoureux, Laurendeau, Manness, McAlpine, McCrae, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson, Vodrey.

### NAYS

Ashton, Barrett, Cerilli, Chomiak, Dewar, Doer, Evans (Interlake), Evans (Brandon East), Friesen, Hickes, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wasylycia-Leis, Wowchuk.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Yeas 32, Nays 18.

**Mr. Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

## BILL 25—THE OMBUDSMAN AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme), Bill 25, The Ombudsman Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Ombudsman, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

**Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley):** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is quite simple. It is to allow the City of Winnipeg to purchase the services of the provincial Ombudsman. In principle, we are in favour of the City of Winnipeg moving as quickly as possible toward ombudsman services.

This is a result of the Cherniack report which was instituted by our Government and which heard from many people across the city of Winnipeg and which heard many briefs in support of the City of Winnipeg's ombudsman Act. Subsequently, the City of Winnipeg Act has been amended and by November, that is last month, the city was supposed to have put in place the principles of an ombudsman Act.

The ombudsman movement, Mr. Speaker, derives from Swedish practice and principles, and it enables citizens to have recourse and redress to some of the difficulties and obstacles that they

encounter in the expanding bureaucracies of the 20th Century. It is at the civic level where bureaucracies are perhaps having the largest impact upon the lives of our fellow citizens, in housing, in welfare, in transit, in education, in gas, garbage facilities. These are the issues which concern people everyday and where they encounter extensive and growing bureaucracies.

There is a need, Mr. Speaker, obviously for ombudsman services responsible for civic issues. I think the need is going to grow. As we look at the increase and the gap between rich and poor across this country, I think we are going to find the need for ombudsmen, the need for redress. The need for assistance for people who have to deal with these kind of bureaucracies is going to increase dramatically.

I just came, Mr. Speaker, from a meeting at St. Matthews Church where the workers there were telling us of the difficulties they have in feeding the people of that neighbourhood. They are equipped to feed on their own initiative 60 odd people a week, and they are finding that everyday there are 10 more people coming to their door who they cannot feed. That is just in one small community of the inner city of Winnipeg.

If you speak to the people at the food banks across the city and particularly at Christmastime when people are more willing to make known their needs, I think you will find that the gap between rich and poor or the increasing poverty in our city is becoming much, much more evident.

\* (1610)

The charitable clothing banks are growing. They are becoming, in fact, a feature of the seasonal life of Winnipeg. It is something which unfortunately people are growing accustomed to.

This poverty, Mr. Speaker, results in violence. If you talk to teachers in the schools of Winnipeg as I did last week, you will find that teachers who have been teaching in inner city schools for the last 10 or 15 years are seeing a growing increase in the violence towards children. Teachers speak of seeing the marks, the hands, the imprints of adults upon children, the result, I would submit, of the growing poverty and the taking out of people's frustrations and anger, not upon the bureaucrats, not upon the Government, but upon the helpless and particularly the children.

The minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, has remained unchanged for many years. The social assistance rates have remained at very low levels. Mothers, as we saw in the newspapers a couple of weeks ago and in the various media reports upon poverty in the city of Winnipeg, are being forced to choose between feeding themselves or feeding their family, a choice that no one should have to make.

Those people who are handicapped by race, by physical disability, are finding it even more difficult in the city of Winnipeg. These are the people who are often the least equipped to find the extra resources, the extra energy, and in many cases, the courage to fight the bureaucrats, to get for themselves the assurance of justice that some of us take for granted.

As we look at the Core Area Initiative, Mr. Speaker, we see that Winnipeg will, indeed, be a "Bleak House" over the next few years. The federal Government is walking away from the Core Area Agreement. It is difficult to see what role the province is going to play in this, sympathetic as we assume that they are. The city may be willing, but how many dollars is it going to have to put into the kinds of programs that have supported core area people for the last few years and which have enabled some of them to break out of the systemic elements of poverty that they have faced? It is these people, Mr. Speaker, those people who have lost hope, who have no future opportunities, who will be affected and who will turn to ombudsmen for redress and for some assistance in making known their grievances.

We agree that the need is there for an ombudsman in the City of Winnipeg. There is no doubt of that. The city itself estimated in its brief that several thousand submissions would be made during the first year of the City of Winnipeg's ombudsman presence. I think that is a conservative estimate. It was made at a time when perhaps the issues of poverty were not changing so dramatically as they are today.

They estimated that many of these, 300 to 400, would result in written submissions to the ombudsman. That too indicates that there is, in the city's mind, a substantial need for an ombudsman. I think if this Conservative Government proceeds with its election pledge to reduce the number of city councillors to 15, giving them larger constituencies than we have as MLAs, that too will result in an increasing number of constituent calls and an

increase in the need for city councillors to act as ombudsmen themselves, as they have in the past.

They are not going to be able to handle that load. Many of them cannot handle the load that they have now at certain times of the year. It is extremely difficult. I think the impact upon a new ombudsman is going to be doubly felt if the Conservatives proceed with that reduction in the number of city councillors.

This Bill, Mr. Speaker, does give the City of Winnipeg the choice. In introducing the Bill, the Minister made a number of points which we may well see may be evaluated, and we may be able to agree with those in the end. The Minister suggested that it will be cheaper for the City of Winnipeg to have access to a provincial Ombudsman. Indeed, that may be the case in the beginning, that is quite possible. Certainly, the case that he made for avoiding the duplication of forms, the duplication of systems, is something that we would look favourably upon.

More particularly, I think the fact that the provincial Ombudsman does provide bilingual services is something which is very much needed at City Hall. The opportunity to have access immediately to a bilingual ombudsman I think is one of the things that we can say in favour of this opportunity for the City of Winnipeg. We would be willing to review these at the end of a number of years, to see if this is indeed the right way for the City of Winnipeg and the province to go.

There are other advantages I think, which perhaps the Minister—some of which he mentioned, some of which he did not. I think there is a perception on some people's part, in the City of Winnipeg, that an ombudsman who is more distant from the city, not appointed by the city, may be the right choice. That in municipal Government, relationships perhaps are too close, have been very close for a long period of time, and that a more distant ombudsman may be the right way to go in the beginning.

It is also true, as the Minister said when he introduced this Bill, that it will involve the administration of The Freedom of Information Act. The province has been garnering some experience in this area, and that experience might be useful to draw upon.

The Minister also suggested that a centralized service would be important and would make the

ombudsman service immediately visible. I think that is something we would want to consider. In the initial period of this opportunity, that may be one of the effects that could be immediately useful to the citizens of Winnipeg.

I think although we support the principle of an ombudsman for the City of Winnipeg, and we are anxious to make these services available as quickly as possible, we should pause for some other considerations. It will undoubtedly create a larger bureaucracy at the provincial level. An ombudsman service is one of those where one would want to limit that kind of unnecessary expansion.

When you go to an ombudsman what you are looking for is quick, easy, direct access. The very kinds of things which you might feel you have been denied before. Immediacy of a smaller bureaucracy is one advantage that the city might have looked at when it suggested that it be allowed to access the provincial Ombudsman. That is something you might want to balance with the immediate provision of French language services, and the cheaper availability of services and institutions right at the beginning of this project.

The city itself projects that a minimum of four ombudsman staff would be required, and that in the first year 10 would be desirable. I think that it is certainly going to be evident that the provincial Ombudsman Office is going to expand. I think that we should have some indication from the Minister on the kind of expansion which he thinks will be necessary.

I think there is also a question, too, of the city records management. The provincial Ombudsman is able to work in the freedom of information area with the provincial archives. A provincial archives which over the last seven or eight years has been moving quite extensively to create new records management systems for the province, particularly in advance of freedom of information legislation.

Many of the investigations that an ombudsman has to do involve good records management. It is one part of an efficient ombudsman's service. I think we would want to know from the city what stages they are at that. I know that they have advertised for an archivist, and that they are interested in pursuing this area. I wonder what kind of difficulties this might pose for a provincial Ombudsman if these services, in light of civic cutbacks, do not proceed to the same level that the province has. It might create some

difficulties, and it is one of the questions we would want to ask.

\* (1620)

I think another obvious question that people would ask at the committee stage, "Is this legislation, or is the opportunity going to be made to other urban areas, particularly Brandon or Portage la Prairie for an example, to have access to the ombudsman services in the City of Winnipeg?" I think also we should look at the role of the ombudsman. He or she is not just a complaints officer. We do not want municipal areas, or the City of Winnipeg in particular, simply to be buying the services of a complaints officer. The ombudsman service is a much broader perspective. It is one which requires education on the part of the ombudsman to educate citizens and to educate bureaucrats in their respective responsibilities.

We would hope that those are the kinds of expectations that the City of Winnipeg has, and that the Minister has, for the nature of the services to be contracted with the City of Winnipeg.

Another area of concern I think, is that the ombudsman is required to report to the Legislature, and he is an officer of this Legislature. I think we will need to clarify perhaps in the committee what kind of reporting lines and recommendation lines he will have to the City of Winnipeg, and in particular what will be the role of the Minister of Urban Affairs as the appropriate officer of the Legislature responding to the issues that the ombudsman, the recommendations he will make, in respect of Winnipeg.

The ombudsman movement, as it is called, has grown in the 20th Century as bureaucrats and bureaucracies have grown. The Province of Manitoba now has an Ombudsman. Certainly the University of Manitoba and other institutions across the country also have ombudsmen, and they perform a most important function in the kind of society which we have developed, particularly in North America at the end of the 20th Century. But I would emphasize that we support the position of ombudsman, not just as an investigator, not just as a complaints officer, but as an educator of citizens as to their rights, and of bureaucrats as to their responsibilities.

I suppose the only exception to this growing movement will be the Province of Newfoundland where the Liberal Premier of Newfoundland has

recently abolished his ombudsman and has offered as an alternative, open-line services, open-line shows. Now I know that this is not the position of the Liberal Party of Manitoba, and one can only hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the case of Newfoundland this was a financial measure that they were forced to take by the increasing cutbacks of the federal Government to all jurisdictions across Canada. But I will let the Liberal Party have their say. In sum, we are in favour of the principle of expanding the role of ombudsman to the City of Winnipeg. We do believe that it is possible that the purchase of provincial services will be feasible, but we do have a number of questions that we would like to raise, and after listening to the citizens of Winnipeg, we may in fact be proposing an amendment with a sunset clause to allow us to evaluate some of the concerns that we have raised today. Thank you.

### House Business

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I am not wanting to speak on the Bill. I am wanting to though, rise and make an announcement on House business.

Firstly, I would like to refer Bills 12 and 23 to the Standing Committee of Industrial Relations that will be meeting tonight at eight o'clock.

Secondly, I would like you to ask the House whether or not there is willingness to waive private Members' hour, and Mr. Speaker, I would also ask you to ask the House whether or not there is a willingness to not adjourn at six o'clock tonight, but have the House reconvene in committee to consider Estimates at 9 a.m. tomorrow morning in the Chamber. That would be from 9 a.m. to 12:30 in the Chamber to consider the Department of Health. We will be sitting only in one section because, as you know, the Standing Committee on Law Amendments will be sitting tomorrow morning to consider Bill 13.

Later on toward six o'clock the Acting House Leader will move the Supply Motion at that time.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to waive private Members' hour? Agreed.

Is there unanimous consent to not adjourn this evening at six o'clock, but simply to recess and to reconvene in Committee of Supply at 9 a.m. tomorrow, until 12:30? Agreed.

### Committee Changes

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Point Douglas, with a committee change.

**Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas):** I move, seconded by the Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows:

The Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) for the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway), and the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) for the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak). Agreed.

\*\*\*

**Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood):** I would like to speak for a few moments on Bill 25. Mr. Speaker, I want to make only two or three points on this bill. The first is to deal with the role of the ombudsman, and the second is to talk for a moment about the process of making law in this province and in this Legislature.

The Member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) has spoken already about the need for an ombudsman, and we support the concept of an ombudsman for Manitoba and for the City of Winnipeg. That is why we supported the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act when they were raised last November.

At a time when there is increasing alienation among the electorate with elected officials, and at a time when bureaucracy grows and seemingly becomes more and more insensitive to the needs of people, we need an ombudsman for the province and for the City of Winnipeg. We have been witnessing over the last number of weeks and months just the degree of alienation there is in the electorate.

We as Members do not have to consult public opinion polls for that point to be driven home because we answer our phones everyday and hear the complaints of our own constituents who cannot get action from social assistance, who have trouble with the Department of Housing, who feel there is an insensitivity and lack of flexibility among politicians and Government agencies. That is becoming, I think, worse and worse over time, Mr. Speaker.

We also see that the way in which Government policy is often implemented is to stay strictly within the rules, and that has resulted in a lack of flexibility. It is almost as if there is a formula that has been

established and under no circumstances will that formula ever be changed. What that tends to do is to overlook the individual needs of people. The role of an ombudsman, among other things, is to try to make the system more sensitive to the needs of individual people.

So we have no difficulty at all in requesting that the City of Winnipeg indeed set the motions in place to have an ombudsman, and we think that the use of the provincial Ombudsman may indeed be appropriate.

I want to spend a minute though talking about the process of making law. I had a look at the Hansard of November 1, 1989, Mr. Speaker, when this amendment was passed. This committee sat until 12:30 in the morning. It was dealing with a very complex piece of legislation. Amendments were being established on the spot, and it was almost as if it was Russian roulette or a poker game to determine what the appropriate period of time would be for the City of Winnipeg to get its act together to establish the ombudsman's office.

Now the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) was sitting on the committee at the time and he liked three months, but maybe six months, but no more than a year. Someone else said, well how about nine months or how about 18 months? It is almost as if I see your six months and I add three months. In a total vacuum without consultation with legal counsel from the City of Winnipeg, without consultation as far as I know with members of City Council.

I do not dismiss my own participation in that process, Mr. Speaker, because I was part of the committee. I, too, was making amendments; I, too, was trying to, on the fly, at 12:40 a.m., make law on behalf of the people of Manitoba. There must be a better way.

You are working to often impossible deadlines, everything is done in a rush. I do not think anyone in that committee really posed the question, will this work? Is this feasible? Does this meet the test of common sense? Rather, we rushed headlong to pass a Bill and to pass amendments to a Bill that I guess, in our wisdom, we thought to be in the best interests of the province.

\* (1630)

I say to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) as he prepares his summation, that I do not exempt myself from the finger pointing of blame that I now introduce into this debate.

So I think that if there are lessons to be learned, the lessons are, when you are making laws, laws which may be on the books for a long time, laws which affect the daily lives of a million citizens, take a little time, consult the people who are going to be affected by those laws and do the most responsible thing and do not do it at one o'clock in the morning. At one o'clock in the morning your sense of judgment is not as good as it would have been—

**An Honourable Member:** What is wrong with one o'clock in the morning?

**Mr. Carr:** I am not interested in engaging in debate but the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) says, what is wrong with one in the morning. Nothing, if you are asleep. Something, if you are making laws. I am trying to, humbly as I can, draw the attention of Members to a process that is badly flawed and ought to be improved.

In summary, we believe that there ought to be an ombudsman for the City of Winnipeg. It is reasonable to ask the City of Winnipeg to look, as one of its alternatives, attaching to the function of the provincial Ombudsman's Office. We think that the process of making laws can be much better than it is.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, our Party is prepared to move this on to committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) will be closing debate.

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs):** Just closing debate on this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker. Just to make a couple of short comments on the record, other than the ones that I have already made when I did introduce the Bill.

The two critics who have spoken on the Bill have brought up some very, very good points. I appreciate the points that they have brought up at this time. I am advised through my staff and through the Clerk's department that the City of Winnipeg will be making representation when it does get to committee. I am sure the Member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) and the Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) will be there to ask questions of the city.

Just a couple of comments. I realize the information we went through in November, I remember them very, very well—I was not pleased with the way it was operated. I do not think the Legal Department and our legal advisers were pleased. However, to the Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), he has to remember that in the legislation that

I had drafted, I had suggested permissive legislation. I just felt I should put that on the record.

I know that the city, without talking out of turn, will probably be coming back to us suggesting again that they would like another six-month extension, to even use our ombudsman I have not given any thought whatsoever—I would not entertain that amendment from the Government side. However, I will be glad to hear their comments when it does get to committee when they make representation.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that the Bill now go on to committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 25, The Ombudsman Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Ombudsman. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Motion agreed to.**

### BILL 24—THE ENVIRONMENT AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), Bill 24, The Environment Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter—

**An Honourable Member:** Mr. Speaker, the—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Is there leave that this matter remain standing? No leave. Leave is denied.

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radlsson):** I am pleased and eager to stand and speak in opposition to Bill 24. We are opposed to this Bill for a variety of reasons. In its current form, it is weak legislation and that is the reason we are opposed to it. Also, Mr. Speaker, it has been handled poorly, and that is the other reason.

There are a number of reasons or areas that point to how poorly this Bill has been handled -(interjection)- by this Government, that is correct.

The current Government has introduced this piece of legislation trying to make it seem like it is not important legislation. They are amending The Environment Act though in a way that is not acceptable to the public or to this side of the House.

Although it is a very short Bill, it has far-reaching implications and it weakens Manitobans' control

over its own environment. It has far-reaching implications because this amendment will affect every environmental assessment done in the Province of Manitoba. It is not something that should be taken lightly. It is very important to the future development and protection of the environment in Manitoba.

To begin with, the first reason that we are opposed to the Bill though is because there was no mention of this Bill in the throne speech. We entered into this Session of the Legislature under the impression that it was mainly to pass two pieces of legislation and to make sure that the budget could be passed to ensure that future budgets would become back on schedule.

To our surprise, and much to the surprise of the environment community, the Government chose just before Christmas to try and push through this major piece of legislation as I said, which would affect every environmental assessment in Manitoba from here on. That is the intent of this Bill to allow Manitoba to enter into agreements to do environmental assessments jointly between other provinces or perhaps states or with the federal Government.

It is the intent of the Bill I believe to develop a process jointly, but one of the major problems is that a section of the Bill allows for Manitoba to give up its right and its responsibility to do an assessment on a project that would affect our own environment.

This is completely unacceptable. It is unacceptable for a number of reasons, but primarily because there was no guarantee that Manitobans would be able to then participate in environmental assessment hearings that would affect our environment.

There is no clear indication of how this process worked to ensure that panel members would be appointed from Manitoba or from the Minister of the Government for Manitoba. One would think then that if we were going to change environmental legislation, that it would be done with the intention of improving the assessment process. The Government may say that they are going to use the highest standard to assess development in Manitoba, but that is not in the Bill. That is not in the Bill, and there then is no assurance that the Government would have to use the highest standard to protect the environment through assessments.

So it raises the question of, how come there is this intention to have this Bill come in when it was not in the throne speech, and when we are trying simply to get the House business, or the business of the Government, back on track? The Government it seems is trying to sell this Bill then by saying that it is going to speed up environmental assessments and it is going to save money; that the intention is to develop joint process which would speed things up.

Well, I take objection to that. One would think that in developing environmental legislation, if we are going to change the process we would want to strengthen the process and ensure that it is adequate. We are not opposed to the principle of a joint assessment, but we want to ensure that it would be a strong assessment, one that is improved from what currently exists in Manitoba and that is nowhere stated in the Bill.

It seems from this Bill that the Government is approaching the whole area of environment assessment as something that is simply a maze to get through, something to be by-passed so we can have development as usual.

\* (1640)

That is not, I would think, the intention of environmental assessment. The intention of environmental assessment is to make sure that development is well thought through and is not going to have an adverse effect on the environment.

This Government has come out frequently, especially during the election, saying that they can be trusted to protect the environment. We have seen through a number of decisions that they have made in the short time during this Session, they have come out in support of using chlorine bleach at Repap, which I would think would not be allowed from an environmental assessment. They have allowed a building to go up at Oak Hammock Marsh, which is in a wildlife management area. One would think as well an environment assessment would protect a wildlife management area from having corporate development on it, but again we see that the current assessment process in Manitoba is not effective because that was not the decision of the assessment process.

The other problem with this Bill though, is the permissiveness of the language of the Bill. It gives the Minister basically a free ticket to development, and gives the Government a free ticket to develop as it sees fit. It gives the Minister the ability to choose

which process would be used. It does not state clearly what this process would be. It gives the Minister the ability to choose the process or, as I have said, to choose to have another jurisdiction use its process to assess a development in Manitoba.

The other area that is not acceptable to myself, our Party or environmental groups, is that it gives the Minister the discretion to give funding to participants in the hearing process. As desperate as environmental groups and activists are for funding, they do not trust this Minister, and they do not trust this Government to allocate funding for hearing process.

I have received a number of letters outlining the opposition to the Bill and to stating very clearly that they do not want intervenor funding to be handled by the Minister or by the permissive language in this Bill. Particularly since the beginning of discussion on this Bill, members of the environmental community have more reason to not trust the Minister.

This legislation was brought in and it was immediately stated by the Government that they were willing to amend the legislation. Oh, so if it is only a couple of weeks before we want it to be passed, there is time to amend it still. Environmental groups entered into discussions with the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister and they had clearly laid out a number of amendments, under the impression that these amendments would become part of the debate and had been agreed to.

The primary amendment was the deletion of the section that would allow another jurisdiction to independently conduct environment assessment which affects Manitoba's ecosystems. The second amendment would include I think under Section 13.1(a) that there would be provisions to ensure any joint assessment process is at least equivalent to Manitoba's and would meet the following criteria: That there would be public notification of the assessments and hearings including advertisements in the newspapers; that the assessment hearings would be filed on the public registry; that the assessment process would allow for public objection to the guidelines, the assessment report and the review of the assessment; that there would be public assessments and hearings in Manitoba; that there would be a joint assessment panel whose members were appointed jointly by the Ministers responsible for the environment from all jurisdictions involved.

Another amendment would be to ensure panel members are impartial and free of any bias or conflict of interest and to ensure a program of financial assistance for participants in the assessment hearings, also to include a process for the Minister to acquire further information after the report of a joint panel to assist in the decision to grant a licence.

These are amendments that would improve the Bill, not to the extent though that one would hope to improve a process for assessing the environment, but these would at least ensure that the process was stronger than it is now.

The whole issue of why this Government has decided to try and push this legislation through just before we are trying to break this Session before Christmas raises a lot of questions.

The Government though has admitted that it is because they want the process to be available for the decision for Conawapa. They try to make this sound like a good thing. The other thing that is happening while this is being rushed through is we are waiting for changes to the federal legislation in the form of Bill C-78, which means that the assessment process for Conawapa is currently very unclear.

Bill C-78 would weaken provisions for intervenor funding and not permit groups to hire lawyers. It seems there is some deal being made so that the assessment process for Conawapa can be some provincial process agreed to between the federal and provincial Governments.

A paper developed by the provincial Government Environment Ministers clearly shows that Bill C-78 will give federal Government the authority to grant a province the ability to do environmental assessment on what otherwise would have been a federal area. So there are a number of reasons to be suspicious for why the Government is choosing to push this Bill through in this way.

The main thing that is upsetting the environment community is that they have not been consulted in a matter which is commonly used to develop legislation. The Environment Act clearly states—and has been developed in the past by consulting with groups. This is something that should be happening any time that there is an amendment.

It is very unusual the way this Government has met with environment groups over the last week to

try to develop amendments. The public at large deserves to be consulted. Environment groups deserve the chance to prepare for meetings, deserve to prepare and meet with their membership so that they can present ideas and amendments and comments to improve the Bill. The Environment Minister and this Government do not seem to think that kind of consultation is important.

The Bill does not improve the process for environmental assessments, as I have said. It does not consider major things like ensuring that environmental assessments would have to be initiated and completed before a project is started, which is one major problem with the current process as we have seen with the number of processes in the country that environmental assessments are done after the fact.

This Government has complained that has happened in the past. If they are going to change the legislation, they should ensure that the environmental assessments would begin and be completed before a project is started and certainly before a project is completed.

The legislation does not provide for another improvement, which should be to ensure that the assessment panel members have experience and are not political appointments.

We have seen the problems with the number of other panels in the province and if the Government is truly concerned about the environment, they will hire or appoint qualified people who have a true concern, experience and expertise for protecting the environment.

\* (1650)

The other thing that would improve the process for environmental legislation, which is not in this Bill, would be to increase the number and the clarity of which projects require an assessment. A number of groups and people are not clear how the assessment process works. It seems that some projects can come up and they will not have to have an assessment if nobody knows about them. If they can be missed by the public, then there is no assessment.

The main thing to conclude is that this Bill has been handled—thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Minister of Environment will be closing debate.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):**

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a few brief words on the record to close debate. I take some umbrage at the personal approach that the Members opposite have taken to the introduction of this Bill and the ongoing reference to whether or not my position, or the position of the Government, can be trusted.

The purpose of this Bill is to allow for two amendments. One, to put in place the opportunity for the province to enter into joint environmental assessments, and we have clearly stated that our reason for that approach is that we know we have as an immediate example the environmental assessment of the Conawapa project coming up. We want to make sure that there are no legal avenues that could interfere into a process that would be embarked upon to evaluate this very large and very important project.

We want the focus to be upon the environmental issues and to be upon the concerns of those who want to come forward and make sure that the issues, as they revolve around environment and hydro-electric production, are clearly dealt with.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we indicated very clearly that we were prepared to introduce, through an amendment of this Bill, the capacity for intervenor funding. That seems to me to be going far beyond what was the election commitment on this side of the House in as much as we said we would consider it.

Today we are saying we have considered and we are prepared to act.

Now the Members opposite have taken the tactic that this Bill needs a great deal of discussion before they are prepared to respond, to allow it to pass through this House. I would only like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the principles of a joint environmental assessment were taken out for discussion in the public. Across the general public a series of six public meetings were held across this province, and we had both the provincial and the federal authorities at those meetings in order to explain what the implications might be of entering into a joint environmental assessment process.

During that process we picked up some very positive comments. There were a vast majority of people who felt this was the direction to go, who felt this was important and that the Government should proceed. There were also some concerns raised relevant to what regulations might be put in place to

support these amendments to the Act. We indicated at that time, as is the responsibility of the Government under the provisions of the Act, that any regulatory adjustments that were envisioned as being brought forward to be attached to these two amendments, would be taken out for public discussion. The public would be allowed to have their input, to provide advice, and the Government would then take those opinions back before the final regulations were written and then put into place.

The entire Environment Act, Mr. Speaker, is an Act that is very much an enabling Act. The powers under The Environment Act are very wide and very sweeping, and when there are people out there who say that we should not be looking at this as enabling, that all of what is contemplated in regulations should be included in the Act, they forget that the entire Environment Act is very much an enabling Act, and that the regulations that are attached to it are very much the operative and the important part of the Act.

Members want to reference Bill C-78 and the changes that are going on in the federal scene for the—all summer debate has raged around Bill C-78 and whether or not the federal Government is prepared to put through amendments to that Bill, and whether or not Bill C-78 in and of itself is seen as a strong environment Bill for this country. The fact is that we know, as does every Member of this House, that the federal interim guidelines are going to be in place when we enter into environmental assessment of Conawapa. They may very well still be in place when we enter into phase II environmental assessment of Repap.

So to introduce Bill C-78 into this debate is nothing more than an attempt to make political points out of a situation that is already overcharged by the fact that there are a number of people out there who are adamantly opposed to the developments we are talking about. I see that some of the Members of the Opposition would like me to slack off, but I really do feel that the opportunity to have had a debate with the environment groups who came forward and presented their concerns to me was worthwhile. That was in addition to the fact that we had the concepts out for discussion.

I would have to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we felt the introduction of this Bill need not have been a contentious issue coming into the House, that we are trying to through two simple amendments, give ourselves an opportunity on behalf of the Province of Manitoba to do some very constructive things that

a very large number of people across the country believe are very important.

Manitoba has clearly stated and has been in the lead for a considerable number of months in this country in looking towards the federal process saying that we are not about to separate ourselves from the responsibilities that we have and the responsibilities the federal authority has, that we believe in the words of Mr. Justice Muldoon that we are quite prepared to warmly embrace the federal interim guidelines if that is what is required.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have had considerable consultation. I am prepared to have more consultation. The fact that we are going to have the committee hearings on this Bill in January will allow for more people to come forward and give me their suggestions at committee. I will go so far as to say I will make myself available for consultations in advance of those hearings so that people will have an opportunity to give me their concerns and then put them on the record at the committee hearings.

Mr. Speaker, no one out there need fear what is intended by these amendments. We want the best environmental assessment at the highest standards that can be possibly achieved for the processes within our jurisdiction. Those are the principles of the Bill. I believe they are principles that everyone in this House should warmly welcome.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 24, The Environment Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed and so ordered.

### BILL 26—THE LOAN ACT, 1990

**Mr. Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 26, The Loan Act, 1990; Loi d'emprunt de 1990, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans). Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave? Leave is denied. -(interjection)-

\* (1700)

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good opportunity to assail the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) who is speaking from his seat about getting it straight -(interjection)- 40 minutes? No, no, just five and then we are going into committee. We want to just make some brief general

comments and then have an opportunity to question and discuss this issue in committee, because it does deal with a significant increase in loan authority by this Government.

It is somewhat of concern to us in the Opposition when we see that this Government that talks about the costs of borrowing and about fiscal responsibility, to come up with an increase of some \$151 million in borrowing authority, in loan authority, some \$151 million in addition to what was in place last year which was set at \$318 million. Now we are dealing with \$469 million, a huge increase by this Government that talks about financial management, about reducing borrowing so that the cost to the taxpayer will be reduced—huge increases right across the board.

Our Party is concerned about this major increase. We want to ask the Ministers and question the Ministers on why they have seen the need for these major increases over this past year. In some instances it may seem that it is justified if indeed the benefits were going to those whom it would seem were gaining the benefits. However if we look at the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation last year, it was only at \$10.5 million in borrowing authority, this year \$66 million. Yet there has not been a major increase in low interest loans to farmers. So why has the loan authority increased sixfold over last year without any major increases and benefits to the farmers of Manitoba who are in a state of crisis at the present time?

If we look at some of the other areas, Mr. Speaker, we see in the Farm Mediation Board \$9.8 million, but no money flowing to the farmers under the special assistance fund that is in place in agriculture. There is a little irony there as to why there is a need for that major increase in borrowing authority.

So I can say at this time that we will be questioning the Ministers on the various components of the loan Bill. Manitoba Hydro for example has gone from \$138.4 million to \$278 million, a major increase there. Why? That is the question that we need to answer. Why has the borrowing authority gone from \$138 million to \$278 million, and why in housing has there been an increase or change from 85 down to 60 in housing—a change, a major drop in housing which is significant and important.

So those are the kinds of things that we will want to ask. I can say to the Ministers, they can talk about previous Governments and borrowing that is

needed, but they only have to look at the jurisdictions to the west, at Saskatchewan which has incurred a tremendous debt increase—a Conservative Government over the last number of years—and as a result will undoubtedly be moving on to Opposition in Saskatchewan.

We look at Alberta—in significant trouble as well where there have been huge increases in the deficit and the need for borrowing, and of course in Ontario, where the Liberals were in Government for a short time after 40 years of Conservatives, 40 years of Conservative mismanagement. You can imagine the increased debt that has taken place in that particular province.

So it is not only a situation where we have major debt increases in Manitoba as a result, allegedly by this Government, of the New Democratic Government in this province. It is at the provincial level in all of the provinces, and at the national level where Mulroney has continued to run up record deficits year after year, even though he came to Government in 1984 saying that the deficit was out of control and he was going to straighten it all up.

We have to look at this particular Government where we have the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) sitting right in this House, responsible for major increases in the deficit this year, the deficit they said they were going to eliminate. The only reason they were able to reduce it over the first two years was because they had a bout of good fortune as a result of major increases in revenue from the federal Government, and surplus—my Leader says a \$4 million surplus per month from the previous Government when they came into office.

They were sitting with a major—well, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) talks about them blowing their inheritance. That is common practice by Conservatives in western Canada because who inherited more than the Devine Government in Saskatchewan when they came into power, a major heritage fund that is no longer there, gone, and a huge debt and per capita basis, almost as much as is in Manitoba? Yet they had a wealthy base, and they have sold off all the major corporations and revenue-generators in Saskatchewan over that period of time.

So let not the Deputy Premier talk about the legacy or mismanagement of previous Governments. What he should be talking about is his own Government now. It is time to take full

responsibility for what this Government is doing at this time. They can no longer blame someone else. There have been two elections since there was a previous Government. Actually the previous Government is this Government. They have to get used to that. They have not even been admitting that fact yet. The previous Government is this Government. So if they are going to blame the previous Government, they are blaming themselves, and they should start recognizing that truth.

Now the fact is that when they get into increased borrowing, it is as a result of their decisions and their spending. That is what we want to question from these Ministers during this particular point in time. With those few comments, I would like to see that we move this into committee so that we can have further discussion. I see the Minister of Finance is ready to deal with that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 26, The Loan Act, 1990; Loi d'emprunt de 1990. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed and so ordered.

### BILL 25—THE OMBUDSMAN AMENDMENT ACT (Cont'd)

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, first, before I forget, I would like to announce that Bill 25, The Ombudsman Amendment Act, which you just passed a few minutes ago, will be dealt with by the Standing Committee on Law Amendments meeting at 10 a.m. and 8 p.m. tomorrow.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader for that information.

### MESSAGES

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour. I am informing the House that I will be moving—let me read this—before the motion to go into Committee of the Whole, I will be presenting a motion from His Honour. He has been informed of a committee amendment to Bill 20 and has recommended same.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the Honourable Minister for tabling that.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the Capital Supply Bill. I will say Bills 20 and 26 in that order.

\* (1710)

**Motion agreed to,** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of Bills referred, specifically Bills 20 and 26, with the Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair.

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### BILL 20—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (TAXATION) ACT, 1990

**Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay):** Order, please. The Committee of the Whole will come to order to continue to consider Bill 20, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1990. Is it the will of the committee that we do this in blocks?

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** I think there is probably a will to proceed rather informally. We recognize that both of these Bills can be dealt with in committee. Madam Chairperson, with your permission, I would like to begin to clarify something with the Minister.

My colleague, the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), has an amendment for Section 26 of Bill 20. What I would like to do is deal with an earlier amendment in Sections 13 through 18, then leave the Bill aside, deal with Bill 26. By that time, my colleague will be back and we can complete Bill 20, if that is agreeable?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** I also have amendments, my first amendment being in Section 12. Is that right—yes, Clause 12. It is agreeable.

**Madam Chairman:** Shall Clauses 1 through 11 be passed—pass.

Clause 12—

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, I move, seconded by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey),

THAT the following section be added after Section 12 of Part 4:

#### Subsection 2(1) amended

12.1(1) Subsection 2(1) is amended by striking out

“, except tangible personal property in respect of which tax is payable under subsection (11),”.

Il est proposé que l'article qui suit soit ajouté après l'article 12 de la partie 4:

#### Modification du paragraphe 2(1)

12.1(1) Le paragraphe 2(1) est modifié par suppression de “, à l'exception des biens personnels corporels à l'égard desquels une taxe est payable en application du paragraphe (11),”.

#### Subsection 2(4) amended

12.1(2) Subsection 2(4) is amended by striking out “or(11)”.

#### Modification du paragraphe 2(4)

12.1(2) Le paragraphe 2(4) est modifié par suppression de “ou (11)”.

#### Subsection 2(11) repealed

12.1(3) Subsection 2(11) is repealed.

#### Abrogation du paragraphe 2(11)

12.1(3) Le paragraphe 2(11) est abrogé.

**An Honourable Member:** Explain.

**Mr. Manness:** Why would you ask me to explain?

**Madam Chairman:** It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), seconded by the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), that the following section be added after Section 12 of Part 4. This amendment is moved both in respect of the English and French text of the Bill. Shall the amendment be passed?

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, the Members asked a legitimate question. I will try my best to give them a response. It is not a deal breaker.

It is not—the present provision 2 Sub 11 reads, every purchaser of liquor as defined in The Liquor Control Act other than beer is defined in the Act shall pay to Her Majesty in right of Manitoba for the public use of the Government a tax in respect of the consumption thereof, computed at the rate of 12 percent of the fair value thereof. Every purchaser of beer as defined in The Liquor Control Act shall pay to Her Majesty in right of Manitoba for the public use of the Government a tax in respect of the consumption thereof, computed at the rate of 7 percent of the fair value thereof.

That was the clause that had the distinction of 12 percent on spirits and wine, as compared to 7 percent on beer. That is being repealed per my announcement last night.

**Mr. Storie:** Having heard the explanation, I have no problem with the amendment.

**Madam Chairman:** Shall the amendment be passed—pass.

Shall Clause 12 as amended be passed—pass.

Shall Clause 13 be passed?

**Mr. Storie:** Madam Chairman, I have an amendment to this clause. This clause relates to the removal of a provision that has been in The Retail Sales Tax Act since 1967, which allows individuals to refuse to pay, and recognizes that the merchant to whom this refusal is given should not be liable for collecting the tax. In fact, the practice was to be that when a refusal took place, the merchant took the name, and address of the refusee and the Government, the Province of Manitoba, was responsible for collecting the tax.

I have had a number of conversations with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) with respect to this amendment. The fact of the matter is that this amendment is going to have serious repercussions for the business community in Flin Flon. In fact, the Chamber of Commerce, the Core Area Business Association, as well as individual merchants in the community of Flin Flon have contacted me, have raised concerns about the removal of this refusal exemption and have indicated that, in some instances, this may mean the difference between surviving as a business and not surviving.

In fact, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), to whom I directed a letter on December 6, has also had correspondence from an individual who operates a hardware materials store in Flin Flon, who indicates that some 20 to 30 percent of his business may be lost as a result of this removal of this provision.

I see the Member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) shaking his head. The fact of the matter is that there are two very unique circumstances to the community of Flin Flon. Number one, of course, is that residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who live adjacent to the community of Flin Flon and represent about 25 percent of the total area population, do not have to pay Manitoba provincial sales tax provided that the merchant delivers the merchandise to the community in Saskatchewan. The same is true with respect to Status Indians in Saskatchewan. In fact, if merchants deliver goods to reserves in Manitoba, they do not have to pay provincial sales tax.

\* (1720)

These businesses, for whom that group of individuals I have just described form a significant portion of their business, stand to lose all of that business, either to merchants in Saskatchewan or, in the case of Status Indians, to establishments that are on reserve, or perhaps to businesses that are willing to circumvent the law, suggest that the goods or the materials have been delivered on reserve or into the adjoining jurisdiction. It is a serious problem.

What I had asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) to do was to provide me with some indication of the level of loss of revenue to the Province of Manitoba. My first question, my one question before I introduce this amendment is to ask the Minister whether he can indicate on the record, how much revenue the province is currently losing as a result of the provision in the Act that allows an individual to refuse to pay the retail sales tax?

**Mr. Manness:** That is one of the great problems. We do not really know with certainty how much money we are losing. I suspect it is an awful lot more than we did believe. Let me read some of the history why—give a fuller explanation why we are doing this.

When the retail sales tax was introduced in 1967, the then Premier Duff Roblin advised that the Act must be introduced in a soft manner to not antagonize merchants. One of the provisions provided in the Act to accomplish this soft approach was Section 9(3) which reads as follows, and again I will read into it into the record: "Except where a vendor has, forthwith after a sale of tangible personal property or of a service, sent to the Minister by registered mail a notice stating that the purchaser of that property or that service has refused to pay the tax in respect thereof, the tax in respect of that property or of that service shall be conclusively deemed to be have been collected by the vendor as provided in subsection (2)."

Madam Chair, this section was intended to transfer a dispute relative to the payment or non-payment of a tax from the merchant to the Government, so that the merchant would not be placed in the difficult position with his customer of trying to support the Government's decision to impose a tax and/or to resolve a difficult tax application.

It was felt, when introduced, it would have a very limited application which was actually the situation until fairly recently. Now the section is being abused,

in our view, in a large number of instances by Manitobans using the section simply to avoid paying tax when tax is actually known to be due.

The taxation division is in a difficult position of attempting to collect the tax directly from the person refusing to pay because of the number of such claims, the inability to trace the delivery of the item purchased or, in many cases, the inability to locate the purchaser, because it is our view now that for many individuals not paying the tax, the vendor is not even recording the incident and referring it to the Government.

Section 9(3) was only intended to be utilized in the very few situations where application of tax was uncertain, not when the purchaser simply did not want to pay the tax. The repealing of this section will remove this easy method of avoiding the payment of tax. Legitimate cases of the incorrect application of tax can still be rectified by a person paying the tax to the merchant and applying for a refund which, if tax has been applied incorrectly, will be granted.

Madam Chairman, Ontario recently repealed their sales tax exemption equal to 9(3), and we understand only the Provinces of Saskatchewan, P.E.I. and New Brunswick retain like provisions. It should be noted that the exemption in Saskatchewan is very broad and, therefore, it would not be necessary to use the refusal that some may want to use to pay this tax. We also understand that the exemption granted by the goods and services tax will be limited also in cases such as this.

I do not have the answer to the very specific question of how much revenue we are foregoing, but I sense that it is certainly in the terms of millions of dollars. I do not think it is tens of millions, but I would have to say it is certainly in the terms of millions of dollars of foregone tax revenue.

I am mindful of the argument put forward by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), who of course makes the case for his community whereby the community is more or less isolated and certainly serves a large clientele of those people from Saskatchewan. To that end, I think I am prepared to try and at least listen to, not arguments on principle because I cannot accept that, but as to whether or not a methodology might be put into place to take into account that certain situation.

**Mr. Storie:** The fact is that if the Minister could quantify what the revenue loss to the province is or would be, I think that would certainly help the

situation. Clearly, I think we all appreciate that the provision in the Act was never intended to be a blanket exemption. It was not intended to be a loophole through which individual consumers could flout the law and avoid paying their legitimate part of the cost of Government activities.

I think that, in the case of Flin Flon, it is unique, and I am pleased that the Minister has recognized that there may be some validity to the argument that Flin Flon should be treated as an exemption. I reminded the Minister previously that, in fact, when a similar circumstance occurred, when the Government of Saskatchewan amended its excise tax on gasoline, we did make some exceptions for communities along the border, Flin Flon being the prime example.

Madam Chair, I am anxious to continue those discussions with the Minister of Finance, because I think the repercussions of this are going to be far greater in Flin Flon and the area than perhaps the Minister and his staff have anticipated in drafting this amendment, trying to deal with what is a legitimate problem.

I make the point for the record that I stand here not just as the MLA for Flin Flon. I stand here with the support of the Chamber of Commerce in Flin Flon, the Core Area Business Association in Flin Flon, the Co-op Board of Directors, as well as individual businesses that have contacted me. In fact, there is broad support for the amendment that I am about to introduce.

With that, Madam Chair, not wishing to delay this any further, recognizing that the Minister has indicated he may be willing to look at some further accommodation of the interests of the business community in Flin Flon and the surrounding areas, I move, seconded by the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), that Sections 13 to 18 of Part 4 be struck out.

**Some Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please. I would remind the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that an amendment to delete a clause is not in order, as the proper course is to vote against the clause. It is *Beauchesne Citation 698*. However, is it the will of the committee to have the amendment framed in this manner? Agreed? Agreed.

Is the committee ready for the question on the proposed amendment?

**Mr. Storie:** I apologize if this amendment is out of order. I indicated to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) yesterday that I would be introducing this amendment. It was prepared by Legislative Counsel, so if I have done something that is technically incorrect, I apologize.

\* (1730)

The spirit of this is simply to have on the record the fact that there is serious opposition to this amendment. I want to say that the follow-up to this is going to be as important as what we finally decide on this matter, and that is whether, in fact, the Minister and representatives from the Department of Finance attend in Flin Flon to attempt to deal with what could be a very serious problem for the business community in the Flin Flon area.

With that, I am prepared to vote on the amendment.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** I would like, Madam Chairperson, to speak very briefly to this amendment in support of my colleague from Flin Flon in asking that this be deleted.

Maybe I did not hear the Minister's explanation, but I am still not satisfied that we have to rush ahead and change a procedure that has been in effect since time immemorial. -(interjection)- Almost. Vendors have always had this opportunity, and there are certain categories of people that may have objections to paying the retail sales tax for whatever reason. I am thinking particularly of Status or Treaty Indians.

**An Honourable Member:** Kill a mosquito with a hammer.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I really think, as my colleague from Flin Flon very well puts it, they are trying to kill a mosquito with a sledge hammer. There are many vendors in this province who are unhappy with this particular section, and particularly unhappy because they have received a notification from the Minister, from the department, that this was effective November 19. I again raise the matter of this being really an affront to the Legislature of this province.

We are in a parliamentary democracy, not a bureaucratic or executive democracy. We have this department already enforcing this. It has been enforced since November 19. Here it is a month later and it is still not passed, still not been agreed to, by the Legislature, yet the Government of the Day has gone ahead and acted in an illegal fashion. It has been acting illegally for nearly a month. That is a

serious affront to the privileges of this House, Madam Chairperson. For no other reason, I would want to support my colleague from Flin Flon in this particular matter.

Again, I really have a feeling that the real reason the Government is wanting to move on this now is that they are worried that there will be such a rebellion by the people of the Province of Manitoba against paying the GST, that the failure to pay the retail sales tax may become a way of life, too, for a lot of people. I should not say a way of life, but a procedure, a practice, that will develop when people are just so darned mad. They will not pay the GST, and while they are at it, they will not pay the retail sales tax at the same time.

Is that the reason? I am getting close. -(interjection)- I do not know. The people of this province, the people of this country, are very, very upset, very, very annoyed with the GST. They do not want the Government of Canada to bring it in. Regardless, it seems the Mulroney Government is going to use, has been using, every technique available to stack the Senate to get it through. There are very questionable practices, procedures, of the Mulroney Government to push the GST through. We are assuming here that the GST is going through. Therefore, I suspect that this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has indeed wanted to cover all the bases and make sure that there is not this massive failure to collect or to pay the retail sales tax.

Madam Chairperson, with those few remarks, I am prepared to vote, unless my colleague or other colleagues may wish to speak on this.

**Mr. Storie:** My colleague reminded me of something that I was asked to put on the record by one of the individuals with whom I have been discussing this issue. It kind of, in a sense, refutes some of the comments made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) about the urgency for this amendment that I am proposing. That is, as much as 20 percent to 30 percent of the customers of some of the businesses in Flin Flon come from the Saskatchewan side, and they in fact do have a choice. In fact, communities like Sandy Bay and Pelican Narrows are almost equidistant between Flin Flon and Prince Albert.

If they have to pay, as the Minister has suggested, the tax up front and then claim a rebate for that tax, the administrative problems that would create for them make it very unlikely that they would in fact

shop in Flin Flon. That is the view of the Co-op board and the Business Association.

Madam Chairman, there is some urgency, and if this amendment should be defeated, I will certainly be taking the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) up on his acknowledgement of the continuing problem that will exist in the Flin Flon area and be looking to him for some correction of the continuing problems this is going to create.

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, there is some response I have to make to both comments. Section 9(3), which presently is the section that is within the law, was never intended to create tax-free zones. The intention, when the Roblin Government of '67 brought forward the retail sales tax, is that all Manitobans would pay the tax.

The Member, I know, would like us to set up a sort of tax-free zone, and I am saying, what happens when it spreads all the way along the border, not only on the western side, but indeed on the southern side? We have a fundamental difference of views. I say that the principles of what it is we are trying to do are inviolate. There is no way we can say to anybody, you can escape taxation.

What we have had now, it is becoming apparent to us, that some of the criticisms that have come from merchants—and I will not identify them as Flin Flon merchants—as we look into the records, some of them have claimed that upwards of 20, 30, 40 or even more percent of their business is the result of people who have some legitimate right to claim an exemption.

What happens, Madam Chairman, is that we search the file, and in some cases they have not filed with us a refusal-to-pay slip for a year. Obviously the law was being abused. I mean, it was our responsibility, in many cases, to have been apprised of that situation as the taxation division and to go out and collect on our own. That is when we began to realize that this certain section was being abused. -(interjection)-

The Member says, you are not expecting to fill out a form for every third customer. -(interjection)- I would say then, what has changed so much in the space of the last few years, because this exemption was never used. All of a sudden it is growing. It is growing very significantly. I say to the Member, it has been growing in other jurisdictions, too. They have moved to remove the exemption, and we have no alternative if we are going to pay for our health

care and our education system as we know it. It is one of the tough difficulties in applying taxation laws. It has to be done fairly everywhere.

To the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), who chastises me for bringing this in and serving notice without legislative authority, I remind him there is a long-standing tradition over centuries of Government bringing in taxation policy by way of announcing and then coming to the Legislature for legislative support. By the way, the announcement was made in this House the same time that the notices went out. The Member knows fully well that is the case.

I say to him we have done nothing out of the extraordinary, and the Member says why did you not do it in the budget. We did not do it in the budget because this is a G—there is a reason why we have to do it, and indeed we cannot provide the notice that the Member would want.

**An Honourable Member:** Taxation might . . .

\* (1740)

**Mr. Manness:** Taxation does not work that way and Members know it fully well.

Madam Chairman, I have to put those remarks on the record before we vote on this amendment.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell me in terms of other provinces—he has given some indication that provinces are moving in this direction. I am looking more to the immediate east and west, Saskatchewan and Ontario, and what they are doing.

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, I do not know what is—while I read the notes, it says here that only the provinces of Saskatchewan, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick retain this provision that we have on our books now. All of the other provinces that have provincial sales tax have removed this exemption.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** I would ask the Minister of Finance, he meets on an annual basis with different Ministers of Finance, has this come up for a discussion? If it has come up for a discussion, what are the other provinces' opinions? Are we looking at all of the provinces moving in this direction, or is this something that a few select Governments have chosen to do, and we can expect to see them possibly changing their views with a change of Government or anything of that nature?

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, this has not been an agenda item on meetings as between Ministers of Finance. So I am not aware of what other jurisdictions are contemplating in the future. Certainly officials, in discussion with officials elsewhere, report to me what the present case is in other provinces, and why it is that other provinces have felt the necessity of moving in this area and have convinced me that it is very necessary that we, too, as a province move in this fashion.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Madam Chairperson, this is indeed a very serious issue. I would have appreciated some type of notice, I guess, from the New Democratic Party had they felt this was an issue that had to be dealt with today.

Failing that, Madam Chairperson, I feel that the Liberal Party's best interest and Manitoba's best interest would be at this time to support the amendment and would encourage, if by chance the amendment does pass, that the Minister of Finance meet with his counterparts and consider putting this on the agenda. Thank you.

**Madam Chairman:** Shall the amendment be passed? All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

**Madam Chairman:** All those opposed to the amendment, please say nay.

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Madam Chairman:** In my opinion the Nays have it. The amendment is accordingly defeated.

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** We would like to have it recorded on division.

**Madam Chairman:** It will be recorded on division. Shall Clause 13—

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Just on a point of order, I have an amendment which deals with Section 26, so perhaps, unless other Members have other objections or questions, we could go through until we get to that section.

**Madam Chairman:** Shall the clause, as amended, be passed? Shall Clause 13 be passed? On division?

**An Honourable Member:** On division.

**Madam Chairman:** Clause 14—pass; Clause 15—pass; Clause 16—pass; Clause 17—pass; Clause 18—pass; Clause 19—pass; Clause 20—pass;

Clause 21—pass; Clause 22—pass; Clause 23—pass; Clause 24—pass; Clause 25—pass.

Clause 26—

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I am sorry. I wanted to talk on Section 26, unless the Minister had something to say about Section 26, so I do not want to pre-empt him.

**An Honourable Member:** No, go ahead. I do, but it will be different than what you—

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Madam Chairperson, it seems to me that there is certain retroactivity that we talked about earlier in this particular Bill, some of which that we have objected to. Some are retroactive to the 19th, other retroactivity items here which we do not necessarily object to, but some refer back to January 1 of 1990.

We do not understand why Sections 12 and 19 should necessarily come in force on January 1. We believe that it is fair to have it come into effect—Section 12 come into effect on September 1. We say this, because we understand there are certain items, certain amusement charges for tickets, et cetera, that are being sold. We understand that the GST is already being levied and being collected and that, therefore, the retail sales tax, we understand, is being piggybacked on this or could be. There is a possibility of this.

So, therefore, in order to ensure that the cascading does not take place, we believe that it is fair that this should not come into force until September 1 instead of January 1.

Madam Chairperson, I would move, seconded by the Member for Broadway (Mr. Santos),

THAT section 26 of Part 6 be struck out and the following substituted:

**Section 12: September 1, 1990**

26 Section 12 is retroactive and is deemed to have come into force on September 1, 1990.

**Section 19: January 1, 1991**

26.1 Section 19 comes into force on January 1, 1991.

**(French version)**

Il est proposé que l'article 26 soit remplacé par ce qui suit:

**Article 12—le 1er septembre 1990**

26 L'article 12 s'applique à compter du 1er septembre 1990.

**Article 19—le 1er janvier 1991**

26.1 L'article 19 entre en vigueur le 1er janvier 1991.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, I do not think the Member knows what he is asking for. He is asking me to repeal a section, in essence repeal the provincial sales tax. What we are referring to, what we are attempting to do in this section, what we are trying to do in this whole area, the area to which he refers to, is to try to force the visibility of the goods and services tax. He is amending that to ask us to waive our tax all together, or asking me to pass legislation that will force the federal Government to waive their tax to September 1. I do not have those powers. If I had those powers, we would not only probably take it back to September 1, we would pass this every year and waive the GST. I do not have the powers to do what it is he is hoping to do by his amendment. So I say that his amendment really does not serve the purpose he is wanting.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Madam Chairperson, we had asked Legislative Counsel to come up with amendment so that the effective date of cascading would be retroactive to September 1 of 1991. It was not our intention to wipe out the provincial sales tax, although there may be some merit in that. I am not so sure that I accept the explanation of the Minister of Finance here, because we would have to have time to study it. Therefore, our intent is, as I explained before, that cascading or piggybacking, or whatever term you like to use, should not be effective September 1.

\* (1750)

May I ask the Minister this: Is the Province of Manitoba now collecting retail sales tax on top of the GST of these items, of some of the items such as amusement tickets?

**Mr. Manness:** We do not collect the provincial sales tax on those items, so how could we be collecting any tax on tax? Retail sales tax does not apply to magazine subscriptions, theatre tickets, memberships, tickets to professional sporting events except—

**An Honourable Member:** Let us do a little more homework, Len.

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, we do not collect provincial sales tax on them.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Madam Chairperson, I was given some of these examples. Are there any other

items? I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, apart from subscriptions and tickets, are there any other items that could be covered by this?

**Mr. Manness:** I cannot think of any. I really cannot think of any. I mean, the best example the Member uses is memberships. As I know in my own farming operations, I have had to pay some memberships where the GST is applied, and I had to pay that back in July. Provincial sales tax is not applicable to that type of charge and due. I say to the Member, I cannot think of any.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Is the provincial sales tax applicable to warranties on appliance repairs, for example?

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, I think the Member has found one. He has found one, and I guess I ask him, how is it—(interjection)—yes, fishing sometimes will pull out a fish even though you do not have a hook on a line. I do not know how it is that you could possibly set up a system of rebate. Who would it cost more—the Government or indeed the retailer, or whoever it is that is selling that service in the first place. I say to him, I understand where he is going to go, but it has to be meritorious in an application sense. I am saying what he is suggesting is totally unworkable.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Madam Chairperson, I cannot be totally responsible for the wording of the amendment, but I proposed it with the intent to protect Manitoba taxpayers who are damn mad about the GST, and they are damn mad about paying too many taxes, and they do not want to see piggybacking. We have pushed this, we welcome sections of this Bill to prevent the piggybacking or cascading.

I recall last summer a constituent coming to see me in my office in Brandon, my constituency office, showing me the warranty, showing me the fact that they had to pay the GST on a warranty, a year's warranty, on a major appliance repair. There was nothing I could say or do to calm this particular lady down. She was totally furious. I am saying therefore we have an obligation here to do everything we can not to impose tax upon tax.

You know, I gave a couple of examples, the Minister said, well, they do not apply. Now I bring up another example. He says, well, yes, it applies, but it is too much administrative headache. It cannot work and so on. Let us face it, the Province of Manitoba has been collecting the retail sales tax on

top of the GST for warranties of major appliances. That is a big item, a lot of people have a warranty on appliances, particularly elderly people, particularly in the -(interjection)- well, that is what I am talking about. That is your intention, and we thought at least some small move to bring it forward to January 1 would be fair and equitable. Again, of course, we are all assuming the GST will be law by that time. All I can say, if the Minister is now telling me he is now admitting that there are some items, there may be some items—

**An Honourable Member:** One.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Well, one. If I go back and do a little more research he may admit to two, maybe three, four, maybe a dozen, who knows.

**An Honourable Member:** One is too many.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** One is too many, as my colleague from Thompson says. It may be one classification, but there are still, I would dare to say, tens if not hundreds of thousands of dollars of warranty contracts written during the year. The Minister is saying we cannot accept it because it is unworkable.

Madam Chairperson, I would like to put it to a vote because I have not had time to research all of the Minister's objections. If we had more time, I would like to have adjourned this, but we do not have the time, so I do not want to delay the proceedings of the Legislature. I would just like to put it to a vote and let it be decided.

**Madam Chairman:** Shall the amendment be passed? All those in favour, please say aye.

**Some Honourable Members:** Aye.

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

**Some Honourable Members:** Nay.

**Madam Chairman:** In my opinion the Nays have it. The amendment is accordingly defeated—

**An Honourable Member:** On division.

**Madam Chairman:** On division.

Shall Clause 26 be passed?

**Mr. Manness:** I have an amendment.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey),

THAT section 26 of Part 6 be struck out and the following substituted:

**Sections 12, 12.1 and 19: January 1, 1991 or later**  
26 Section 12, 12.1 and 19 come into force on the later of:

(a) January 1, 1990; and

(b) the date of coming into force of those provisions of Bill C-62 of the Second Session of the Thirty-fourth Parliament of Canada that are related to the goods and services tax and that are stated in that Bill as at November 22, 1990 to come into force on January 1, 1991.

**(French version)**

Il est proposé que l'article 26 de la partie 6 soit remplacé par ce qui suit:

**Articles 12, 12.1 et 19 - au plus tôt le 1er janvier 1991**

26 Les articles 12, 12.1 et 19 entrent en vigueur à celle des dates suivantes qui est postérieure à l'autre:

a) le 1er janvier 1991;

b) la date d'entrée en vigueur des dispositions du projet de loi C-62 de la deuxième session de la trente-quatrième législature du Parlement du Canada relatives à la taxe sur les produits et services, dispositions qui sont, au 22 novembre 1990, censées entrer en vigueur le 1er janvier 1991.

**Madam Chairman:** It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Finance that Section 26 of Part 6 be struck out and the following substituted.

**Sections 12, 12.1 and 19: January 1, 1991 or later**  
26 Section 12, 12.1 and 19 come into force on the later of:

(a) January 1, 1990; and

(b) the date of coming into force of those provisions of Bill C-62 of the Second Session of the Thirty-fourth Parliament of Canada that are related to the goods and services tax and that are stated in that Bill as at November 22, 1990 to come into force on January 1, 1991.

**(French version)**

Il est proposé que l'article 26 de la partie 6 soit remplacé par ce qui suit:

**Articles 12, 12.1 et 19 - au plus tôt le 1er janvier 1991**

26 Les articles 12, 12.1 et 19 entrent en vigueur à celle des dates suivantes qui est postérieure à l'autre:

a) le 1er janvier 1991;

b) la date d'entrée en vigueur des dispositions du projet de loi C-62 de la deuxième session de la trente-quatrième législature du Parlement du Canada relatives à la taxe sur les produits et services, dispositions qui sont, au 22 novembre 1990, censées entrer en vigueur le 1<sup>er</sup> janvier 1991.

Shall the amendment be passed? (pass); Clause 26—(pass); Clause 27—(pass); Clause 28—(pass).

**Mr. Manness:** I would like to move a third amendment. I move, seconded by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey),

THAT the Legislative Counsel be authorized to renumber the Bill and to make any changes to cross references necessary to insert in the Bill in proper sequence the amendments made in this committee.

**(French version)**

Il est proposé que le Conseiller législatif soit autorisé à rénuméroter les dispositions du projet de loi et à corriger les renvois de façon à tenir compte des amendements faits en comité.

**Motion presented.**

**Madam Chairman:** Shall the motion be passed? Agreed. Preamble—(pass); Title—(pass).

Is it the will of the committee that I report the Bill as amended? Agreed.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

\* (1800)

**IN SESSION**

**COMMITTEE REPORT**

**Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairman of Committees):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 20, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1990, and has directed me to report the same with certain amendments.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mrs. Rønder), that the report of the committee be received.

**Motion agreed to.**

\*\*\*

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn, I would like to move the Motion of Supply. You have the instructions with respect to what that committee will consider tomorrow morning.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty at nine o'clock tomorrow morning.

**Motion agreed to.**

**Committee Change**

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Inkster, with his committee change.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry), that the Law Amendments be amended as follows: the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) for The Maples (Mr. Cheema).

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed. This House is now recessed until 9 a.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

\*\*\*

The House took recess at 6:05 p.m.

**After Recess**

The House resumed at 9 a.m. (Thursday).

**COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY  
SUPPLY—HEALTH**

\* (0900)

**Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay):** Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. Today this section of the Committee of Supply will continue to consider the Estimates of the Department of Health.

I would ask the Minister's staff to please take their seats in the Chamber.

We are dealing with 1. Administration and Finance (d) Policy and Planning Secretariat, page 88 in your Estimates manual.

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns):** Madam Chairman, I have just a few questions following up from our last session. I am wondering if the Minister has had a chance to look into the situation with respect to the subcommittee dealing with the MNU report: All in a Day's Work, and if he is now prepared to correct the record and clear up any wrong impressions that were left on the record with respect to any suggestion that this was unanimously

approved at the subcommittee by the subcommittee.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** I am not aware of any confusion about what I said. If my honourable friend has some confusion she believes is there, maybe my honourable friend should be more specific on her confusion.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I would be pleased to clarify further, from our previous session, the situation for the Minister and ask him to look into this situation as quickly as possible, since I think the impressions being left are clearly not helpful in terms of the negotiations presently going on between the MNU and the MHO.

As I said at the previous sitting of Estimates for the Department of Health, there was no unanimous approval of the subcommittee report. The MNU had written to the Minister at least on two occasions. I referred previous Estimates to November 12. He has also received a September 17 letter indicating that the MNU representatives on the subcommittee at no time gave approval for the report and in fact raised serious concerns. I think it would be in the best interests of all involved to clear up the record and indicate that there are outstanding concerns vis-a-vis the subcommittee on the MNU report, All in a Day's Work.

**Mr. Orchard:** Is my honourable friend saying, and I have to apologize because I missed a couple of her words, that the four MNU representatives on the subcommittee did not agree to the report that went to the commission and went to the executive members of the MNU? Is that what my honourable friend is saying, that the four members of MNU, members on the committee, the subcommittee studying, All in a Day's Work, did not unanimously agree to the report that was forwarded?

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, as I have said on a number of occasions, the representatives from the MNU on the subcommittee at no time gave approval for this so-called final committee that had been forwarded to the Funding Guidelines Review Committee of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. It is clear that the Minister is not prepared to address this any further. I had hoped that he would clear up the record in the interest of creating a co-operative environment around negotiations. I hope that this does not come in the way of such a co-operative approach on negotiations.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, the only person who is trying to disrupt the negotiations between the MHO and the MNU is the Honourable Member for St. Johns, leading the charge for the NDP.

My honourable friend is saying, and if I believe I understand what she is saying, she is saying that the four representatives of MNU on the subcommittee studying All in a Day's report did not agree to the tabled report that went to their respective superior bodies. That is what my honourable friend is saying and, my honourable friend, I simply say to you that the minutes of the Funding Guideline Review Committee held on Monday, August 27, 1990, at 1,200 hours in Commission Board Room No. 350 has an item 3.0, review of draft report: following a lengthy discussion, the draft report of the subcommittee was reviewed, revised and accepted by all.

I cannot do anything more than indicate what the minutes—and these minutes were circulated on two separate occasions after that. If the minutes are wrong—I do not believe they are—I suggest my honourable friend is wrong.

What my honourable friend is getting confused about is that when the subcommittee report reached the executive of the MNU, they had disagreements with it because the report did not deal with two issues. That is where the disagreement is. The members of MNU on the subcommittee agreed to the report that was presented. The superiors in the MNU said, we do not agree because it did not deal with a couple of substantive issues which I indicated to my honourable friend on Monday of this week and Tuesday of this week were issues that are currently before the MHO and the MNU in bargaining. I am not commenting on those issues, but to try to leave the impression that the subcommittee membership did not agree to the report as presented is wrong, Madam Chairman.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I would suggest to the Minister that he perhaps as soon as possible consult with the chairperson of that subcommittee, Mr. Vandewater, and try to ascertain the facts and try to get a better comprehensive overview of this issue at hand. He has had two letters now at least from the Manitoba Nurses' Union indicating there was no consensus on the report. I think it is a very serious matter that the Minister would proceed on the basis of those minutes, which do not appear to be accurate.

I want to go on to another matter that we have dealt with before. As of late yesterday, this Government had still not put a monetary offer on the table in terms of negotiations between the MHO and the MNU. Has the Minister put a position on the table this morning? I want to know, what is the holdup? What is the delay? What is the Minister waiting for?

**Mr. Orchard:** To reach an agreement without a strike.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, when is this Minister going to put a monetary position on the bargaining table between the MNU and the MHO?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, we will have a monetary offer before MNU. The MHO will present a monetary offer to the MNU, and that will happen well within the contract time. I am not here to carry on my honourable friend representing the New Democratic Party's desire to bargain in public. We are bargaining in good faith. There are good communications going on between MHO and MNU right now. They have been working this week on issues which are regional in nature. They have continued their discussion.

The only people that appear to want these negotiations to break down and to go nowhere is the New Democratic Party, who obviously want to foment and to cause difficulties in the health care system. We have no desire of that. A monetary offer will be made. It will be made in due course and in good time.

That is all I am going to say to my honourable friend, who seems to wish to precipitate job action or whatever the NDP vernacular is for a strike in the health care system. I am not coming from there. I am not bargaining in public. We are trying to reach an agreement agreeable to both sides and to the taxpayers of Manitoba to protect the health care system. I hope my honourable friend would at least try and put questions which would get us there rather than prevent us from getting there.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The only person trying to precipitate job action and not working to avoid a strike in this province is the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) for the Province of Manitoba.

\* (0910)

I want to ask him what he is trying to hide. He knows the timetable agreed to by the two sides. He knows that it was recognized and agreed to, that there would be a monetary position on the table by Monday of this week, not Friday the 14th, the last

scheduled day of negotiations. We want to know, what is he waiting for? Is he waiting for this Session to end, so he does not have to be under the scrutiny in the Legislature? Is he waiting to the last moment so that he can avoid any dialogue in this House on this issue? What is the Minister trying to hide? Surely he knows what he is going to put on the table. Why has he not put it on the table, and when is he going to put it on the table?

**Mr. Orchard:** I am not here to negotiate with the Health Critic for the New Democratic Party. There is a negotiating process which has been going on for the last several weeks. It involves Manitoba Health Organizations as representing the employers and presenting Government's offer. The bargaining table has at it—the membership of the MNU are involved in negotiations.

My honourable friend wants to bring the negotiations to the floor of the Legislature. Not only is that a most inappropriate way to approach it, it is also very disruptive. I can only conclude from that that my honourable friend wants to foment a strike in the health care system. If she persists in that kind of action, then she will carry the costs to the people of Manitoba, who may well be hurt by that kind of action.

I have no desire to have a strike in the health care system. Our negotiations have gone along very, very well to date. There will be a monetary offer on the table, and it will be one that I believe will precipitate the necessity for any further job action by the MNU in their respective facilities across this province. If that is not satisfactory to my honourable friend and she wants to continue to foment a strike, then carry on. I have nothing else I can add to my honourable friend, because negotiations are ongoing right now, will continue to go on until we reach a settlement with the Manitoba Nurses' Union.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** What the Minister is doing by not respecting the timetable of the two parties, the MHO and the MNU, is bordering on bad bargaining. It is bordering on bad-faith bargaining, Madam Chairperson. I would submit to the Minister that the only person who is causing tensions, who is inflaming an already serious situation, is the Minister responsible for health care in the Province of Manitoba.

All that we are asking and suggesting is that the two sides sit down and start talking about the most serious issue facing the nurses of this province. That

is their salaries and the wages they earn as hard-working professionals in this province.

It is clear I am not going to get anywhere with this Minister on this issue. I hope that he has the decency before noon today to put a monetary offer on the table, so that the two sides can have adequate time to start dealing with this very serious issue. We all know give and take is required. The Minister is not allowing adequate time for give and take. He has, in fact, precipitated action on the part of the nurses of this province to hold a strike vote on Saturday. We find that unconscionable, because it could have been avoided if this Minister had simply put a monetary offer on the table.

I am going to move on to another topic, Madam Chairperson, another one I raised the other day. We had just started talking about midwifery, and the Minister had mentioned that this was being discussed by the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses.

I would like to ask him if he is involving the other concerned groups on this issue who are very concerned about policies pertaining to midwifery, that being the Homebirth Network and the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Is he involving those two significant organizations in these discussions and in the development of policies pertaining to midwifery?

**Mr. Orchard:** Let me tell my honourable friend, that I am not involved in that at this time, because this committee is setting up to give us guidelines which we will then put out to the public and have those people put their input in.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Let us talk about excited rhetoric. The Minister likes to use that terminology. I think this might be a little too early in the day for the Minister to handle Estimates. I asked a very straightforward question, and I think it deserves a more serious response than that provided by the Minister.

I am not asking him if these organizations will be consulted after a policy has been drafted. I am asking him if he will include representatives of the Homebirth Network and the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women, this Government's own advisory body, in the deliberations on the development of policies pertaining to midwifery?

**Mr. Orchard:** As I indicated to my honourable friend in my last answer, that will happen.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Can the Minister tell us if he has looked at the recommendations of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women report, and if he has any early considerations, views, reflections on their recommendations?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes, Madam Chairman, I have a completely open mind on the subject. That is why I am seeking professional advice and have agreed to the study by the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses of Manitoba, who will provide me with a report to guide decision making in Government.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** On another matter that was touched on at our last sitting of Estimates, could the Minister indicate—he mentioned, when I asked him a question about staff in this secretariat, that the director of the secretariat is Connie Becker. I am wondering what happened to Dr. John Wade, who I believe was the director. Where is he now? Is he working for the Department of Health?

**Mr. Orchard:** My honourable friend is half right. One of the directors of the program is Dr. Connie Becker. Dr. John Wade, we used a vacant executive director position to establish a contract with Dr. John Wade via which he provided us services in terms of senior administration in the Policy and Planning Secretariat. That contract now, after one year, was not renewed. We have Dr. Wade working for the Government on a sessional basis, providing us input into a number of issues. The position of executive director, we hope to have filled some time in the near future.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The Minister mentioned that Dr. Wade is providing ongoing advice, I believe, on a contract basis for the Government of Manitoba. Could he indicate in what area he is doing that work?

**Mr. Orchard:** Various areas, much similar to what he provided for us over the past year, inclusive of meetings with various institutions to ascertain direction, program quality, initiatives taken by various health care facilities in an attempt to bring reforms to the system, in the health care system of Manitoba, that can allow us to provide and continue to provide excellent patient care, maybe refocusing our resources and doing things better, always with an eye on innovation and an eye on the fact that we no longer have the luxury of unlimited funding to resolve problems in the health care system.

Dr. Wade's advice—and the reason why we were so pleased to have him at full time for the last year is that he not only brought with him substantive knowledge of the workings of the Manitoba health care system, but he had the educational experience as the dean and then took a little over one-year sabbatical. He has spent extensive time in California working with the educational system, the delivery system, as well as he got a very good handle on new approaches that are emerging in health care and the system, and give him quite a balanced perspective. His advice is being actually very well received throughout the system, not simply to us, but his advice and consultation process is very well received, if my honourable friend were to take the time and talk to some of the executive directors that have been part of the meeting process that Dr. Wade has undertaken.

We hope to continue that relationship on a sessional basis, because Dr. Wade did not want to commit full time to the department.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The Minister is having a hard morning. I certainly was not questioning the credentials of Dr. John Wade. I am simply trying to ascertain on what basis his relationship with the Government of Manitoba continues, and where in the Estimates for the Department of Health the fee or contract arrangements show up.

**Mr. Orchard:** We have a vacant position of executive director. That salary is being redirected to provide those kinds of monies.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Could the Minister indicate what arrangements have been made with Dr. John Wade for payment of services? Is it on a contract basis, a fee-for-service basis or a salary?

**Mr. Orchard:** Sessional, Madam Chairman.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Could the Minister give us more details on what that means? What dollars are we looking at?

**Mr. Orchard:** Sessional rates, I believe, are in the neighbourhood of \$500 a day for a full day.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** On staff, with respect to this secretariat, it appears to me that this area has increased by about three staff from the Estimates approved last year. Could the Minister indicate what the need was for increasing staff in this area by three?

**Mr. Orchard:** There is increased staffing here. We are focusing in on the program evaluation, and we

have redirected staff from elsewhere within the Commission and the ministry to provide those positions for evaluation of what we do in the health care system to assure that we are meeting program needs and outcomes.

\* (0920)

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Is the Minister saying that there has been a commensurate decrease of three staff in the Health Services Commission?

**Mr. Orchard:** One from the Commission and two from the department.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Could the Minister indicate where in the department the two were taken from?

**Mr. Orchard:** We had staff years that were unfilled at the mental health centres which we redirected to provide the analytical services here.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The Minister is saying two positions came from the Brandon Mental Health Centre?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes, Madam Chairman.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I would just like to revert back for one second, while we are on staff, to Executive Support. I notice in this year's Estimates that in fact staff complement in terms of Professional/Technical staff has declined by one from the previous Estimates approved, but that salaries have gone up considerably, so that we now have four staff being paid at quite a bit more than five were approved for in the '89-90 Estimates.

I am wondering if the Minister could explain that?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, the information I have is that it is only in the area of Administrative Support that there has been an increase in salary budgeted for this fiscal year. In Managerial and Professional/Technical there has been, in fact, a decrease and an overall decrease.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I am comparing the salary line for the Professional/Technical category, and the amount that was approved in last year's budget for the fiscal year '89-90 for five staff was \$143,100.00. We now have the Minister recommending payment of \$218,700 for four staff under the Professional/Technical category.

**Mr. Orchard:** I do not know where my honourable friend is coming from, because in Policy and Planning Secretariat, the Professional/Technical staff salaries were budgeted at \$268,500 last year and are budgeted at \$253,100 this year. My

honourable friend obviously has a misprint over there.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I refer the Minister to his own detailed Estimates tabled in last year's Budget Debate where it clearly lists and recommends approval for \$143,100 for five SYs in the Professional/Technical category.

**Mr. Orchard:** I will just tell the—in Policy and Planning Secretariat, our Professional/Technical staff—this is a photostat out of the book—the budgeted salaries for Professional/Technical staff is down \$15,000 year over year.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Perhaps the Minister had not heard me. I was asking about the Professional/Technical staff under Executive Support.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I did not realize we had gone back to an item that we had already passed. I will try now to give my honourable friend whatever information she did not ask for the other day.

Professional/Technical staff I have—this brings in the Deputy Minister's salary into this year's Estimates.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Could the Minister indicate where in last year's Estimates then the Deputy Minister's salary falls?

**Madam Chairman:** I would remind the Honourable Member for St. Johns that we are dealing with 1.(d) Policy and Planning Secretariat. It is my understanding that all clauses prior to that and, in particular, the last two questions you framed have been dealt with and duly passed.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I realize that we have passed this item—from MHSC, that is where the Deputy Minister's salary was funded last year.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, I will just ask one final question on both lines together. So then the difference between \$143,100 and \$218,700 is basically explained in terms of the Deputy Minister's salary?

**Mr. Orchard:** That is correct, Madam Chairman.

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples):** Madam Chairperson, seems like I missed the first 20 minutes of excitement this morning. Could we go back to page 28 in the Supplementary Review? Last time we were on, I think, the last four items on page 28. Can the Minister tell us the results of the Seven Oaks Hospital Psychogeriatric Review, which was

conducted last year? Could we have a copy of those recommendations?

**Mr. Orchard:** I can tell my honourable friend that a preliminary report was completed late this fall, a draft report or whatever you want to call it. That has been forwarded to Seven Oaks, and they are reviewing the draft report and making comment. We expect that based on their response to the draft report that we ought to have a completed report early in the new year.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, could the Minister share with us some of the major findings of that report?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I would love to be able to do that, but I do not know what was in the draft report. Not that I am not interested and concerned and want to be fully informed, but I get enough completed reports that I have some difficulty getting around and reading that I have not read the draft report. I will confine my investigation when I receive the final report after having Seven Oaks presumably review the draft report and accept it or suggest legitimate changes.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us how much it cost for that report at this stage?

**Mr. Orchard:** It would be a portion of \$629,700 that we spent. It was all done internally. There was no external departmental cost. There was no externally attached individual, so the cost will have been contained within. Quite frankly, I do not think we have the ability internally to assign hours to specific reports to give you a number, but it is part of the \$630,000 budget.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, my reason was to ask if there were any external people who were hired to do the report and if it was within the Department of Health and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. That is fine.

\* (0930)

My next question is going to be in terms of the activity identification from the Department of Policy and Planning, to have representation on the Post-Graduate Medical Education Committee. Now can the Minister, because I asked him the other day some of the questions, what areas is this ministry going to look at in terms of the shortage, you know, within four or five or the next 10 years? Now, can he tell us who the person is who is sitting on this committee and what advice the Minister of Health

(Mr. Orchard) has given to this person who is sitting on this particular committee?

**Mr. Orchard:** Dr. John Wade, that was one of his activities in the past year. In his advisory capacity to Government, he will continue to provide us with his insight, but another staff person has been specifically given his former responsibilities in that.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us his own views and the views of his Government in terms of the advice given by him through Dr. John Wade to look at the various post-graduate programs and make sure that some of the programs, if they are not possible in one province and could be done in other provinces, what is the cost factor and also the other costs attached so the post-graduate programs in the future can be addressed? It is very difficult to have sometime all the programs in one province. If some of the programs can be done in Ontario or Saskatchewan or British Columbia, can the Minister tell us if they are thinking on that line?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, there have been some discussions amongst the western provinces, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, in terms of identifying strengths in training programs. They are moving toward giving Ministers the possibility to consider strengthening a program in one province in a specific area versus having everyone have a little piece of the action.

I think my honourable friend can appreciate that that has a lot of merit. I think that can provide a fair bit of strength in the excellence of training. There is the usual downside. Nobody wants to admit that maybe they ought to have the program carried out in Saskatoon or Calgary or Vancouver or Winnipeg and not have it in their own home turf, because we are always driven, and I use this word, and I have used it before, by vested interest in this.

Those kinds of decisions of interprovincial co-operation are most difficult ones because, although they may well make perfect sense from excellence of education and from being able to better utilize scarce resources amongst provinces, whenever a program is amalgamated with another one, I would suspect that there might be some and there might even be some inside this Chamber who would stand up and bemoan the loss of a given training program in Manitoba, it is a sign of chaos and decay in the health care system.

We have heard all the rhetoric before, not from my honourable friend, but I have heard it before. That is probably the approach that might be taken by some; I would hope by none of my informed critics. We have discussions that have been ongoing for at least a year and a half, two years, maybe even longer, I do not know, among the western provinces. They have been doing their discussions over the past number of months to try and see whether this is a reasonable approach to take and, given advice from the committee studying it, the western Ministers will give it some serious consideration.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, I think the Minister has made a significant point in this area. It is not going to be possible in the near future to have all the programs in all the provinces. It is not economically otherwise possible because of the limited resources. Certainly in some specialty areas, it is not going to be possible at all. That is why I think it does not matter which political Party is going to be in Government. It is going to be a difficult choice, but if they are working together with three or four provinces it would make some sense.

That is why when the Minister I think last year attended the conference, some of the discussions took place in terms of sharing in some of the major programs in the hospital having, for example, Hamilton for a transplant or some other special areas and making sure that some of the cost can be shared from the province to the other province so that ultimately money can be saved.

Certainly, other than the major specialties, we have no difficulty, but some of the areas where at least we could have the access to go through the program I would rather have at least a partial access rather than nothing. I think most of the people in the area of education at the U of M and also the medical faculty are very serious in terms of making sure that the students from this province will at least have access to those programs, and the cost can be shared. That is one way of saving money in the long run.

My next question is in terms of, one of the areas of identification is that the Deputy Minister from this province will take part in the activities of others, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Can the Minister tell us how many times they have met and what is their basic agenda in terms of the health care cost?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, let me understand my honourable friend's question. It is on investigating the training programs among the western provinces.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, my question was in terms of one of the areas this department has identified, the feasibility study for western Canadian Deputy Ministers on the health care policies. Can the Minister tell us how many times the Deputy Minister of Health has met with the other Deputy Ministers on the issue of health care planning and policy? What is there in terms of the agenda for the health care cost in the western provinces?

**Mr. Orchard:** The western Deputy Ministers have met four times. There are a number of agenda items, both formal and informal, part of which was seeking out whether there is consensus on the training programs. Part of it is sharing, as I find one of the greatest advantages of meeting with my counterparts the Ministers, with what has been working in terms of—because every province has had a major or is in the process of a major examination of their health care system. Whether you call it The Rainbow Report in Alberta, every province is doing an investigation on how to reform the health care system to get better value for service delivery for patients. The deputies, as do the Ministers, pick each other's brains and pick the winners out of some of the programs that have been tried and tried with some success.

I cannot be more specific than that, but the deputies have met four times in the last year, western deputies, and there have been a number of other—my deputy is chairing and is part of a number of other Deputy Minister subcommittees which involves all the provincial deputies, et cetera. To the area of the western discussions in terms of training and other areas, four times.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us during these discussions if at any given time they have discussed the aspect of charging fees for some of the services, because Alberta has been thinking of doing the same thing and B.C. is already talking.

\* (0940)

Can the Minister make a clear statement if they have ever discussed the possibility of user fees?

**Mr. Orchard:** That has not been a topic on the agenda, Madam Chairman.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us what are the health care demonstration projects being undertaken by this department at the present stage?

If they would like to just provide us a list rather than reading through a whole list in the Estimates process, that should be okay.

**Mr. Orchard:** Two are still ongoing and outstanding. The shortened hospital stay for low birth weight infants at the Health Sciences Centre is ongoing, and funding has been extended to the end of this month.

In the psychoeducational program for families of schizophrenics, Health Sciences Centre, that project funding has also been extended to the end of this month and reports, we expect, will follow on both of those in the near future.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister give us an update on the premature birth program out of the Health Sciences Centre?

**Mr. Orchard:** I would like to give an update to my honourable friend, but we do not have that with us this morning.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, the Minister just said a few minutes ago, so far they will be receiving funding for this year. Can he tell me if this program, like the newborn program at Health Sciences Centre, will be receiving funding for next year or not?

**Mr. Orchard:** The funding will end, I am informed, at the end of this month, and then an evaluation will be made as to the results, the effectiveness, the appropriateness of the project, and decisions on funding will be made post that evaluation process.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, I did not catch the second program the Minister was saying about the schizophrenic society program. Can he give us an update on that program? Will that program be receiving money next year or not?

**Mr. Orchard:** Again, as a demonstration project, funding has been continued until the end of this year. A report evaluating the effectiveness of the funding will follow, and then based on that funding, decisions on how to integrate the program, if it is an effective one, into the system will be made.

I just want to tell my honourable friend that that is the purpose of the evaluation modalities that we are putting in place now. I know we have talked about this before, but my office is constantly approached, the ministry and the Health Services Commission

are constantly approached to undertake projects. Every proponent will, almost in all cases, indicate that they believe they can save money in the system. They have a more cost effective approach. They sincerely believe when they say that, that it can be achieved.

What has been the difficulty is that previously, when such approvals were made, there was not a requirement for a strong evaluation component to prove, if you will, the statement that they could save them money. We recognized that as a problem almost immediately upon entering office.

We changed a couple of things. We have put a fairly significant evaluation component—that is why we strengthened the Policy and Planning Secretariat with the three reallocated staffing to do analysis of projects, so we can assure ourselves that when we recommend this to the system, it is going to be providing either equivalent or better services at hopefully lowered costs or levelled costs, so we are not facing the cost increases.

Also, on demonstration projects that we have undertaken in the last little while, not only are we insisting on a strong evaluation component but the business plan, if you will—put brackets around business plan—on which proposals are approved for funding have to identify what they are going to do, in what manner they are going to deliver the program, what they expect the results to be and where they can replace a higher cost service in the system.

The hoped for outcome is that if their program works as they say and they replace institutional costs in the community, we then have the demonstrated, analyzed and proven vehicle to go to the institutions and say, look, we are diverting resources to the community base, and we are saving you X, Y, Z resources. Therefore that is how we are making the shift from institution to community, as an example.

You know, in all of these areas where we have tried demonstration projects, the evaluation post conclusion of the demonstration or the project is critically important for us to make decision making in future budget years. As I say—as I repeated already—that is why we have strengthened the evaluation component over here.

I have to tell you that my honourable friend has aided and abetted in this because over the past two sets of Estimates he has been very, very insistent

and very, very inquiring as to what our analytical capacity is to evaluate programs. Very much we are moving in that direction, and my honourable friend's goal has been our goal.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, I think we did spend last year and in 1988 considerable time because a lot of projects have been going for the last few years and some of them never had any major evaluation done. Especially, the Minister has made very clear there when you are spending money, you want to know where it is going and how much it is going to save and if there are any alternate ways of having health care delivery. Simply giving grants for short-term purposes is not going to have a major policy development and if something can be derived out of some of the programs, especially the program out of Health Sciences Centre where the newborn program is very effective, it is saving money in the long run.

The follow-up has been very good, because I know the program. I know the staff there who have been working very hard. It is a very research-oriented place, and I think they are saving money in the long run. I am not advocating for expensive programs, but if you have an insight into some of these programs, I would like to share that. If they cannot even cut down a one-week stay in the hospital, I think at least they will save \$600 per day. That is the minimum for intensive care, probably more than that. I think it is a good way of dealing with some of the financial restraints on the department.

Can the Minister tell us now from research from the Policy and Planning Secretariat, have they assisted anybody from the Province of Manitoba to have access to the research fund from the federal Government? I think some of the research money in some of the departments—one of the examples I will give to the Minister was on the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program. We did ask questions last year, and the Minister said they were going to look into that.

Would the Minister like to answer that particular question now, or shall we wait until we go to the other item? I think it is extremely important that we should get our fair share of the funding which is available through the federal Government—but to have access to that funding you need some assistance, and if the assistance is being provided by the department or not. Because in the area of health, like anything else, research is the fundamental aspect. If you lose the research money

and if you do not have access to the money, some of the programs will not come to Manitoba.

**Mr. Orchard:** Let me deal with the first comments my honourable friend made. You are absolutely right that if we can in meaningful ways reduce, particularly with low birth weight infants, their length of time in hospital, particularly in both of our teaching hospitals which have both the intensive and the intermediate care nurseries, there is substantial potential for saving. I simply want to tell my honourable friend the general direction that we are trying to head in the department.

\* (0950)

I will share with you the anecdote out of Second Opinion that just brought it all home for me, and I use this quite often when I speak on where we are going in the system reform of health care. Second Opinion is quite an interesting book. The only disappointment I had in it is that the author kept me completely enthralled with the book by good authorship, good examples, good writing, but by the promise that in the last chapter he is going to tell me how to save all this money. Unfortunately when we got to the last chapter, I was disappointed. Other than that, that book was a very good one.

The example that stuck in my mind was, and I am not going to paraphrase it exactly as it was in the book, but basically the authorities noticed, the Government or whomever, that there were people reaching a point in the river and they were just on their last gasp. They were going down for the third time. They were almost drowned, so they would fish them out and they would revive them. This was happening on a more regular basis, so they kept developing more and more sophisticated ways to save these almost drowned individuals at this point in the river.

They had a rescue team. It was equipped with the best of equipment and the latest innovation. It was fast. They were hauling these people out on a regular basis and saving them. Finally, after spending all of this resource on rescuing these near-drowned people, which is a very laudable goal, someone asked the question, well, how are they getting in the river in the first place? They walked upstream a half mile and they arrested the fellow that was throwing them in. Now, a very simple analogy, but I think very demonstrative of where we have gone in our health care system generally.

We have focused in the Province of Manitoba through the medical intervention line, through our hospitals and through the physicians probably \$1.3 billion of spending, and the argument has always been made that we have not spent the money on finding out what causes the ill health in many ways. We have been moving in that direction as quickly as possible.

In the case of low birthweight babies, probably the most economic thing we can do, and this is where we hope to be guided over the next couple of years, is to bring in a very strong program for—and maybe it has to be targeted at higher incident groups to prevent low birthweight babies so that through nutrition, through guidance during the pregnancy period, mothers will have a much better chance of not having that low birthweight baby, because there are mitigable lifestyle factors which, if known ahead of time, can prevent that. That just fits into the story on a second opinion.

Let me deal with the second aspect of my honourable friend's question in terms of federal funding participation. Generally, and I say this as a general term because there will be specific instances where we do not do as well because competition is pretty tough for research dollars, not only from the federal Government, but also from national and international firms that provide research funding. The competition for it is very, very stiff as my honourable friend can well appreciate and knows.

As a general term we do exceptionally well in Manitoba. Our research community is well thought of. It is probably one of the best kept secrets in the Province of Manitoba. Again, an area that we hope to address in the next number of months, so that we do reasonably well in terms of accessing federal funding and quite well in terms of accessing both private funds nationally and internationally.

In the five Centres for Excellence that the federal Government funded a little while back, did we not get a piece of the action on three out of five? I may stand corrected, but the federal Government established, and there was very substantive competition for Centres of Excellence research dollars that the federal Government put up. There were five major research areas, and we, in Manitoba, participate to a fairly significant degree in three of the five areas, which gives you an example of the excellence we have.

I think in terms of research, that is why we committed, what, \$260,000 annually to the World Health Organization's Collaborative Centre on the quality of care and cancer treatment at St. Boniface, Dr. Schipper and group. That is just a tremendous example of the excellence in research that we do in Manitoba.

To answer my honourable friend's question—and I will try to be more brief in the future—yes, we do reasonably well. We do not always get all the dollars we would like to have but that is not unusual. I guess everybody is wanting to do the same thing, but we do have reasonable success in terms of the competition.

What has enabled us to be a little more aggressive, too, is the fact that last year we added, what, a million and some dollars. A million one I guess it was, just over \$1 million annually to the \$900,000 research budget of the Manitoba Health Research Council. We nearly doubled the budget.

That has assisted them in being much more active in their pursuit of other source funding, because often research is a collaborative approach of some provincial money through the Manitoba Research Council and private foundations in Winnipeg, the Health Sciences Centre, Children's, St. Boniface, supplementing that and then seeking federal Government matching funding or private funding from both national and international firms.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister give us an update on the virology lab, when actually that project is going to start, and what this department has done to make sure that all benefits from the virology lab, in the future, will come to the College of Medicine and the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba?

Two years ago this was a topic for major discussion between the City of Winnipeg, the Government of Manitoba and the federal Government, but we have not seen any solid plans, any concrete action. It probably looks like when they are going to call the federal election in 1992, that may be the time for them to initiate that. I would like the Minister to tell us what they have done to assure that we do not have to wait for 1992.

**Mr. Orchard:** I do not have in front of me the current schedule for construction. What I can share with my honourable friend is two things. First of all, the site selection process was a very long discussed one. There was a lot of lobby effort. I will say this, taking

a small amount of credit, because I supported, this Government supported the downtown site.

It just, to us, made the most sense. So we put our advice to that location. At every occasion we had, I gave strong moral, personal and whatever support I could to the blue ribbon committee that was in the site selection, after the decision is made, to make sure that was accepted, because even after the decision was made there was substantial lobby, my honourable friend knows, to the then federal Minister, Mr. Epp, to not choose that downtown site.

They made arguments from landing paths for aircrafts. I mean you name it, they had everything on the go; but a decision was made on location. Subsequent to that the city has agreed and is proceeding with site preparation for the lab in terms of the Works Yard relocation. Just off the top of my head, I cannot tell you the name of the firm, but design is going on for the lab. This is a high-level containment lab, so that the design work, I understand, takes quite a little while.

From our perspective, we want this ground to be broken as quickly as possible. As far as we know, that is the position of the federal Government for a very obvious reason; the longer you delay, the more your potential construction costs escalate. The federal Government has allocated so many dollars towards the project, so that delays have the negative impact of impacting on how much the project can cost.

\* (1000)

I know that there is probably a great deal of resistance yet, at the bureaucratic level in Ottawa, not to move out of the inner sanctums of the world in their eyes, I am sure, of Ottawa. We do not share that. We have argued, from a position of strength with the federal Government on this issue, that we have undertaken a major decentralization of our provincial Government from Winnipeg to communities throughout rural Manitoba.

We lauded the federal Government when they made the decision they were going to decentralize some of their activities from Ottawa to Winnipeg, namely the virology lab and other initiatives. We believe that it fits with good public policy. From that standpoint, we not only argue the merits of the policy but we have a track record which says we are also living by what we say, you know, not saying one thing and doing another, so that our pressure is on. Our discussions involve, at staff levels, et cetera,

encouragement to make sure this process continues and gets ground broken as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us, other than The Mental Health Act for which the Minister is going to bring some amendments, is there any other area that in the next Session we should be looking for changes, in the health regulations?

**Mr. Orchard:** There may be a couple. There may be other Acts that require some amendments, because I have not brought any amendments in for a couple of years. The Mental Health Act is clearly going to be, you know, as significant a series of amendments as we will make. There may be some minor amendments come forward, but as I stand now, I am not aware of any significant changes driven by court decisions or anything else that say we are wrong and have to make appropriate change.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, my last question on this section, can the Minister tell us what his Government is doing in terms of bringing the health care industry to Manitoba, because this is one area where progress can be made? You do not need, you know, ships, boats and all those things. I think that we are in the middle of this country, and the health care industry is undergoing a major expansion all through North America.

What special initiatives are being forward by his ministry, because I think that there is a chance for bringing more jobs for Manitoba, especially with the Virology Lab? I know they brought the manufacturer of oxygen cylinders at one of the towns in Manitoba, but what other area is the Minister going to look at to make sure that the health care industry, in terms of some of the manufacturing industry—and also, is there any possibility some major pharmaceutical company could come and have the expansion in Manitoba?

**Mr. Orchard:** Well, Madam Chairman, I am going to confess a little bit of cross-departmental shifting of responsibility. The major responsibility centre for the health industry and the attraction of investment, job creation, and presence in the health industry, lies with my honourable colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst), where the Health Industry Development Initiative is currently funded, staffed and developing program.

Let me tell my honourable friend that there are some key areas we have identified as growth areas. I will give you just some brief background of where Government in general has gone over the last couple of years. Centre for Products on Aging, and I probably have the name wrong. I never can get the name right, but you know what I am talking about.

We viewed that as a particularly promising initiative, because it brings together all the players in the industry, from consumer through to potential innovators of new products. We believe that given our central location, our north-south access into the U.S. market, we have the ability to have a manufacturing presence in the Province of Manitoba. That is confirmed by firms like Otto Bock who are here and are pretty satisfied with their relationship with Manitoba and the ability to move into new product lines, et cetera. We have enjoyed a good working relationship with that firm.

On the issue of oxygen concentrators—and let me just give you the background of that. Oxygen concentrators, concentration is a technology that has been in place for awhile. What we were missing in Manitoba was a policy under which it would be advantageous for hospitals to even consider oxygen concentration.

Now, when I first came into office in May of 1988, the proposal was sitting there that made a lot of sense. There had been some discussion at the federal side to see whether there was any assistance to have the firm locate in Manitoba. One of the difficulties was that they wanted to have some assurance that they could market their product in Manitoba. It only made sense to me to do that.

In discussions with Manitoba Health Services Commission, we changed regulations within a couple of months of coming into office and developed a policy whereby most of these oxygen concentrators will pay for themselves in anywhere from—well, in the case of Churchill, I guess about 10 months, to other facilities where there is maybe a three- to six-year payout of the entire capital cost.

So the proposal we put to them is, replace your current oxygen cost, your bottled oxygen cost, with the oxygen concentrator, putting your purchase cost towards the capital retirement of the installation. At the end of the capital payout period of time, whether it be eight or nine months as in Churchill, or five or six years, or two years, or three years, depending on the facility, then you will retain within your facility

two-thirds of the savings. Government will retain the other third.

There was a positive incentive for the facilities to move. As a result of that, we were able to make a commitment for a minimum of a dozen installations over an 18-month period of time. I think we are up to around 20 now, and as a consequence, Rimer-Alco has a Manitoba presence. That will certainly be their Canadian presence and may well be their North American presence in oxygen concentration.

I am excited about that technology from the hospital's standpoint, but I believe that the world is wide open in terms of oxygen concentration in environmental initiatives. If you get into high temperature burns you need oxygen, and I think oxygen concentration has a place there. I believe that oxygen concentration can have a place potentially in bleaching of pulp in a much more environmentally friendly way. There are demonstration projects. I think we are on a leading edge with a company whose technology is world-leading in Rimer-Alco out of Wales—great potential.

Let me talk about two other areas, and then I am going to sit down. We have some significant presence in the pharmaceutical field in Manitoba already. Trimel Corporation, recently acquired, is part of the Manitoba health care manufacturing scene and is going to be a big presence in the province. It is located outside of Winnipeg, and is going to be a big presence in the province.

Other corporations looking at Manitoba—our own home-grown ABI Biotechnology, I think has a great deal of potential in the province. We are trying to support them in a number of different ways. Western Diversification recently provided funds, and we were very supportive of that application because they are into the fermentation technology which is really, I guess—I speak from a non-technical standpoint—but the fermentation processes in terms of development of new pharmaceuticals and other drugs, I guess, is the generic way to call them, is leading edge technology, and we have got it here in Winnipeg. We have as good a technical group, I understand, as exists in Canada in that regard. Very much some of the things we are doing are building upon some of the strengths that were inherent in the Manitoba community, and our initiatives are trying to continue to build on that.

Research does play an important part in that, and that is why we put the additional money into research. That is why we focused the \$1 million a year in addition to the research community, so that we could undertake research with \$1 million a year for four years which would have a market focus to it, and an end product creation focus to it.

**Ms. Wasylcia-Leis:** I would like to raise a couple of more issues under this section since I am not sure where they would fit otherwise.

The first has to do with the whole question of research done by this department pertaining to the links between health care and income. Just yesterday we received the reports of a new study done by the National Council of Welfare showing that low income earners tend to die significantly sooner and spend more time suffering from poor health than people with much higher incomes.

In fact, the report also quoted another study which found that high income earners enjoy an average of 11 more years of good health than those with low incomes. That report follows on the heels of other reports such as the one about a year ago from the Canadian Institute of Child Health linking infant mortality and poverty.

\*(1010)

I am wondering if this branch of the department has done similar research, or if it has accepted the results of these studies. What is the strategy pertaining to dealing with this incredibly important linkage?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I want to thank my honourable friend for bringing this issue to the House because my honourable friend is endorsing everything that we have done to date in terms of coming to grips with this issue, inclusive of bringing in taxation, and economic and management measures in Government, which will assure that our economy grows and that we have the wealth in our economy, new wealth generation which provides those kinds of jobs so that we can eliminate poverty directly through a growing economy, through creation of new jobs, through the creation of wealth from those new jobs.

There is probably no greater, as my honourable friend has just indicated, contributor to health than family income. Family income in this free society of ours is a direct function of the private sector economy, its strength and its ability to create good-paying, meaningful jobs in the provincial

economy. That is our economic side of the issue, and I am pleased to see my honourable friend buying into that. Some days, when I hear some of her colleagues questioning it, I do not get that impression of understanding the importance of the strength in the economy as it links directly to health.

I am ahead of those studies, and this department is ahead of those studies that my honourable friend has mentioned, because we have established for instance, within Government, a healthy public policy initiative. That healthy public policy initiative recognizes, as I have been saying for upwards of a year now—the last time I was in Brandon, just on December 1st, speaking more directly to the topic, I spoke to the topic of healthy public policy, as a result of background work that we have done upwards of a year previous to that in developing a healthy public policy.

Let me explain that to my honourable friend. We do not believe, in the Ministry of Health, this Government does not believe, that it is the sole reason for good health indicator. The \$1.7 billion that we spend on health does not do as much to create health status as many other factors beyond the Department of Health, factors such as housing, factors such as the economy and its ability to create meaningful jobs, factors such as no anarchy in society so that you can walk safely in communities, et cetera. So there is community health involved.

As a result, the healthy public policy that we have enunciated and bought into brings together the Deputy Ministers in a working committee of a number of departments, Family Services, Education, Justice, Highways, because all of those departments in their policy pronouncements, some of their initiatives, some of their spending programs, are focusing on the issues of what determines the health of population. Housing certainly does, highways in terms of making highways safe, or a vehicle inspection, justice in terms of drinking and driving, and the toughest legislation on drinking and driving in Canada, very much a determinant of health.

Now, that is the healthy public policy standpoint, and that is basically what a number of organizations are talking about as a healthy public policy. I think we are the first provincial Government in Canada to have a formally structured healthy public policy initiative with a structure amongst Deputy Ministers, and a commitment by Government that this is where we are moving.

We deal with other areas. My honourable friend talked about the linkage, the relationship between income and health status. That is why we have announced the funding and the creation of the Manitoba centre for health policy and evaluation, because we believe that through the analysis of our information and statistics through calling upon experts across Canada, we will find that we have a unique opportunity in Manitoba with the kind of healthy public policy initiatives that we have already started, and our data base, and the understanding of the system that flows across departmental lines in Manitoba, that health is not merely the prerogative and the initiative of the Department of Health alone, that it is very much a cross-departmental initiative. That the centre for health policy and evaluation will lead us to policy development, program development, which will genuinely reform the health care system.

The difficulty we have had, and I fault my honourable friends as Government before and I fault ourselves as Government before that, all of us have talked about health promotion and education and wellness and other areas that are necessary to be invested in. Previous Governments, I put it bluntly to you, have not lived by what they said. There have not been the pro-active initiatives to move the system towards an education and prevention model away from the high cost curative institutional system that I talked over with my honourable friend from The Maples just a few minutes ago. We spend, in our institutions and between our physicians, \$1.1 billion, \$1.2 billion. It is all post-healthy public policy, if you will, because we are curing the problem after the fact, and everybody says we cannot do that.

So what are we doing? Well, for instance, we contributed significant resource to a healthy heart survey in the Province of Manitoba a year and a half ago. The first results of that came out. I have not got my notes with me, but one of the most positive headlines that I have read in terms of health care and bringing about public understanding was about six or seven weeks ago in the Winnipeg Free Press, where they analyzed and reported on what the survey of Manitobans showed in terms of heart health risk, because cardiovascular disease and death is still one of the greatest killers in Manitoba—the No. 1 killer.

You know that the factors causing it are in the main, lifestyle-controllable factors such as smoking, stress, exercise, diet, alcohol consumption. All

lifestyle-related initiatives, and what we have put parameters around is whether specific groups in society are at higher risk to varying lifestyles, and so we can focus our health promotion program on those target groups to reduce the incidence of abusive lifestyles in terms of heart health. We think that is the way to go and we will show progress and we will show direction. That is an initiative that is well under way in the Province of Manitoba to put flesh and blood into the carcass of health promotion and education to make it happen. It is only one part of many.

I want to tell my honourable friend that the centre for health policy and evaluation is in my estimation absolutely unique in Canada and maybe in unique in North America, because what we have in Manitoba is a statistical data base that is two decades old, and by sheer quirk of, I guess, of individual decision, because there was no Government policy driving this. We have had individualized data in Manitoba for 20 years. That data, when compared with socioeconomic data from census data, can lead us to positive conclusions as to how various factors outside of the \$1.7 billion that we are debating today influenced the health status of Manitobans.

We can thereby have world-leading research conclusions on what are the factors driving health, what is the role in a publicly funded health care system and where is the policy development role of Government to assure that we do the things that maintain health rather than intervene post-ill health in a very expensive way and a very high tech way that even my honourable friend has criticized from time to time.

\* (1020)

So I simply tell my honourable friend, in all of these areas, we are well ahead of the nation in terms of our planning, our understanding of the issue, the policy development that we have put out for the public of Manitoba, and in the creation of very sophisticated, well-funded—because there is \$3.5 million dedicated over three years to the centre for health policy and evaluation to bring to the public forum informed analysis on the determinants of health so that we, as Government of Manitoba, can be guided in our funding decisions, our policy development decisions.

We believe, and I sincerely believe this, that this will be of such significance nationally and

internationally, that centre will be self-sustaining from outside sources of research before the end of its three-year time period because of the excellence of opportunity that centre has in delivering real and usable goals for health care planning in Canada and in the free world.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairman, yes, Manitoba is in the lead. We are in the lead in terms of one of the highest poverty rates among children to the point where today roughly one in four children in Manitoba live in poverty. We have one of the highest mortality rates among children anywhere in Canada, somewhere in the neighbourhood of one and a half times higher than a province like Ontario and Quebec.

While the Minister speaks of their economic plans, which is basically the Mulroney approach of let the free market determine what happens in our society, a hands-off approach, the gap between the rich and the poor is growing and babies are dying. I cannot believe what I am hearing this morning. I would have hoped, in the context of child poverty and infant mortality, the Minister might have gotten off the propaganda of his Government, whether here in Manitoba or in Ottawa, and started talking in terms of some real solutions, getting at the roots of infant poverty and infant mortality.

Not only did we hear about how their hands-off approach to a very serious economic situation, a recession, is contributing to greater poverty and mortality, but the other thing that the Minister brings to this debate is, we just have to change lifestyles. If only we can change lifestyles, then we will have dealt with the major problem facing health problems in our society today. We will have made enormous gains, and we will have led the country in terms of great advances in improving the health care for poor Canadians and for poor children.

He did not mention a thing about the economic and social barriers to good health. He did not tell me that he was taking a leading position and urging his colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), to ensure that school boards had the resources to continue breakfast programs and lunch programs for poor kids. He did not tell me he was lobbying his colleague, the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), to ensure that funds were put in place for parent-child centres, which actually have proven to be effective in terms of preventing health problems among children, child abuse among children. He did not tell me he was working with his

colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), to find ways to put some dollars in the pockets of the poorest elements of our society. He did not tell me he was fighting for greater services for Child and Family agencies, so that those community-based services would have the resources to help protect children and prevent further abuse and violence in our society today.

All he talks about is changing lifestyles, suggesting over and over again that if only these people would just change their lifestyles. Stop drinking and driving. Stop doing things to their health that, if they used their senses and came to their wits, they would be able to change. He did not address the roots of the problem. He did not give me a single assurance that he was leading the way in terms of real, substantive solutions to a most serious problem.

I am not going to pursue this much further, Madam Chairperson, but I will ask the Minister, since he claims to be so far in the lead in terms of dealing with the difficult issue of mortality and poverty, poor health and poverty. Perhaps he can tell this House, or table in this House, during these Estimates this morning, his response to Article 24 of the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child, and give us his very specific, concrete plan of action for dealing with the subsections to that Article dealing with, infant and child mortality; necessary medical assistance and health care to all children; combating disease and malnutrition; ensuring adequate nutritious food and clean drinking water; ensuring appropriate post- and pre-natal care for all expectant mothers.

I think in that context he should start recognizing that we are dealing with a particularly serious situation when it comes to our aboriginal community. He should pay attention to the statistics showing that deaths among Native children in the first week of life on reserves is about 80 percent higher than for the population as a whole.

I want him to tell us how he is going to ensure equal access to education and use of supports in terms of social services, education, and other aspects of society; how he actually is working in a very concerted, meaningful way to develop preventative health care and working very hard to eliminate, to reduce poverty so that we can then reduce poor health care and, in fact, mortality.

**Mr. Orchard:** I say this with all the respect I can muster for my honourable friend from St. Johns. I really believed, I genuinely believed that she had a greater understanding of the challenges of the system than what she has demonstrated this morning. What my honourable friend demonstrated this morning was the philosophy that has guided her Party over the last number of years, that the solution to every single problem that faces society and its individuals and its families can be solved by Government funding and Government spending.

I had genuinely thought that my honourable friend had a little larger understanding of what problems can be solved, and how, than what she demonstrated this morning. It is the same old story of let us spend more in Government. My honourable friend, we are dealing with the Department of Health, and our \$1.7 billion of spending. She has suggested a whole series of spending in every other department, from Family Services to Education, to any number of other departments that she went through in her quick list of quick-fix solutions.

\* (1030)

The one thing that she forgot to ever mention, and this is where we started the Estimates debate some ten days ago, where does the money come from? Where does the money come from to do all of these things that you believe are going to cure the problems? When I make that statement, I remind my honourable friend that her philosophy governed this province for, I suppose, 14 of the last 19 years. She comes up with these statistics today as if they have miraculously appeared in the last 48 months since we have come into Government. Those are problems that my honourable friend had when she sat in Treasury Bench. I submit—and we will debate this as long as we have to—that did not create one single solution through the “pour money at it” philosophy of the New Democratic Party over the last six and a half years of Howard Pawley and the New Democratic Party, prior to that, Mr. Schreyer.

If you ask anyone who is an objective observer and ask them to take themselves back in time to 1970, prior to the advent of the New Democratic Party philosophy in Government in Manitoba, ask them whether 20 years later there are fewer social problems today than there were 20 years ago, the answer will be an unequivocal “No.” There are more problems today than there were 20 years ago. Why is that? Is that because we have spent all of these monies in all of the areas that my honourable friend

says is the magic solution? If it worked, if my honourable friend's approach to this worked, why do we have more problems 20 years later after experimenting and dabbling with this?

My honourable friend says, all we talk about is this horrible thing called a healthy economy—investment, job creations, new taxation, new wealth to spend. All we ever talk about is this horrible, private sector economy. Let it just roll, she says, let it just roll. Well, I want to tell my honourable friend I am going to try to do something for her to bring her into the 1990s, and it will not be me that does it. It will not be me that does it, it will be —(interjection)—

If I need any comment from the person sitting beside the critic, she will stand up and give them. Until then she might do the courteous thing of listening.

I am going to do something for my honourable friend from St. John (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), and I will invite her friend behind her. I am going to try to arrange a presentation to my honourable friend from the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research. I will try to get a Dr. Fraser Mustard in.

Now my honourable friend shakes her head knowingly because automatically I think she has come to the conclusion that this would not be anything she would want to listen to. Well, that is fine, but —(interjection)— oh, no problem. We can do that too. Because his solution and we have listened—I have read the book. Have you read the book? No, well obviously you have not read the book. Read the book, and you will find out that he talks about the problems without treating the solutions and that is not an appropriate answer any more.

You have talked about the problems this morning. You tried for 14 out of 19 years to solve them with more Government money. You ruined our ability to create new wealth in this province by constantly driving private sector investment out of this province. That is the fundamental woe and evil we have had. That is why I asked you at the start of Estimates, do you still adhere to the NDP philosophy that you can tax, tax, tax? You did not answer that.

Do you still believe in the NDP philosophy that you can go to the money markets with \$500 million of deficits year in and year out and drive the interest cost, in six and a half short years of budget under Howard Pawley and the NDP, from \$90 million a year to \$560 million a year and say you are going to

maintain all of the social benefits you want while you are spending \$470 million a year outside this province on interest, not delivering one single meal in the education system to a student who needs it, not delivering one single program to a Native and aboriginal community in remote northern Manitoba to prevent ill health because all of that money goes to the NDP financial friends in New York, Zurich and Tokyo? That is where the money goes instead of into programs. That has been the fundamental problem with this economy.

Now to get back to what Dr. Fraser Mustard said. He posed a very important question, and my honourable friend says we are doing terribly in Manitoba. Well, she is wrong. We are doing well in Manitoba compared to any other country in this nation. We are doing very, very well. I will compare it to any other province, and we are doing quite well.

If my honourable friend wants to listen and we can deal with that too, if my honourable friend wants to listen, she believes that all of this social spending that she has adhered to for the last number of years is going to solve all the problems, and it does not matter if you have to borrow the money to do it. You do it anyway. It does not matter if you take interest tax dollars out of average Manitobans, send them to Zurich and Tokyo instead of spending them on programs in Manitoba. That does not matter. In the NDP philosophy, it is all right to do that.

Well, I do not believe it is all right to do that, and most Manitobans do not believe it is all right to do that. That is why they booted you unceremoniously out of office in 1988 and will continue to leave you out of office. You are nice people to have around as sort of a social conscience, but you are damn poor in Government because you ruin every place you step. You watch Ontario and you see Premier "Bob and weave" and what he is going to do to the Province of Ontario.

Now, let me get back to Fraser Mustard. Fraser Mustard presented a chart. The whole issue was in terms of spending on health care and nations spend varying amounts of their GDP on health care. We are amongst the highest and the U.S. is the highest. He presented another chart, and I wish I had the comments here, and I would give his comments directly. I will paraphrase him for you, and if ever you have an opportunity you might be able to listen to them directly.

There is a post-World War II analysis of the leading industrial countries of the western world, and the chart is the average length of life because that is one health indicator, and it is not the best one but it is a reasonable one. In every industrialized nation, post-World War II, the average life of the citizens of those countries went up. The graph was a fairly steadily climbing one, but the chart showed one country, and that country was Japan.

In post-World War II, Japan had an average life expectancy below the other industrialized nations of Sweden and France and Great Britain and the United States and Canada and Germany, less, below. Does my honourable friend follow that? The average length of life in Japan was below. In the most recent comparison they have shot dramatically above all other industrialized nations. They have a healthier population today than any other industrialized nation, and they started out some scant 40 years ago with a lower degree of health in their population. What is the secret? Well, if I listen to my honourable friend, it is spending. Got to be spending on health care, got to be spending on everything that she mentioned.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

You know the observation that Dr. Fraser Mustard made was that it is not spending on health care, because they spend roughly one-half of what we do in Canada on health care. So what is the answer? You know what the answer is for my honourable friend from St. Johns? The answer is that the Japanese economy has grown and grown substantially. They have not frittered their money away borrowing it for the future, taxing future Manitobans.

They have created an economic environment where investment is rewarded with profit, where there are jobs with income to the citizens. Because of that income, those citizens have bought better housing, been able to afford better nutrition, educate their children very well, provide for their children from birthrate through to their post-education years very well, because of one single clear and unequivocal factor that is different in Japan than any other nation that was compared, and that is that their economy is stronger, more productive, more profitable, more beneficial to the people. That is the single difference between Japan's dramatic increase in health status compared to ours or the United States or any other industrialized country.

That is why the emphasis of this Government, as well as maintaining our health care system and our support system, is so much towards the creation of a vibrant economy in the Province of Manitoba that provides real opportunities for jobs, real opportunities for growth. That means a taxation system that is competitive, a taxation system that rewards the innovators and the risk takers. A taxation system that does not penalize the horrible word profit in an NDP vocabulary. If we do not get there in terms of a good, solid economy in this nation, then we are not going to be able to afford any social programs. That is the bottom-line message from Dr. Fraser Mustard.

\* (1040)

You know my honourable friend keeps talking about—oh, do not tell me, yes, I have it—my honourable friend used to wave this document until she read it. She used to read the document called *The Future of Canada's Health Care System - the End of Federal Funding?*, a report for the Canadian Health Coalition in October 1990. She used to wave this report. This report is written by, in part, Tim Sale.

### Point of Order

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I am just wondering if I could get an answer to my question, which was about the U.N. declaration on the rights of children?

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** The Honourable Member did not have a point of order.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, my honourable friend used to wave this report as her more recent bible in health care planning until some of the quotations were read back to her out of it. I want to read one to her right now because it fits exactly what I have been trying to tell her all morning, and for the last three or four days. There were several questions that were asked. The first one is, are Canada's expenditures out of line with comparable jurisdictions? The answer fairly clearly is no.

Now that is a pretty important question. The second question is, are expenditures growing at a rate which appears unsustainable?

### Point of Order

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The Minister has already addressed this in a previous session in Estimates. He has already put that same thing on record. He

knows he is taking things out of context. The author has already indicated that. I do not think the Minister should be using up the valuable time of Estimates to repeat something he has already put on record. Now I have asked a simple straight forward question about this Government's response to the U.N. declaration on the rights of children. Now can I have an answer to that question, or is the Minister going to continue to abuse these Estimates?

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts, but I will ask the Honourable Minister if he would please refrain from leading away from the question and answer a little more to the question.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes, I will because the answer to the question is right in this next statement I am going to read to my honourable friend. Are expenditures growing at a rate which appears, and expenditures being health expenditures, unsustainable even if they are not out of line with others, the others meaning other jurisdictions? The answer may be a qualified yes, and here is what Mr. Sale and others say. The reason is not inherently the health expenditures themselves, but rather the policy of Governments to incur deficits and amass debt, weakening the overall fiscal capacity of Government, and driving out the capacity to use the available and necessary resources on health care. Do you know what that means? You can read my lips, because I am going to tell you what that means.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Yes, and you can answer the question.

**Mr. Orchard:** It means that you under the NDP and Howard Pawley, because you incurred deficits and amassed debt, you sent—Mr. Deputy Chairman, would you control the Honourable Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Lels)?

What this says is that the Howard Pawley Government in amassing and incurring deficits and amassing debt took \$470 million of tax dollars on an annualized basis, and sent them out of the country instead of spending them on health care. That is what this statement says.

Now I am going to tell my honourable friend what this Government's policy is on children. This Government's policy on children is to get out of the deficit syndrome of the NDP, to encourage

economic growth so that we have the resources to enforce programs, policies and delivery of service to make our children of Manitoba, be they infants, newborns to school-age, healthier, better educated and more able to take a job in a growing Manitoba economy.

This is what we are going to do. If anyone wants to analyze how to get there, there is only one route to get there. It is not the NDP policy of incurring deficits and amassing debts, and thereby having interest payments deny your ability to create opportunities for children in this province. We will not follow that treadmill as Government, and, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Manitobans do not want us to.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** It is clear that this Minister has not even read the U.N. Convention on the rights of the child. He has no idea what Article 24 is. He has obviously decided to go on and rant, and give us some more of his self-laudatory puffery that we have heard throughout the course of these Estimates, without answering the questions, because he does not know what I am talking about. He does not have an answer, and he does not have a strategy dealing with poverty and mortality among the children in the Province of Manitoba.

He is telling me that he is going to continue his Government's policy of a hands-off approach to this critical recession facing Manitobans no matter how many children will die, no matter how much poverty will grow in the Province of Manitoba. It is a disgrace; it is a national disgrace. This province is not anywhere in a leadership position. This province is at the bottom of the heap in terms of action and attention to the very serious problems of poverty and infant mortality in our society today.

I am going to change the subject now, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

**An Honourable Member:** Oh, no, you are not.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Yes, I am going to change the subject. I am going to ask the Minister, on another issue pertaining to research, children and health, what his research shows in terms of the spread of AIDS in our society, and whether he has studied the most recent information coming from the World Health Organization indicating, and I will read for the Minister's benefit so he does not have to misinterpret what I say: By the year 2000, it is expected that 70 to 80 percent of all HIV infections will result from heterosexual intercourse.

I also refer him to another study from the United States showing that AIDS is fast becoming an epidemic. I want to know from the Minister what his research shows, what his long-term planning is with respect to this very serious problem, and given these recent studies, if he has moved away from his very homophobic position of July 1987 where he clearly, on several occasions, put on record over and over again that AIDS was strictly a homosexual disease.

In fact, he stated on July 16, 1987, quote: It is not the heterosexual community that's spreading it, Madam Speaker. It's the homosexual community, the very homosexual community that you've conferred status quo on. He goes on and makes a considerable number of homophobic comments.

I want to know if his attitude has changed since that day so that he can show us whether he is capable of dealing with a very serious problem, what strategies he has in place, how is he ensuring that AIDS does not become an epidemic in the Province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, my honourable friend closed with some comments that are—they really do not deserve the dignity of this Chamber. It fits with the typical wild-eyed rhetoric of my honourable friend when she says, how many children will die, et cetera, et cetera—all of that kind of wild-eyed rhetoric. No one has used that except a New Democratic Party Member in this House.

My honourable friend, if she wanted to go back, and if she is saying, how many children are going to die because this Government does not do as she suggests, that would mean that if we assume responsibility, then I am assuming that she has assumed full responsibility for the children who died when they were Government.

That is the kind of pointless silliness that my honourable friend is famous for. When she is caught, and when she has it pointed out to her how really silly and how really small her comments are, she starts nattering from her seat. You are going to accuse this Government whose policies have done nothing but enhance the opportunity for Manitobans, whose health care delivery has been to greater degree than the previous administration, whose policies, whose research, whose development initiatives will lead us to a better health care system at the end of our mandate than we

inherited. All of the things we do will make a better health care system in the Province of Manitoba.

\* (1050)

I do not stand up and lay the blame on the previous Government for not having planning in place, for not having a concept of healthy public policy in place, for not having researched a guide health promotion which my honourable friend now does not believe in because her statements two answers ago said, all I can talk about is reducing lifestyle factors.

That is the most anti-progressive attitude I have ever heard expressed by a health critic in this Chamber. She is saying that we should not try and modify lifestyle as it affects individuals' health. There is nobody that I know of in the Canadian health care community who believes Government ought not to be pro-actively involved in pointing out and attempting to change health-endangering lifestyles -(interjection)- my honourable friend says that is the sum total of my whole policy.

Have you ever talked to the Canadian Public Health Association? That is what they are saying Governments should do, and we have been negligent for 20 years in not doing it. Now my honourable friend says, oh, that is all your doing. That is a major initiative of what we are doing, yes. I will debate that in any public platform my honourable friend wants to undertake. I want her to stand up and say it is wrong, because the professionals in health care across this nation and within this province will give her a message very quickly that she better do a little more thinking about her statements.

All I am asking my honourable friend is to just sort of maybe wake up tomorrow morning and try to transpose yourself to 1990 because you are not living there with the statements you have made this morning.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, my honourable friend wants to talk about AIDS. I want to tell my honourable friend, and if she wants the numbers developed, we will develop them. When I was critic for the official Opposition, there was a great deal of very, very, very serious concern about the AIDS epidemic and how rapidly it was spreading, because our numbers were doubling every several months. Our numbers—I mean the numbers available in North America. It was a very serious public health problem, and it still is.

I want to tell you that my honourable friends put out one series of television ads in face of all of that very, very alarming information which came forward. Since we have come into Government, there is a lot less publicity, a lot less public information and concern because there has been a levelling off of the incidence of AIDS. There has been a change in where the AIDS epidemic—epidemic may not be the appropriate word—but where the AIDS as a public disease problem is appearing to be troublesome. Despite that, this Government has consistently increased the resources available to fight AIDS in the Province of Manitoba.

Our initiatives include public awareness campaigns through television, through radio, through print media. We now have the AIDS pamphlet, lauded to be one of the best pamphlets in Canada, translated into six new immigrant languages, or seven, I believe it is. We have continued to spend money on staffing resources for AIDS education. We have supported physicians in their efforts to make AIDS and the counselling and the identification of the problem and the information more available so they can counsel patients about risks, et cetera.

We have funded the Street LINKS project in co-operation with the City of Winnipeg to get at a high risk target group. Just yesterday, we approved monies to send members of Manitoba's aboriginal community to a major conference on AIDS and the Native community, so that they can come back with the direct knowledge as Native leaders in trying to intervene in the problem in their community. My honourable friend will stand up and say, oh, you are not doing anything. That is why she deludes and she disgraces herself when she comes with these kinds of rhetorical attacks.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friend the numbers in terms of AIDS in the Province of Manitoba. The actual number of people who tested positive in 1987 were 54, and the AIDS cases were nine. In 1988, those testing positive decreased to 45, and the AIDS cases were five in that year. It jumped up again in 1989, with actual of 57 testing positively, and 17 with AIDS.

That 17, I think you can see, ought to go up, because AIDS is a progressive terminal illness. In 1990, although the figures are not complete for this year, but the latest projection we have is that we will have 50 people testing positive for HIV, and the number of AIDS cases will be 10. We are projecting

similar numbers for 1991. It appears as if we have a leveling of the AIDS problem in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, one must be very careful—let me just offer this caution to my honourable friend—in using world statistics on the AIDS epidemic, because they involve all nations. One nation in particular, namely Africa, significantly changes those statistics. There is more evidence of heterosexual transmission of AIDS. Yes, there is more. There are also potentially interrelated factors, such as intravenous drug abuse, such as anal intercourse, heterosexually, such as STDs and their correlation with people carrying the AIDS virus.

The African circumstance is a very, very saddening circumstance, because the spread of AIDS—and I have had recent discussions with Dr. Allan Ronald who has had direct work in Africa over the last number of years. Their heterosexual spread of AIDS is indeed alarming, and it is caused by a number of factors. In all of them—I cannot give you the epidemiological verification of what is the spread of AIDS attributed to, a given factor. There are such things as hygiene, STDs, the lack of practice of circumcision—which are all driving the AIDS spread in Africa heterosexually. There is a high degree of prostitution. Prostitution in parts of Africa is a very, very leading cause of the spread of AIDS heterosexually. It appears to be closely linked with STDs, other sexually transmitted diseases. That correlation is causing problems in Africa which are alarming. There appears to be because of our higher degree of public education on birth control and the use of condoms—that is not part of the African way, if you will. How else I can put it more genteelly, I do not know.

There are a number of factors for the world's statistics that are not appropriately transferable to our circumstance in Manitoba. Our STD numbers, I believe, are decreasing. We do not have the combined factor. We do not, I believe, have the same type of problem with prostitution, for instance, as some countries in Africa. We have a better educated population, better able to understand the risk. We have more mature education programs. Dr. Ronald tells us that what we are doing in Manitoba is considered to be about the best in the world in terms of our overall approach to education and STD.

I do not say that, taking credit for it, because some of it was started in the school system well before we came to Government. I am just simply saying that,

in relative terms, an expert like Dr. Allan Ronald says, we do quite well.

Even despite that, that has not stopped us placing more resource to the problem. Our resources now are targeted to higher risk groups. That is why we funded Street LINKS. That is why we sent aboriginal leaders to a conference on aboriginal health, focusing on AIDS.

\* (1100)

I simply offered that information to my honourable friend. I offer the balance of opinion as I have been informed in discussions with experts on AIDS. I believe and I hope that our programs will continue to be as successful as they appear to be in terms of containing the spread of AIDS amongst Manitobans.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Just following up on the Minister's response. I think it is probably fair to conclude from the statistics provided by the Minister that we cannot at this point expect that the numbers, in terms of people with AIDS and having HIV infections, have stabilized and that the trend is going the other way. It still appears, based on the rapid increase between '87 and '89, in terms of the statistics, that—the Minister has raised his eyebrows and wondered, what increase? I think it is significant that when you go from 54 to 57, in terms of the people with HIV infections, and from nine to—I believe you said 17?

**Mr. Orchard:** How about using 1990, where it is down to 50 again?

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Let me come to that, Mr. Deputy Chairperson. There has been a steady increase in terms of identified people with AIDS and HIV infections. We have statistics for 1990. The Minister is projecting that will continue into 1991. I would rather know that this Government is taking this issue in the most serious possible light. Using, not applying directly, the statistics from the World Health Organization, or making direct comparisons with the United States, but at least being prepared for that kind of trendline and the growing concern among all communities that we are facing a potential epidemic.

I appreciate that the Minister has taken some steps. I am not, as he thought I might, going to stand up here and suggest he has done nothing. I am concerned, very concerned, about some gaps in policy. I do not get a sense, talking from the AIDS community, that they feel this Government has done

its utmost, that they feel there is a long-term comprehensive strategy in place. I hear several major concerns. I will relay them to the Minister and ask him for his plan of action in those areas.

When it comes to education and prevention, there does not seem to be, anywhere in the community or in our education system, a feeling that we are actually changing people's behaviour. There have been calls, and I repeat those calls today in this Legislature, for a much more broad, comprehensive approach in our education system. Calls for compulsory AIDS education have been made before, and I think have to be treated seriously by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) in conjunction with his colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach).

The Minister talks a bit about targeting high risk groups and about counselling. There is no sense out in the community that we have made much of a dent in terms of reaching young people and changing their attitudes and their behavior when it comes to sexual activity. There is no comprehensive strategy or program to get the necessary information to those individuals and to actually change behaviour. I would like to know what the Minister has in mind in terms of a much broader, more effective approach.

Most significantly, I hear from the community that this Government has done almost nothing to help the community help itself. There are no supports to date for individuals trying to provide shelter arrangements. There are no backup supports for those wishing to care for AIDS victims in their own homes.

There is some very significant community work going on, on a volunteer basis, in our community. I think of the AIDS Shelter Coalition. I think of Body Positive. I think of Kali-Shiva, and of course we know about the incredible long-standing work of the Village Clinic.

Those organizations are appealing to this Government for backup support, for a show of commitment to the kind of work that they are doing to care for people dying from AIDS. I think it is a lonely, frustrating area of work. There is very little recognition from Government. The victims themselves must always carry with them a certain stigma because of a failure on all of our part to change some of the homophobia that has been expressed in our society up until this point.

There is a great deal that needs to be done in all areas. I would like to know from the Minister—since it is obvious he by no means has put in place his master plan to deal with this very serious issue—how those different components are being developed, and what plans are being made in dealing with the various concerns and aspects of this most serious problem.

**Mr. Orchard:** I am glad my honourable friend put her comments on the record because I think her comments come from a group who has very specific desires.

They want to have an AIDS shelter. I have never ruled out an AIDS shelter—never have. The difference between the examples they hold up of Vancouver and Toronto are sheer numbers. There has to be—and I am glad we do not have sufficient numbers in Manitoba of people dying of AIDS that an AIDS shelter is necessary as it is in Vancouver and as it is in Toronto. I am glad of that.

It does not, in any way, show any lack of compassion for those who are dying from AIDS. The statement my honourable friend made that there is no support for those dying in their homes from AIDS is wrong. We provide support through home care, if that support is requested, to assist individuals in their home. That statement is wrong. We do not have an AIDS shelter in Manitoba. That is right. You have to have a certain number and a certain demand for that kind of service before you fund it. Even with the previous Government, that was the case, that they did have to have certain numbers before they proceeded with certain programs. That exists today.

My honourable friend made the case that in the education system we are not doing enough. She says we should be in a compulsory education program. My honourable friend did not do that when she was Government but yet, from the comfort of Opposition, she is advocating it.

In the meantime I will tell you, and you can ask my colleague the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) to further it. There have been more progressive materials for education of children and awareness amongst our youth in the school system of the dangers of AIDS. That is well over a year old now. The video that my honourable colleague the Minister of Education brought to my attention was one of the most well done that I have seen in terms of making children understand the epidemiological

encroachment of the AIDS virus and how they can protect themselves. It also dealt with the issue of casual contact, which has caused concerns throughout the community. All of that is a significant improvement over what my honourable friend saw done when she had direct access to the Minister of Education as a Cabinet colleague.

To stand up and say that we are not doing this and we are not doing that does not accurately reflect what we are doing. We have put more resource into AIDS than the previous Government ever contemplated doing. It has been in a number of areas. It has been specifically targeted. My honourable friend gives a quick little blush and says, we sort of like some of the things you are doing. The Native community is a high-risk community, a potentially high-risk community. We are trying to work with them in as pro-active a way as possible. That is why we are sending a number of representatives from the Native community to a conference on AIDS.

\* (1110)

Street kids are another high-risk target group. We did not go out—and we could have funded, I suppose, Village Clinic. I know they were upset that we did not put the money through Village Clinic because we wanted to do a street outreach program. We invited proposals from a number of groups. We evaluated those proposals and accepted the one that we thought would make the most effective use of the resource. That was not Village Clinic. That was not a couple of other proponents, but it was the City of Winnipeg Public Health Department and their Street LINKS project. That Street LINKS project has been ongoing now for some time. It deals with street kids, provides them advice, counselling, provides the means to protect themselves. We think it is a very, very pro-active and positive approach to the street kid problem.

My honourable friend just sort of dismisses that as if, well, I mean, that is what you did for me yesterday, what are you going to do for me tomorrow? We have been working very pro-actively with AIDS. -(interjection)-

Manpower? We have put more manpower to it. -(interjection)-

Oh, come on. You know, my honourable friend, for every little thing that she brings up, we have probably done two or three things to replace it. I mean she cannot have it both ways. She cannot

stand here as the Health Critic and say, more, more, more and then support her colleague, the Minister of Family Services, who says, more, more, more and then say to the taxpayers, well, do not worry about it we will just borrow the money and then we will tax you to death and we will interest you to death.

What we are doing is we are taking more resource and often it is reallocated from within the department, from areas of lesser priority to areas of higher priority. I tell you right now, we came to the conclusion two and a half years ago that we had to come to grips with the funding issue of Government. We have made those pro-active reallocations of staff which has enabled us to put staffing on AIDS education within the regions, has enabled us to put extra nursing staff at St. Boniface Hospital, Health Sciences Centre and—was there not additional resource staffing at Klinik?—funding for additional staff.

So we have done all of these things. I think by the fact that when other jurisdictions in the world see a fairly dramatic increase in an African, in particular an increase in their incidence, ours is levelling off. I hope ours continues to level off and continues to remain static with the ultimate goal of it going down.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I want to tell my honourable friend that we are also participating in national programs on AIDS. It was identified in the Annual Report of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, where we are participating in two federal seroprevalence studies to identify from spent blood samples the prevalence in the general population of the AIDS virus in participation with the national Government, so we can have a larger picture of the prevalence of AIDS as a killer in society.

All of those things we are doing. It costs money, it takes resource, but we are willing to put it to it. We think, although not perfect, we have as good a program as any province and, according to experts, our approach is actually as effective as anybody's approach is in jurisdictions that he has been in across this country and throughout the world.

Certainly, we could do more, and we will do more as ideas come forward that (a) make sense to the Manitoba context and we have resources to fund them. We are prepared to make the tough decisions of reallocation if we have to, if the program seems to be the appropriate one to do. We have done that

in the past, and we will continue to do that in the future.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I just want to put some of our thoughts on that particular issue even though we thought it would be discussed in the area of communicable diseases. I want to be careful, because I think it is very important. We had this discussion last year in 1988 and at that time the Minister was new. I have to disagree here with some of these things that have been said, because it is a very complex issue.

We cannot compare what is happening in Manitoba and Canada with the rest of the world. I mean the trends are there. It is a very difficult problem and to scare the public at this time, I think is not going to settle the purpose. Our aim has to be to make sure that we get the services. So many things have been done, I will not hesitate to put those things on the record. Some of the things have been done. Outreach worker program which we advocated last year has been done. Secondly, the education pamphlet and the education TV ads are one of the most explanatory possible in a human sense. We cannot do more than that.

We are very pleased that the Minister even accepted the needle-exchange program. He was not happy last year when we made the recommendation, but finally, they have come to realize that is a program that could be used. There are a lot of people who are against the program, because some people are saying, people who are diabetic, why are they not given free needles. It is a question of moral values here. Are we going to look at a narrow scope for the short term, just political posturing, which I think is disgusting, to use this platform because we have a short period of time? We want to achieve certain things. I think we have very careful scared up the public. We have to be honest. If things are right, they are right; if they are wrong, they are wrong. This area where the Government has made progress—here they have made progress.

For us to say, we are going to have a major problem, major disaster in Manitoba is simply not true. Certainly if the needle-exchange program, which has been very good in Vancouver, has been proven very effective, and the same in San Francisco and some other parts, what I am trying to say here is that we have to be very careful to scared up the people, because it is a very important issue. It will send the wrong message, because for the

short term, 20-second clips are not going to do any good; I think we will be doing a disservice. I am disappointed with the 20 minutes of discussion. That is not what we are supposed to be doing here.

I would like the Minister to tell us now what plans they have for next year in terms of the target groups. They have outlined one, the native community, on some of the reserves where there is a high risk of sexually transmitted diseases. Second is the expansion of the outreach worker program. Also, what is the specific policy in terms of the setting up of the hospices in terms of if there is a need? We have a very small number of patients, as the Minister has indicated. Then it may not be possible to set up an immediate program. If there is a need for somebody to live in their home and have the comfortable and compassionate part of their life, is that possible? Can the Minister tell us what kind of funding we have available for that, for that special purpose?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have been open to proposals. What guides my approval-making process is the analysis of those proposals by the department in the case of the hospice and the need in whether that is the most effective use of our next additional dollar of resource.

The resources that are available now are, for instance, acute care in the hospitals for hospital admission, I mean absolutely open, and the Home Care Program as I explained earlier.

Let me indicate to my honourable friend, though, the information that I have received on the specific area of needle-exchange program is that there is not epidemiological indications that is an effective program in preventing the spread of AIDS. Needle exchange is part of the Street LINKS program, but it is not part of the Government funding. We have not funded that.

The City of Winnipeg has chosen to provide the resources to make the needle-exchange program part of the Street LINKS program. Our \$100,000 funding commitment was much more narrowed and did not include needle exchange, because I do not have the ability from an epidemiological and proven-program standpoint to make that recommendation and have not.

If they wish to try it and to have it as part of Street LINKS program which we were funding in terms of the education, the direct contact with street youth,

the provision of birth control material so that they can protect themselves from the spread of AIDS in terms of their sexual activities, yes, we agreed that all of those are appropriate. In terms of the narrowed issue of funding a needle-exchange program, no, we did not.

\* (1120)

Mr. Deputy Chairman, the department has undertaken a number of initiatives in terms of provision of both acute care and community-based care, education, promotion and health outreach. I do not have an unlimited wealth of dollars, as I have indicated to my honourable friend, but in this particular area of AIDS, we have put substantial new resource and will continue to do that.

I cannot predicate what Estimates next year are going to provide, but certainly we have additional funding for staffing people at the regional level, direct physician funding at three of the major institutions that deal with the AIDS epidemic. We have continued availability of educational materials. In terms of Street LINKS, naturally a fairly major and new initiative, we have some quite open hope that it is going to be the way to go to reach a more narrowed target risk group.

We are working with the aboriginal community as another potential high-risk group so that we do what we can from the prevention side. It is not going to be a perfect program, but I do believe that our record in Manitoba is certainly an awful lot better than other nations, and in Canada, as a nation, we are a lot better.

That is why I caution my honourable friend, the new Health Critic for the NDP. You know, you use world numbers. Africa distorts those, and other countries have a tendency of distorting them. To make good public policy, you have to have sound information, and to leave the general conclusion that may have been the impression from her information would not be accurate. I am pleased that my honourable friend clarified that.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, as I have put on the record, progress has been made. We have no doubt about that. I think that is very positive. It is very important because prevention is the only right tool available for this dreadful disease.

My next question is—I cannot quit on the needle-exchange program because I want to know. The Minister has said that they have no epidemiological study available, that they have no

statistics to prove that this program is effective. How come then Vancouver is doing it? How come Toronto is doing it? San Francisco is doing it. Some of the European countries are doing it. They must see something in this program, and that has been there for the last four or five years. Why would the Minister not fund such a program which will benefit?

I know that the other questions are going to come. Are you going to give free needles to the drug abusers? Why are you not going to give the free stuff to the diabetic patients, who are going to need needles for a long time? That question was raised to me by some of my constituents and some of the people from the diabetic association.

I think it is the right question, but right now we have to see where the money can be used more effectively. The needle-exchange program is one of the programs where you can save money because even if one or two persons can be saved from the infection with HIV, you will be able to save a lot of tax dollars. It is a very, very inexpensive way.

With the different treatments that are coming, and especially with AZT being approved, the cost is tremendous. So I would like the Minister to outline or tell us where they did get the information that this program is not effective.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, my honourable friend mentions programs in Vancouver and programs in Toronto. I cannot speak for the one in San Francisco because I do not know who funds it. I just want to tell my honourable friend, do not make the automatic link, as one might do with the Street LINKS program, that because it exists, it is funded by the provincial Government. Those programs in Vancouver and Toronto are identical to the one that is in Winnipeg. It is funded by the civic Government, not by the provincial Government.

I say to you that this issue has been debated and there are experts in the field. If my honourable friend wishes to have some, I will give him after Estimates the name of an individual he should talk to on this issue because this individual is very much concerned that you have exactly the opposite effect with the needle-exchange program than what you would expect. In fact, he has information that he has provided to me from some European countries to show that. They are backing away from this because it has not worked.

That is why I say to my honourable friend that I have analyzed this issue, because you were

pushing for it. You believed we should do it. I am not sure. The NDP never did make up their mind where they were coming from on the issue.

I investigated it seriously, and I asked a lot of very, very pointed questions. There is no one and, because it does not exist, a study to show that it is effective. There are people on both sides of it, those who firmly believe it is and those who say it is not, but there is no medical proof that says it is.

I am under the unfortunate constraint that I cannot fund ideas and concepts as health programs. I have to have some evidence that it is going to work, and in the lack of that, we have said, no, we will not fund, as B.C. has done as a province, as Ontario has done as a province. Their civic Governments have provided the money, as our civic Government in Winnipeg is providing the money.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am having difficulty with this answer. I do agree with the Minister's summary, convinced that progress has been made in some part of his planning to deal with this serious issue; but, with the needle-exchange program, when the City of Winnipeg is funding, they are not stupid. Vancouver has funded the program. Toronto has funded the program. Why does the Minister have the hesitancy of just admitting that this program has been proven effective, not only in Canada, but in the United States and Europe?

With this program, if one person can be saved from HIV infection, that will save a lot of money in the long run. Not only can you save money, but also by needle exchange the trace of people who are abusing drugs or sexually transmitting diseases can be made. It is one way of getting to know to them, getting to each of those people. It is a very important program and if there is a philosophical difference, I am not going to give up on this program. I think this program is worth trying, and the Minister should have a serious look at this program.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, with all the due respect I can muster for my honourable friend, the Province of British Columbia, the Province of Ontario both came to the same conclusion that I come to. They have all of the information that is available that I have available, which says it is not medically proven and medically effective, but other information says that, for instance, funding direct contact with street kids is. To provide them the educational materials, the materials to protect themselves, is very, very effective in preventing the

spread of AIDS. We have funded those. We have funded them to the tune of \$100,000 in co-operation with the city.

You are going to have to ask the City of Winnipeg why they chose to provide the money for the needle exchange and on what basis they made that decision. I simply tell you that I have no medical information on which to base that decision. Neither does the Province of B.C. Neither does the Province of Ontario. That is why the provinces do not fund them.

Now I submit to you that it is not easy to sit here and have you tell me that we should be doing it, to have advocacy groups out there saying, oh, it is great, great! Do it, do it. Spend the money. I cannot succumb to those kinds of pressures. If I succumb to public pressure from you and from advocacy groups across the province, I would have to double my budget.

I have to make decisions based on the best medical information available, and I do that. The best medical information available, epidemiological studies, Europe and other places, indicate there is no effect. There is no positive effect, contrary to the push and the public pressure that is put on by advocacy and lobby groups. That is why we do not fund that.

There is going to be an evaluation of what we do in Street LINKS. That will be part of the evaluation. Maybe we will have a unique circumstance that proves it. If that is the case and it turns out to be an effective prevention tool, we will consider funding it.

\* (1130)

In the absence of that kind of information, I know there are effective programs that will be positive in their outcome and we have been funding those. That is why we have increased the funding to AIDS education prevention outreach programs, clinical services delivery, community service delivery, because we know they are effective use of resources. Those that are not effective use of resources, we cannot fund. We do not have that luxury.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we have no difficulty with the rest of the programs, and that is why we are asking the Minister, can he tell us, can he give us a single piece of evidence which says that this program is not effective? Can he share with us a single document that it is not effective?

**Mr. Orchard:** As I indicated to my honourable friend, and I will have to dig back through my files going back better than a year ago, there was a study presented to me. It was a World Health Organization document, where it indicated that—or it was presented to a World Health Organization-sponsored conference, which indicated that the programs, and I am going by memory, to European countries—I believe one was Holland and the other one was Italy—where the programs were not effective. That was presented to the conference.

Now my honourable friend says he wants evidence that it is not proven effective. That is not the way you make medical decisions. That is not the way you make funding decisions. You do not make decisions on the basis of proof of what is not effective. You make decisions on proof of what is effective, and I tell you right now there is no evidence, documentation to say this program is effective. There are people who say it is and there are people equally as committed who say it is not.

Until there is medical evidence saying it is, I cannot consider it, and that is the decision I have made. It is commensurate with decisions in B.C. and Ontario. So I do not know how else I can put this in any more understandable terms to my honourable friend.

**Mr. Cheema:** I think this is the one area where we will end up with a disagreement, and I think it is fair game, but at the same time the Minister is saying that the City of Winnipeg had made a wrong decision, the City of Vancouver made a wrong decision and Toronto made a wrong decision. Is the Minister saying they have the expert?

**Mr. Orchard:** I am simply saying that those cities made a funding decision which I could not make based on medical evidence. Maybe those three respective cities made the decision on the basis of the pressures from people like my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, from people like some of the councillors who may well advocate for this program in the City of Winnipeg and the City of Vancouver and the City of Toronto. That may be why their decision was made. I cannot answer what was behind the decision making; I am simply saying to you they decided they had enough money to put it there. If it was public pressure, advocacy group pressure, council pressure, I do not know. I am simply saying I had the same pressures and, in absence of medical information, resisted those

pressures, and will continue to resist them until the program is proven to have medical efficacy.

**Mr. Cheema:** I think we will end this area at least for now. I am sure by next year the Minister will have enough evidence and probably he will reconsider his decision at that time, because he has made significant improvements in some of the other aspects of the prevention program. I am sure he will come to the realization that this program is effective.

Can the Minister now tell us that he made remarks earlier that they are going to look into the reserves and make sure that the programs are being effective there? Can he tell us if there is any federal program and how they are going to co-ordinate for the federal and the provincial programs in the area of AIDS prevention, especially in the reserves.

(Madam Chairman in the Chair)

**Mr. Orchard:** No, I cannot indicate to my honourable friend what the federal Government might be willing to do on reserve, but let me just simply say to my honourable friend that the Street LINKS project does deal directly with Native youth, particularly who are in the City of Winnipeg, and those individuals fall under our program jurisdiction. So we are attempting, and we are working with, as I mentioned earlier, Native leaders in terms of helping them understand and, with understanding, work with Government to have some kind of creative solutions. If those are solutions which involve involvement on reserve, then naturally the federal Government is going to have to take the lead on those because that is their responsibility. We are willing to work with the federal Government to create effective programs to make sure that education, whatever, risk factor understanding, is very much a part of it. But we are commencing it with Street LINKS and some of the areas where we have already program and responsibility.

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister tell us now exactly how much money has been spent this year on the AIDS prevention program that includes the outreach program, the TV ad, the educational pamphlets?

**Mr. Orchard:** I will give you as close a figure as we can. I will have staff develop that for you.

My staff just pointed out to me that we have initiatives undergoing in terms of AIDS education for aboriginal peoples. Now a number of Native leaders have recognized the need for AIDS education, and a few are already planning educational programs in their communities. A committee of Native leaders,

education and health consultants prepared a proposal for AIDS education. The Swampy Creek Tribal Council has received federal funding for a two-year project which addresses culturally appropriate education programs and activities for the schools, the home and the community.

Now, I do not have the ability to tell my honourable friend the time frame within that two-year project, but, okay, basically we worked with the Native leaders in sharing our knowledge and our departmental resource with them. Based on creation of a program, the federal Government provided the funding for Swampy Creek Tribal Council to make that a pilot project, and we are fully willing to participate in that kind of activity. I have to say, the federal Minister of Health is quite open and receptive to this.

Now, I am just indicated—the first number was a better one, but roughly \$110,000 in AIDS education.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister clarify that they are only spending \$110,000 on AIDS prevention, the education, the pamphlets, the TV ad for this year, or maybe I did not catch exactly?

**Mr. Orchard:** Well, that is additional funding that we are spending this year. It is the two programs. The University of Manitoba, now correct me if I am wrong, is that not the peer counselling program, the University of Manitoba, for the large part? That is about a \$57,000 initiative. We have another just under \$57,000 program for Planned Parenthood of Manitoba in support of an immigrant AIDS education project. Those are the two new ones that are coming up.

The department is still, as I have reiterated before, involved very much with the distribution of the educational materials, et cetera, et cetera. These are two new programs.

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister tell us exactly how much total money, on all these programs, will be spent this year?

**Mr. Orchard:** Well, I am going to have to get staff to develop that for me, because we have regional staff involved. We have additional resourcing at Health Sciences Centre, St. Boniface, in terms of additional staffing for their AIDS program. We have Street LINKS ongoing; we have our educational pamphlets, et cetera, et cetera. So I will have to pull that together for my honourable friend.

\* (1140)

I do not want my honourable friend to leave the impression we are only spending the \$110,000.00. Those are the two new programs that are fit in. In addition, I do not know whether we can pull together the cost of Cadham Lab's participation in the national seroprevalence study. I mean, there are a number of initiatives ongoing within the department that we are going to have to fit together and come up with a global number, but we will attempt to do that.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, if the Minister would recall, I did ask him a question in the House that was related to the HIV studies, which is where the province is involved in one with the federal Government and one is done provincially. I did raise a concern that time that the patients were not being notified. Can the Minister give us a clarification today that in those studies, are they being notified that their blood products are being used for a particular study?

**Mr. Orchard:** I do not want to get into a beat-him-up fight with my honourable friend because I could beat him up on this one. When you posed those questions, you did it from the standpoint that you thought you had an issue where we were breaking confidentiality and all that. When I pointed out to you it was a national blind study with no identification, passed all the confidentiality, you indicated from your seat that I was not being accurate, and I think you had to swallow those words a little bit afterwards. No, no patient is being informed, because the Cadham Lab does not know whose spent sample of blood it is. There is absolutely no possible way that the individual's identity can be attached to the analysis. That is why it is called a blind seroprevalence study.

The criteria under which it is undertaken are because there is nothing that has raised the issue of confidentiality more than the AIDS issue. I do not need to go into all the factors. There was the original argument five years ago, because it was highly involved in the homosexual community, and that was the original stir of AIDS, and then recently that is still there, but there is also the fact that you can be positive with the virus and be as normal as you or I, so you know that is part of the confidentiality aspect.

So given that there is a high degree of concern over confidentiality around the issue of HIV before this blind study was undertaken, much discussion through the various ethics committees in this

province as well as the national ethics committees were discussed, so that we have if you will a fail-safe program in terms of assuring on this blind study that there is no infringement on patient rights and identification. That is the whole purpose of it. It is a very valuable exercise nationally because the numbers of HIV tests that I shared with my honourable friends this morning are only those who have voluntarily submitted that they want to have the test, and it specifically named them as the whole series of confidentiality procedures surrounding that to guarantee confidentiality of the result.

So the argument has been made, well, unless you come in, we do not know, okay. That is a legitimate argument. So then it begs the question, well, is the virus much more prevalent in society at large and is there a greater risk of its spread? We cannot answer that. The only way you can answer that is to take all 26 million Canadians and test them tomorrow and analyze the results and even then you would not know, because there is a period of time of incubation I understand where it would not even show up. You know that is neither practical, cost effective, nor would it meet probably the test of public health opinion today.

In absence of that your next best thing is to design a blind study of spent blood samples to give you some feeling as to what the prevalence might be because you thereby expand your people numbers beyond those who come in for voluntary testing to a somewhat larger group through blind study analysis of spent blood samples.

There is no, I repeat, no way that the testers of that blood at Cadham Lab, the analysts, know from whom the sample originated. That was built in deliberately so that we could go ahead with this program.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us if there are any experimental drugs being used for the patient with the HIV positive infection?

**Mr. Orchard:** I am informed that, yes, there are some experimental drugs being tested, and we have some participation in Manitoba on clinical trials. That is specific for HIV, you are asking? Yes.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, is there a possibility that the Minister could share the names of those drugs with us? Can he tell us if the patients are being notified prior to the use of those drugs?

**Mr. Orchard:** The answer to the last question is yes. They are knowledgeable participants in the clinical

trials. That is a prerequisite for any clinical trial, this one included. I am trying to get you—aerosolized pentamidine and alpha-interferon are the two that are being clinically trialed.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us if the cost of AZT is fully being covered for the patients?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes, Madam Chairman.

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister tell us if they have done a study to know how much it is costing per patient per year for all these drugs?

**Mr. Orchard:** I take the opportunity to introduce Dr. Margaret Fast, Director of Communicable Diseases, to Members opposite. Dr. Fast informs me that the AZT costs are in the range of \$5,000 to \$6,000 per patient per year.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, is it possible to know the total cost per patient, for the HIV positive patients in Manitoba, per year? There has been a perception that these patients are costing more to the taxpayer than the rest of the average patients. Do we have the information?

**Mr. Orchard:** Not for HIV positive because for some HIV positive people there is absolutely no cost. For AIDS, for those who suffer from AIDS in the terminal stages of HIV infection, the figure that is used—and we have not been able to either prove or disprove the accuracy of it—is considered to be \$80,000 per AIDS patient per year. That is a national cost, and we think our costs are probably very much in that range.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us if we are getting any funding share from the federal Government for some of the experimental drugs, and also some of the cost for the AZT or some other factors which are playing a major role in terms of the patient with the AIDS illness?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, the AZT costs are born 100 percent by the province. The other two experimental drugs are of no cost to the province. I believe the pharmaceutical company developed them and by sponsoring the clinical trials are paying the costs of the pharmaceutical in those cases.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us if there is a provision for special trained professionals who deal with the AIDS infection in their own homes and in the communities? Can the Minister tell us how many professionals are

particularly trained to deal with somebody who is dying with AIDS in the terminal stages?

**Mr. Orchard:** There is no one being specifically trained, for instance, to care for an individual in the home. You might recall, I mentioned additional funding provided for positions at Health Sciences Centre, St. Boniface Hospital, and Village Clinic specifically for patient care. A co-ordinator position is part of that where the co-ordinator provides the advice for in-home care and is the trainer, if you will, of those providing the care.

In terms of having one individual care specialist trained to care in the home, no, but a co-ordinator to assist those who will be doing that, the co-ordinator approach being chosen because the individuals will vary, because some people will not want the same—I mean, we need a number of different people because circumstances with each individual case change.

\* (1150)

The co-ordinator is there to help each individual case undertake the care with the kind of professionals and support they need, and that co-ordinator's part of the responsibility is to provide information, advice, on how that can be undertaken in the individual circumstances.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, I think it will make some sense to have some specific people trained for this particular illness because even though our numbers are not high, still there are people who will require these services. That will be one way of saving money, so the people could be cared for in their own homes. Even though the co-ordinator still has a responsibility, I think the caregivers at the level at home are the most important element. They must be taken into consideration.

My next question is, can the Minister tell us how many seminars, educational seminars, for nurses, for other professionals, are being carried out on a monthly basis to teach the upgrading of their information on AIDS?

**Mr. Orchard:** We do not keep that kind of information. We are going to go through this again, so I will. That is why we put resources in the community, in regional services, so that kind of information can be disseminated not only to nurses, but to community educators and other people who are interested.

That is why we put the additional resource at St. Boniface, Health Sciences and Village Clinic. That is why we have got street outreach because that is indeed part of the education process. I mean, this is ongoing as part of a public health policy of education. I simply do not have the ability to give my honourable friend the number per month, the number of people per month and who is touched, where they are, et cetera, et cetera. It is an ongoing part of the process.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I am just following up with a few questions on that. Would the Minister consider supporting speakers from the AIDS community to be available for schools and other organizations that have expressed an interest in bringing in such a speaker? I know that in the past the department has assisted with some travel costs when a speaker is asked to go to a place like Thompson, as was the case recently with Rick Cable. Would the Minister consider a more broad approach to such an approach?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, we have left that decision up to the individual school boards in terms of, if they want to bring someone in, then they arrange the cost. We have supported costs of individuals coming in for specific conferences on conference undertaking.

That is all we have done, and that is all we will continue to do because you cannot—I submit to my honourable friend that I am not going to get involved in making decisions as to which school division is going to get funded to bring in this speaker, that speaker or the other. School divisions have to make those decisions themselves in terms of supporting costs, et cetera, et cetera. When conferences are organized by the Province of Manitoba, we have acceded to requests to help sponsor travel costs and will continue to do that.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** With respect to the question of care in the home, I know the Minister earlier mentioned that home care is available, although I believe that there has been a concern expressed in the community that often home care workers are somewhat concerned about the types of services they provide in the case of a person dying with AIDS.

Also there is a need for round-the-clock support, companionship for AIDS victims dying of AIDS. I am wondering if the Minister would consider supporting an initiative through Kali-Shiva to support its work of getting volunteers to provide that kind of

round-the-clock support to people dying from AIDS, if he would consider a small investment in a very worthwhile initiative to provide support for AIDS victims?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, we support the federal funding of that initiative.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Would the Minister consider an initiative to the province in terms of working with Kali-Shiva to help co-ordinate the volunteers who provide home care, round-the-clock home care services?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, the reason why we are supportive of the federal Government's funding of that is to find out how it is meeting the target and how it is meeting the goals. We hope it will. The federal Government does not put money into some of the things we do that are additional in enhancing the ability to deliver.

Now, already we have provided staff support to that federal funded initiative of Kali-Shiva. We are part of it, but if my honourable friend wants to lobby for additional funding at some time in the future she may do that.

We have supported philosophically the federal Government's decision to fund that, and we are supporting it through staff resource availability.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, I am simply looking for some indication from this Minister about his commitment now and down the road both with respect to situations where we have short-term funding arrangements through the federal Government and also community-based volunteer efforts that need ongoing support.

I gather from the Minister today that he is prepared to, No. 1, receive positively a proposal from the AIDS shelter coalition for support for a shelter; and, No. 2, that he is prepared to see ongoing support for organizations like Kali-Shiva who seek to support and provide companionship and love and care to AIDS victims who would like to die in their own homes.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, my honourable friend has expressed her interpretation of what I have said, and I appreciate that.

We have looked at all approaches for funding. We have funded, to the best of our limited financial ability, many new initiatives. It may well be that the two she mentioned as her projects today would become part of provincial funding. We certainly

entertain those kinds of approaches on a weekly basis. Decisions are made in accordance of prioritization of funds and the most effective use of those funds.

\* (1200)

I cannot—and I hope my honourable friend does not indicate that we have automatically made the decision to go ahead with funding, because we have not. Number one, we have not received a proposal. Number two, the difficulty, as my honourable friend well knows, is that the federal Government, from time to time, funds an initiative and then cuts it off and says to the province, you pick it up.

Well, from time to time we do if it fits within the provincial program, but there are no guarantees and there never is when those programs are funded on a temporary basis.

That is the case today. That is the case it was when my honourable friend sat in Cabinet.

In answer to my honourable friend, the Member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), our collective resource in the ministry for AIDS is \$1.5 million.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Could I just get a clarification on that? The Minister is saying total provincial allocation for programs—

**Mr. Orchard:** Provincial Department of Health.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** May I just clarify once more? Is the Minister saying total provincial Department of Health budgetary allocation for AIDS programs, policies, is \$1.5 million? Did I hear that? I am just getting a clarification.

**Mr. Orchard:** That is the best estimated compilation of our efforts within the Ministry of Health. That does not include any initiatives which would be funded through Education or other departments involved, but that is the best guess that we have. It would include what our best estimate is of what the hospital budget would be for those—(interjection)—oh, hospital budgets are on top of that, but that is what we can identify within the ministry.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Thank you, I think we both appreciate that information. I am wondering if, before the end of Estimates today, the Minister could provide us just with a rough breakdown by program of expenditures in this area?

**Mr. Orchard:** We have grants to service organizations of \$175,000.00. We have new positions of \$100,000.00. We have AZT costs of \$400,000.00. We have existing staff within Cadham,

et cetera, at \$250,000 estimated; and we have open budget, which is what I have been indicating throughout the regional services and other parts, of \$500,000.00. That is the breakdown I can share with my honourable friend from the ministry.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, just two other questions, would the Minister tell us what his plans are with respect to the request from the hemophiliac's association in Manitoba with respect to compensation from the provincial Government?

**Mr. Orchard:** That is under discussion at the provincial level. We discussed that item in Charlottetown at our most recent provincial and territorial Health Ministers—we have the disadvantage that Ontario was not there. Quebec does not participate at national conferences. The Nova Scotia ministry was in the process of change, and the Minister for the Northwest Territories was not there. We are seeking their opinions in terms of a provincial response to the request by the Hemophilia Society, and we probably will have that compiled early next year.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Could the Minister tell us if his Government has developed a policy vis-a-vis the federal compensation payment of I believe it is \$120,000 over four years per individual and whether or not that will be tied to social assistance?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, that is exactly what we discussed at the provincial-territorial Ministers level. We have certain goals that we think are appropriate to achieve as provincial Ministers because all of us face the problem, and we are seeking the advice of Ontario who was not present. We hope to be able for the staff level to still receive input from Quebec even though they do not participate at ministerial conferences. We would like to have the wisdom of Nova Scotia and the Yukon Territories in formulating that decision.

Madam Chairman, I simply indicate to my honourable friend that we intend to be part of the provincial-territorial solution to this problem. One of the difficulties, and I have discussed this with my honourable friend's Leader some eight or nine months ago, is that the federal Government did two things. They announced a unilateral program of assistance to those hemophiliac patients infected with the AIDS virus through the blood system. They provided the opportunity for a lump sum payment and they said two things. First of all, you must save harmless the federal Government. The second thing

they told those individuals is then go to the province and try to get money out of them.

You know, in the spirit of national co-operation and problem resolution we were not consulted. We were not part of that announcement. We were not part of the decision making behind it, because the one thing we would have suggested to them was that you know our information has it, and I have shared this with the Canadian Hemophilia Society, other jurisdictions have provided this kind of compensation.

The Canadian Government compensation is the largest current settlement anywhere in the world. It is the most generous, and with co-operation from the federal Government instead of unilateral action we believe we could have had a solution to this right away.

When you have a federal Government that says to a group to whom they are providing compensation, we think you should get more from the provinces, here is our deal, sign us off, go get the provinces. We do not think that is in the interest of either the individuals or the Canadian health care system. That is why with that kind of action from the federal Government the provinces are attempting to come around this issue in a reasoned fashion with hopefully a policy decision that will uniformly treat hemophilic patients suffering from AIDS because of the Canadian blood system uniformly in Canada. When those decisions are made, I simply indicate to my honourable friend, Manitoba will be part of those decisions.

I am not able today to offer any more information to my honourable friend because Ontario was not part of the discussions, the most recent discussions. This has been before us for a year, and we were presented with a report, et cetera. The information we received in Charlottetown has been shared with Ontario, Nova Scotia, the Yukon Territories and Quebec. We are awaiting their response so that hopefully we can provide a provincial territorial response to the Hemophilia Society of Canada and its provincial counterparts. I can do no more than share that process with my honourable friend and the background behind it.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I had understood in my mind there were two separate issues here. One was the question of provincial compensation for HIV infected hemophiliacs, and the other was the question of our policy with respect to tying the federal compensation

to provincial social assistance. I understood that in fact a couple of provinces had developed a policy of not tying that federal payment to social assistance. However, we will await further to hear from the Minister the results of his discussions with other provinces on this matter.

\* (1210)

I believe my colleague, the Member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), and I are prepared to pass this line now and move on to some other areas.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 1. (d) Policy and Planning Secretariat (1) Salaries \$504,300—pass; 1. (d)(2) Other Expenditures \$94,000—pass; 1. (e) Communications (1) Salaries \$254,700.00. Shall the item pass?

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I am wondering if the Minister can tell us why staff has increased in this section from the previous budget as passed last year after the Estimates process? There appears to be another increase in terms of a communicator. I am wondering if he could tell us why and what the reason for that was?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, this reflects our French language co-ordinator as part of this budget now.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Is the Minister saying that the position has been moved from some other place, or is it a new position?

**Mr. Orchard:** From executive function, Madam Chairman.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I see, if I look back several years, that in actual fact the budget and staff for this Communications Branch, the department has, I think, doubled. I am wondering what new activities are being undertaken. What are we getting now with this expanded Communications Branch than we were getting before? What is the public getting? What are the benefits from this increased Communications Branch?

**Mr. Orchard:** One of the benefits is a rather substantial mailing right now that is ongoing in terms of our discussion paper on substance abuse, alcohol, drugs and substance abuse.

Madam Chairman, since I have come in to this ministry, this is now the fifth paper that we have co-ordinated a public mailing of so that there is information, a much greater sharing of information than has been in the past. That involves some co-ordination and feedback, et cetera, et cetera. [

think that the more open communication of this Government is reflective of those discussion papers and initiatives that we have undertaken.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, very interesting words, given this Minister's criticism in the past of any kind of communication efforts on the part of the previous administration. In fact, I recall the Minister moving to eliminate a mere \$24,000 out of the Health budget for the publication of information and distribution of information. So it is very interesting, Madam Chairperson, how things come full circle, how the Minister, once the greatest criticizer, one of the people in the forefront of criticizing communications activities in the past and accusing the former Government of having nothing but apple polishers, is justifying defending—

### Point of Order

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I have to take personal offence with my honourable friend where she says that I indicated the previous Government, accused the NDP Government, that she was part of, of having apple polishers. That was Gary Doer who made that accusation.

**Madam Chairman:** The Honourable Minister of Health does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over facts.

\*\*\*

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The term was quickly adopted by Members opposite, who are now dramatically increasing their budgets for communications—interesting turn of events. It does not appear we are getting a lot for it, Madam Chairperson.

One would have thought we would have heard a better explanation for this major increase in dollars than a mailout for this so-called consultation process on drug, alcohol and solvent abuse.

We will leave it at that, Madam Chairperson, and I believe we are prepared to move to the next line.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 1.(e) Communications: 1.(e)(1) Salaries, \$254,700—(pass); 1.(e)(2) Other Expenditures, \$19,400—pass.

Item 1.(f) Administration and Financial Services.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, I am wondering if the Minister could explain again a situation of additional staff from the budget approved by this Legislature last year?

**Mr. Orchard:** There was a transfer in of one staff year and a conversion of a position so we could keep our accounts current.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Could I just get a clarification? The Minister said there was a transfer in of one position. Could he tell us from where and what that position was? Second, he said he had to add a person to keep their—could the Minister explain both the addition of two staff years from the budget approved last year by this Legislature?

**Mr. Orchard:** One was a transfer in from Mental Health; the other was a conversion of term to permanent staff.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I am sorry. I did not catch the latter part, a conversion from? Madam Chairperson, could the Minister explain how that position that went from term to permanent did not show up in last year's Estimates?

**Mr. Orchard:** Conversion of term to permanent involved a movement from home care staff and equipment to here.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Just a couple more questions on this. I believe the Minister is in the process of amalgamating administration services between the department and the Health Services Commission. Is that the case and, if so, where are we seeing any efficiencies as a result of that?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes, yes, and more to come.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, I am glad he said there is more to come, because we cannot seem to find anywhere in this entire budget any efficiencies as a result of that. In fact, we are seeing more being spent on staff and administration. There certainly is no commensurate reduction on the administration with the Commission. In fact, we see almost, and we will get to that later, a three-quarters of a million dollar increase with respect to administration, and we see considerable increases here. So we will be anxiously awaiting to see some considerable savings from the amalgamation of administration services between the department and Health Services Commission.

\* (1220)

I am wondering, I believe that Fred Anderson is responsible or the head of this branch or is responsible for the amalgamated administration efforts, and I am wondering if he shows up here or, if not, who is paying for his salary?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Anderson is the ADM. He does not show up here. His salary is paid out of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and, no, I am intrigued and interested in my honourable friend's position, because it appears now as if the NDP are advocating layoffs.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, I think it is important to clarify that, since the Minister is prone to misinterpreting and putting his perspective on issues. I am simply questioning the increase in administration staff, which I find quite peculiar given the great to-do from the Minister. I note though, we are not talking about any efficiencies, we are talking about transfers of people involved in direct service delivery into administration, communications, executive support and so on. So that is my concern, and I think—

**An Honourable Member:** That sounds pretty reasonable to me.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** As the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) has said, that sounds very reasonable. So I think we will leave it at that, and I will pass it over to my colleague.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, I just have one question for the Minister of Health. Can he tell us how much they have paid for Mr. Kaufmann's settlement?

**Mr. Orchard:** Not one red cent. I want to just have a little chat with my honourable friend the Health Critic. Well, it will only take me just a minute to straighten her out. Madam Chairman, my honourable friend three answers ago was advocating layoffs and staff savings and all that sort of stuff. When the reality of her answer was presented to her, that she was advocating layoffs, my next questions would have been, where and whom? Then all of a sudden she backs away and says, oh, that really is not what I meant.

#### Point of Order

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** On a point of order, perhaps the Minister could clarify what I said that even suggests any questions of layoffs. This is a touchy subject since I am asking about increased staff on the administration side of his department and why I would be suggesting layoffs when in fact I am wondering why people have been transferred out of direct service delivery positions and into executive, administration-type positions. Could the Minister perhaps clarify what—

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over facts.

**Mr. Orchard:** Thank you, Madam Chairman, I knew that she did not have a point of order.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Orchard:** I just want to correct my honourable friend. There is no shift of direct service staff providers to admin services or executive support. Madam Chairman, my honourable friend wants to talk about the efficiencies. I want to tell her about an efficiency that has already happened as a result of some of the better procedures we are putting into the management of the department and the commission.

Ask anybody three years ago how long it took them to get a Pharmacare refund. These are people who my honourable friend will stand up and advocate for from time to time in the House as being those who need their money, et cetera. It took up to six months to get a refund out of the NDP. We have it now turned around to four weeks because of an administrative process we have put in place and the advantages of spending the money to resource it, so we administered programs better so Manitobans get the money they deserve from the programs in Government. That is an example of the increased efficiencies.

Madam Chairman, I just want to tell my honourable friend that I am going to discuss with her Leader her suggestion of layoffs in the Department of Health so that I can get whether it is NDP policy or not or whether this is merely the wonderings of Health Critic.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us, it has been more than two years and I think it is a very important issue because we had the Deputy Minister of Health and he was let go. There were some problems and the settlement has not been made as the Minister has said. How much so far has it cost the taxpayers' dollars to just even go through this lengthy process?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, my honourable friend brings up a very serious matter, because it is two years, five months and a few days since we cancelled the contract for the individual mentioned. We have been doing a lot of hard bargaining involving some legal input, which has cost us some money. I cannot give you the numbers. I will try to

get those for you this afternoon as to how much money we have spent in terms of seeking out legal advice and services on it. We have not settled it yet. That is why I say we have not paid the individual one red cent.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister share with us what major hurdles they are facing with the settlement and what the Government has learned from this particular process in terms of the Deputy Ministers and how in the future they are going to deal with all these Deputy Ministers in case of a change of Government?

You know, you fire somebody and let them go. Then I think what happened in 1988 and prior to that, this agreement was made without knowing that these positions—you know, you cannot just sign a paper and say we are going to give you everything. If they change the Government, now you just fire those people. So I think it is not a fault of the individuals as such, but the Government policy has to be very clear.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, my honourable friend brings up a very valid point, because when we came into Government in May 1988, we inherited from the NDP the obscene prospect of having contracts to carry on in key positions of Government.

My Deputy is at the will of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, as are all of my senior staff. We have not provided a five-year, gold-laced contract for him to protect him against a change in Government, because the man is there on his own merits. I would suggest if Government was to change this would be the same Deputy Minister of Health.

Such is not the case under the NDP. They had to protect their friends with no-cut contracts that impacted upon Government when Government changed. We had to then face the prospect of buying out a contract or else simply hive the person off into a corner and have them twiddle their thumbs and play tiddlywinks all day.

No, we chose not to do that, because there is no way in the British parliamentary system that one Government should have to inherit senior Order-in-Council appointment positions by contract as the obscene practice of the NDP was. It was done not only in this one, but in several other areas of Government, not the least of which was Energy and Mines, where we had the Eliesen contract complete with Volvo, bells, whistles and all the options available.

Now, we choose our people. The people that we put into senior positions we believe will stand the test of time, of Government change, because those individuals are not hired because of their peculiar ideological philosophy as the previous NDP Government has done in signing contracts, but they are there because of what they can deliver in terms of program policy and direction and administrative competence irrespective of what their political philosophy might be. Quite frankly, I do not know and I do not care.

I look for competence when I put people in senior positions. I wish we had inherited that kind of a circumstance, but we did not. We inherited contracts, contracts that bound this Government. We chose not to exercise carrying out those contracts, but rather to cancel. That has caused us some problems. It is going to cost the taxpayers some money. There is no question about that, but that points out why we have not done that. That is why these individuals—my Deputy right now is an Order-in-Council appointment. That is the way the British parliamentary system has worked and ought to continue to work, not the gerrymandering of my honourable friends in the NDP.

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please. The hour being 12:30 p.m., committee rise, and call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

**Madam Deputy Speaker (Louise Dacquay):** As previously agreed, this House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m.

# Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Wednesday, December 12, 1990

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees</b>	
Committee of Supply Dacquay	2947
Municipal Affairs Standing Committee Dacquay	2947
<b>Oral Questions</b>	
RCMP Services Doer; Filmon	2947
Judicial System Chomiak; McCrae	2948
Remand Centre Construction Edwards; Cummings; Driedger	2949
Health Care System Wasylecia-Leis; Filmon	2950
Manitoba Nurses' Union Wasylecia-Leis; Filmon	2951
Northern Tax Allowance Lathlin; Downey	2951
Goods and Services Tax Lathlin; Neufeld	2951
Immigrant Physicians Cheema; Filmon; Orchard	2952
GATT Negotiations Plohman; Findlay	2952
CKY Television Strike Ashton; Filmon	2954
Anti-Scab Legislation Ashton; Filmon	2954
Winnipeg Public Libraries Barrett; Mitchelson	2954
Liquor Import Fees C. Evans; Manness	2955

### Non-Political Statements

Beginning of Hanukkah Carr	2956
Mitchelson	2956
Martindale	2956

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Debate on Second Readings

Bill 12, Labour Relations Amendment Act Ashton	2957
Doer	2963
Praznik	2968

#### Bill 25, Ombudsman Amendment Act

Friesen	2971
Carr	2974
Ducharme	2975

#### Bill 24, Environment Amendment Act

Cerilli	2976
Cummings	2979

#### Bill 26, Loan Act, 1990

Plohman	2980
---------	------

#### Bill 25, Ombudsman Amendment Act Law Amendments Standing Committee Meeting Announcement

Manness	2981
---------	------

### Messages

Bill 20 Committee Amendment Manness	2981
--	------

### Committee of the Whole

Bill 20, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1990	2982
--	------

### Committee Report

Committee of the Whole Dacquay	2990
-----------------------------------	------

### Committee of Supply

Health	2990
--------	------