



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 92B - 7 p.m., WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

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

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, July 24, 1991

The House met at 7 p.m.

THIRD READINGS—AMENDED BILLS

Bill 68—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2)

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 7 p.m., resuming debate on Bill 68, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg, standing in the name of the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), who has 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Speaker, of all the levels of government, the municipal or city level of government is the government that is closest to the people. It is the government where it is difficult to distinguish between what they call policy and what they call administration, because the basic services like garbage collection, water, utilities, snow cleaning, road paving and things like that are performed by the city level of government. Therefore, for any representative of the city to be responsible and accountable to his own constituency, he cannot sometimes distinguish what is policy making and what is serving delivery of services to the people.

The municipal level of government has evolved from what we call the town hall meetings of the citizens, where they decide what they shall do with their own locality, with their own community. So it is based on the democratic principle which is citizen participation. Democracy, as we know it today, is far from that. Democracy does not mean that you should poll the people's opinion because the opinion of the public is simply transitory. It may be that the opinion of the general public now is in favour of a smaller City Council, but they do not know all the consequences of such a policy.

Of course, we have preserved the democratic principle of one person, one vote, regardless of the size of the ward, regardless of the number of citizens represented. As long as the wards, in principle, are more or less equal in terms of the number of citizens, then there will be that equality of opportunity of the citizens to be represented in their own city level of

government. Therefore, it is one of the principles in the city policy that the number of citizens represented by its elected official should, as much as possible, be as nearly equal.

If there is to be any variation in the number of citizens represented by each elected alderman or councillor, it should not be more than 10 percent differential, because if there is any greater difference in terms of the people represented then, by definition, those wards with lesser numbers of people will have greater voting power in terms of effect to the matter of policy making at the city level of government.

It is also a principle that needs to be observed in the allocation of the areas to the various wards in the city that the unique physical, cultural, any specific characteristic of each of the localities or the local area should be respected. For example, the inner-city area of government have certain needs that are quite different from the needs of those who are living in the suburban areas. There are certain areas of the city that have unique historical and cultural characteristics like some French-speaking communities in St. Boniface or in St. Norbert. Their own qualities should be properly represented at the city level of government.

The complaint about the parochialism of a single member district as distinguished from the multimember ward is a matter of balancing of values. Parochialism, as we know it, is an outcome of a single member ward. On the other hand, if all the councillors are elected at large throughout the entire city or through some big segment of the city so that they become a multimember ward, then you stamp out their local ties and loyalties. You get rid of parochialism at the same time. However, you make them so far from citizens' accessibility that they are no longer accountable or responsible as representatives of their respective constituency. So you have to balance all these competing values, parochialism and local loyalty, as distinguished from the interests of the total city as a whole.

One of the reasons why we had the metro level of government a long time ago is because of the recognition that there are certain interests that are

city-wide and that are not merely limited to certain areas or localities. For example, the efficiency of the Police Department is a matter of city-wide interest. It cannot be said that the needs for police is limited to one locality, and if the police are to be efficient that efficiency should be reflected all across the entire city, regardless of area, regardless of cultural diversity.

* (1905)

On the other hand, it is also important that the local physical configuration of the ward should be preserved because the people have a certain feature and certain characteristic that has to be represented at the city level of government, and their proper representative can only come mostly from the same locality, the same community that know and represent their respective interests. How can a non-French speaking person, for example, properly represent a French-speaking community unless of course they know how to speak French, and they understand the French culture?

If the heart of the city, the core area of the city has become so multicultural of many people from many different national origins, how can somebody who has not been aware of these differing cultural values be able to represent this people? So it is essential that the elected body, the policy-making body, whether at the level of the city, at the level of the province, at the level of the national government, should be composed of people who can properly represent their respective constituents. By representation here, we mean they understand their feelings; they understand their sentiments; they understand their needs; they understand what they are aspiring for. That is what we call democracy.

What we have known as democracy so far at various levels of government here is simply changing control by two groups of elite politicians—the ins and the outs. This has happened, and we call it democracy, but they have been in control of the power. Whether they are out of office or in office, this is the same group of people who have been alternating in the governing and the governance of the people, and astride at their control is a supposedly nonpolitical administration which is not democratic either, because the administrative setup of our institution is patterned after the bureaucratic model which is based on the principle of hierarchy and based on the principle of confidentiality and secrecy and monopoly of official

information, monopoly of that information essential for running life and citizenry.

Before a democracy can work, before a democracy can operate, the citizen must be enlightened. The citizen must be formally aware of all the various information that they need in order to make an intelligent choice. If this information is not available to the public because it is kept in secret by reason of confidentiality of those who are in possession of it, that is the very reason why the established bureaucracy in our government possesses that kind of influence and independent power, because the power is based on information and information they monopolize. Therefore, they monopolize power.

Sometimes it is very difficult at the political level of government to sway the thinking of those who are career officials in the bureaucratic structure of our institution, because they have their own basis for subsistence. They have their own basis of power and influence that outlasts the power of the elected official.

We have a very limited political cycle in our institution. In the city level of government, for example, there is to be an election every three years. At the provincial level of government there is to be an election every four years, or at the most, five years—(interjection)—or three, depending on the whims and fancy of those who are in control of the government at the time. We have witnessed how the Peterson government in Ontario, thinking that they had a winning majority, called the election prematurely to their own detriment.

* (1910)

So what we call democracy is not truly democracy. It is still the rule of the ruling elite, the few politicians who belong to the majority party or the minority party competing and changing their role all the time, and not being entirely accountable or responsible to the people except during election time. That is why they can make promises and not keep those promises, because the people are helpless. There is no such institution in our society whereby the elected officials can be recalled and be held accountable for the promises that they make. If we are to understand what a democratic system of government means, it is a system whereby there is free citizens' participation, because it is through citizens' participation that we are able to develop the capabilities and the faculties, the innate potential of

the citizens for self-government. It is a learning process for them how to rule and how to be ruled properly in an enlightened fashion.

Participation in government should be in a certain manner. I will give a formula for political participation of those people who right now are powerless in our society because they do not know the procedure. They are ignorant about the processes, and they do not know all the vestiges of how to achieve political power and share power to the people to whom we are all accountable.

There is a formula that I know, and it is embodied in an acronym called GRASP, G R A S P. What is this full formula, GRASP? Participation: for G, it has to be gradual. Those people who want to learn the political processes have to do it gradually, gradual. They first have to learn all the rules that are observed, all the traditions, all the values of the people. What does R for? R stands for responsible, so you should be participating in a responsible manner. What is A? A means you have to do it actively, active participation, active way, not an impassive way. What is S? S means for sustained, sustained participation. You do not give up. You know that your cause is just. You know that you are fighting for what is right. You sustain yourself and have that will to pursue the goal, the objective that you are right. What is P? P is participation. Gradual, responsible, active, sustained participation.

When that is fulfilled by every citizen, they develop their own faculties. They develop their abilities. They know how it is to be governed in a civilized society, and they know how to govern, once they are possessed of power and influence, for the pursuance of the national interests and the interests of everyone.

Politics is sometimes misconceived to be the pursuit of narrow self-interests. That is, in fact, a prostitution, an imitation of what is political because if you go to public office, to public life, merely to make money, that is not politics. That is something else. One who has to serve the public has to be prepared for the supreme self-sacrifice of self-denial of his own self-interests if he wants to promote the welfare of all the people of his own community.

Whether we recognize it or not, it is very difficult to play the political role, because you are always under public scrutiny every moment of the day or the night. Every utterance we make in this Legislative

Assembly has been recorded. One of these days, all those utterances will be quoted to us face to face and then we are contradicting ourselves, but let us not forget that there are certain social roles that we play in our society. When we play the role of government, we have a certain perspective. We have a certain outlook. We have a certain responsibility. When we play the role of opposition, we have another perspective; we have another outlook; we have another way of looking at things.

It is the adversarial system which is not of our own making; we are just creatures of the institutional arrangement in our society. I think there is a much better system than the adversarial system, but that is not the way it is now. When you have to find yourself, you are born in a society, you are just a captive of the institution that you have been born into.

The adversarial system is good in the sense that it always keeps the one who possesses power and responsibility on his toes, that he has to be watchful and cautious and careful about the kinds of decisions and policies that he makes. When any kind of government that is possessed of power and responsibility is cautious and careful and thinking of the public interests, then this government deserves the right of support because it is exercising power in a legitimate manner, but when this kind of government has achieved such power by making promises that they do not keep, by making a commitment that they have no intention of complying with, then that is the prostitution of democracy and they have lost their legitimacy and right to govern.

* (1915)

The same thing with the kind of city government. In the kind of city government, the more people there are in the City Council, the more diversified the kinds of interests and opinions and sentiments that will be represented in that city. It is in the balancing of this various competing push and pull of interests that the outcome is the making of policy that inures to the benefit of everyone.

No one group in society can always get all that it wants. No one group, on the other hand, in society can always be the stepping ground of those who have power and opportunity. There must be compromises; there must negotiations; there must be accommodations; there must be giving and taking because, if all you know is to take and you do

not know how to give, there will come a time when you have no more to give.

Life is paradoxical. Sometimes the more you give, the more resources you have; the more you give, the more resources will be coming but, the more you take, you find out sometimes that people are all against you, and then you have lost your legitimacy, you have lost your status, you have lost your standing in the community.

In this Legislature, we pride ourselves to be a democratic forum, but some of the rules in our Legislature are contradictory and paradoxical. We have somebody we call a Speaker who can never speak. All he does is sit there all day and he can never have the opportunity to speak. We have members here who would sometimes want to express their sentiment in this House, but unless they have their clearance from their House leader they cannot stand even in their own legislative forum.

There is no such thing as complete freedom, because all freedom has its own corresponding responsibility. When a person has responsibility, he cannot always do what he wants because, if he does all that he wants all the time, then that is not freedom, that is licence and absence of freedom. In effect, you will be losing the right that you have because you do not know how to observe the rules of the game.

In our society, there are fundamental principles that have developed throughout the years and principles which constrain our behaviour. These are some of the traditions of our parliamentary government, the traditions of this House, the rulings of the Chair, the rulings that we have to live by and respect.

It is true this observance of established rules has permeated through time, that we are to preserve this institution to hundreds and hundreds of years, that we are able to enjoy the blessings of established differences of opinion and the blessings of peaceful transition of political power.

Without this established institution, before there can be transition of political power, you have to shoot the leader just like it happened in other countries. Which one do you want? Which kind of system do you want? Which kind of system do you prefer?

Is it the system where you can criticize him openly and publicly and expose the things that he has done

as a responsible leader, or is it the kind of system in other countries where you have to go out and hunt the leader because, otherwise, he will not surrender power and, therefore, you have to get rid of him.

We are fortunate to have the form of democracy, but we do not know how to practise its true tenets and its true principles. If we know what democracy is at the city level of government, then we would promote, we would advance citizen participation so that they can be trained, so that they know how to behave in the political forum, so that they will know how to observe all the rules of the game; so that they will behave themselves in a manner that is moral, that is ethical, not only legal.

* (1920)

You can be very legal and you are still very devious in your way. You can be very legal and still immoral in your decisions and, when that happens, people will understand, because we have a heart, we have a mind that can feel what is just and what is unjust.

Only the rule of justice, only the rule of equity, only the rule of equality that is observed in our society will perpetrate the legitimacy of those people who are possessed with power to govern.

In the city level of government, the more we share the power with the citizen, the more we acknowledge the virtue of democracy, the more we persuade the people to adhere to the democratic way of life, because they have their opportunity to participate in the policy making and their participation will be meaningful enough so that they will understand how the system will work.

When we cut off such opportunity for participation like cutting off opportunity to be part of the community committees, to be part of the citizens advisory group, to be part of the citizens advisory committee, when we cut off all kinds of democratic participation, then we are institutionalizing a power of ruling by the few to the detriment of the many, who can be suppressed for the meantime, but yet the time will come when there will be an accounting and then there will be an accounting for what you have done.

We are obligated, despite the fact that democracy is the slowest of all systems, the slowest of all decision making—it is very slow; it is not efficient—but we have to pay the price of delay. We have to exchange the price of delay, because that

is the only way that we can preserve a peaceful way of resolving conflict in our society.

We sometimes become so eager to go home, we want to end the session. I have seen the kind of lawmaking that we have made. We do not even think about the implication of some of the amendments that we make. Sometimes we do not even know the nature of the amendments that we are making. Is that the kind of responsible participation? It is not.

We said we want to hear the citizens. We said we want to hear their views, and yet we close our eyes to what they are saying. That is not democratic at all. In a democracy we have to understand that the power to decide is always in the hands of majority, it is this principle of the rule of the majority that has to be observed.

On the other hand, the minority has certain rights. The minority has to be heard. Unless the minority is heard, we destroy the very system that we say we are promoting. It is just like a gladiators' combat. In a gladiators' combat when you see that your opponent is down there and then you are ready to strike, what would you say? Speak up, and I am going to strike. You let him speak up first because if you do not, that will be unfair.

Even those who are about to die in prison, those who are sentenced to death because they have committed such grievous, heinous crimes, they always ask him what is your last wish? They still have the opportunity to express their last wish before the decision is carried out.

* (1925)

It is appropriate. Whatever is the collective will of the society, whether they want to get rid of those undesirable citizens right away by capital punishment, or whether they want to incarcerate them for life inside, which is not too bad because of our humanitarian tradition—do you know how much money you spend per prisoner inside the prison? On the overhead cost alone of paying the warden, maintaining the prison and all those things, it amounts to almost \$90,000 per prisoner.

If we put that amount of money to educating our citizens from infancy, from childhood and rearing them up as good citizens, then we prevent these kinds of things. There will be less cost in society. Therefore, an enlightened citizen, which is at the basis of democracy, is what we are aiming for in order that democracy may work. They have tried

democracy in other countries, but because the people are so easily swayed by demagogues, by people who misled them, then the system is sometimes destructive of the very system that they want to preserve.

How many times have they tried democracy in Latin America, in Asia, in India? India is supposed to be the birthplace of democracy out there because the British have been there for so many years. What are they resorting to now? They are resorting to assassination. They killed the former prime minister and they killed the son who is now the prime minister. That is not the democratic way of life. The democratic way of life is peaceful election, peaceful processes, peaceful exchange of power, and that can only happen if we respect the basic rules, the fundamental rules, that are evolved in society.

One of the fundamental rules that we evolve in our industrial system is the system of collective bargaining, and what does this government do now? They are trying to destroy this very principle that we have established. They do not know the consequences of this. That means that there will be more unhappiness among the workers, there will be restlessness in the industrial relationship of employer and employee. That means there will probably be more strikes unless they restore the system where it is rightly intended.

You know this kind of collective bargaining system is not a gift that was given, it was the product of life-long struggle of the labour movement. In the olden days, it was conspiracy for workers even to organize because the very organization is deemed to be criminal conspiracy—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have been extremely lenient with the honourable member for Broadway (Mr. Santos), but I would remind the honourable member that we are debating Bill 68, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act. Relevance.

Mr. Santos: A basic principle is that the more representatives there are, the more people who will learn how to govern. The more people learn how to govern, the more there will be people who will understand the system; and the more people who understand the system, the more stable the system becomes. The less people there are, as in our City Council, by monopolizing power in the hands of the few, they exclude the many and by excluding the many, the many will be dissatisfied and the many will no longer observe the rules, the fundamental

rules of the system because they have no opportunity, especially if they perceive that they cannot even run for any elected position that they want to try.

Now bringing it all together, it is important that we not only honour democracy in theory, we only practise its tenets, we apply it to our daily life. It is like saying you are a good Christian, you go to church every Sunday. That is not what a Christian means. A Christian means you visit the sick, you visit the poor, you help those who need help. That is what Christianity is all about. It is not being in church or knowing the pastor or the preacher, it is applying it to your daily life.

Democracy means applying it to our everyday life, applying it to all levels of government from the highest level of the federal level of government to the provincial level to the municipal level, and more so because you are closest to the people. If the people are the ultimate justification for our exercise of political power, then they deserve respect, they deserve empowerment, they deserve sharing in the governance of the political system. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (1930)

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to stand and add my comments to that of my colleagues. There are a lot of truths in what my honourable colleague has put on the record here today. I must agree with a lot of the comments that he has said, and he has echoed the sentiments of this side of the House quite eloquently.

Point of Order

Mr. Edward Connery (Portage la Prairie): I wonder if the member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) could repeat some of the truths that we had learned in the previous speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Reid: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) will have ample opportunity to read the comments in Hansard. Should he be around next session, I am sure he will have the opportunity to respond to those comments.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very important piece of legislation, and I believe it is going to have serious impact. My comments will deal a lot with how it is going to impact upon my constituency and my constituents in Transcona.

Of course, with this bill the minister has proposed to reduce the number of city councillors from 29 down to 15. The current workload for these councillors is very large indeed. They represent a constituency base somewhat larger than what the MLAs do in the urban centre of Winnipeg. I think that is a workload that is a very onerous one for them to have to take on, and now this minister is proposing to increase that workload.

I have had some discussions with members opposite during the course of the last session when they were on City Council, and they made me aware of the type of workload that they had. In fact, one particular member of the government benches has mentioned to me that on some days their phone calls would number in the range of 200, and of course for any one individual to have to handle that type of number of phone calls and that type of workload is very difficult indeed.

This minister is proposing to increase that type of workload, and I do not think any one individual, no matter how capable they are, is going to be able to handle that with any degree of efficiency.

I have had the opportunity personally to sit in on some of the community committee meetings, from a personal point of view and from an observer status. In the ones that I have sat in on, these meetings have gone on into the early hours of the morning. With the proposal to decrease the number of community committees down from six to five, I think there is going to be more pressure put onto these community committees. It is going to be very difficult for these presenters who are there to have the opportunity to make their presentations in what would be considered an orderly fashion and within a reasonable period of time without having to wait through the undue delays that are obviously going to occur.

The early indications when this bill was going to be brought forward, Mr. Speaker, and when it was brought forward, the minister responsible indicated that this bill and this change in the number of councillors is going to save money for the taxpayers in the city of Winnipeg. Of course, we learned through the process over the last couple of months

that this indeed is not going to save money for the taxpayers in the city of Winnipeg. In fact, it is going to do just the opposite. It is going to cost more. A reduced number of councillors are going to require support staff. They are going to require increased salaries because they are now going to be full time, and all of the other extra expenses that go along with that. So indeed the taxpayers in the city of Winnipeg are going to incur extra costs as a result of this bill.

These new 15 councillors that the minister is proposing in this bill are going to have to represent between 50,000 and 60,000 people -(interjection)- 40,000 depending how the division is done. There are ratios that are built into that. The member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) obviously disputes that fact, and he is entitled to his opinion, but I disagree with his comments. I put that on the record and I have no problem putting that on the record.

(Mr. Jack Penner, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

I do not know, Mr. Acting Speaker, of any individual who can effectively represent that number of people and do it without any support staff. -(interjection)- Even the minister opposite says that he can do it. I still believe that he has several support staff working in his office to handle the various problems that are encountered on a daily and weekly basis that may arise out of his constituency. So even there he has support staff to help him.

Yet the city councillors are not going to be entitled to that type of support staff, Mr. Acting Speaker. Of course, the Liberals have sided with the Tories on this bill, and it is unfortunate they have chosen to take that direction. They seem to flip-flop and go with the wind in this case. They think that this is going to speed up or improve the decision-making process. If we want to have efficient decision-making processes, maybe they should start with their own cabinet rank members over there. They can reduce the number of cabinet ministers if they want to make it more efficient, and I think that would be an appropriate place to start.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there are obviously some cases here—and there have been opportunities for the different parties to have the opportunity to have different cabinet ministers. Of course, we believe that it is more important to have efficiency in the government. If it means 21 cabinet ministers to have that efficiency, then that is what we have for

government. If this government here is proposing that it is going to be more efficient with a reduced number of city councillors, then the same should apply to their ranks on the cabinet bench.

I believe, Mr. Acting Speaker, that the citizen participation through the resident advisory groups, which are going to be eliminated, is going to create some problems, because the change that is going to affect them there. We had some participation by the resident advisory groups in my community and, of course, they would advise the city councillor. These resident advisory groups were advising the city councillors, and I think they were not given enough opportunity to expand the role of these resident advisory groups. Unfortunately, the minister has not seen fit to increase that participation by these groups.

The Eldon Ross committee, Mr. Acting Speaker, has gone through its process, this so-called nonpartisan group that was appointed by the minister. They took some offence to some of the remarks that were made by some of the presenters, and I had the opportunity to sit in on some of those presentations. They had the opportunity to take note, also, of the number of presenters that were at these meetings held by the Eldon Ross committee. I must say that from the meetings that I saw and the ones that I have been informed of that took place where I was not able to attend, well over 90 percent of the presenters were opposed to any reduction in the size of City Council. I am sure the minister knows that full well from the number of presentations that were made.

There is one area, if there is any good in this bill and the changes that the minister is supposed to be bringing into place here, that is to let an impartial committee decide what the boundaries are going to be. I believe that is very essential. The government has a majority. They have stated that over and over. If this is their will to have this bill go through with the support of the Liberals, very obviously, at least an impartial committee is going to decide the boundaries for the new wards. -(interjection)-

* (1940)

Mr. Acting Speaker, the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) thinks I should get onside on this issue. I think it is important to recognize what the long-term ramifications of this bill are going to be and how it is going to impact upon the opportunities for the

residents in the community. I am looking for the long-term effects that this is going to have on the residents in the community of Transcona. That is where my concerns are.

There is going to be less opportunity for them, I think, to have access to their councillor than what they have now. Now they just have to pick up the telephone and they will be able to get in touch with their councillor to resolve any of the matters that might be of a municipal nature.

I have had calls come into my constituency office, constituency office that I share with my honourable colleague, the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli). We have had calls coming into that office talking about the inability of the city councillor for Springfield Heights, who has not fulfilled the obligations of that person's office—I have not received any calls talking about the councillor for Transcona not fulfilling his obligation.

The councillor for Springfield Heights had made a presentation to the Eldon Ross committee and had talked about her ability to handle an increased workload. Yet we have calls coming in saying how her time is not being spent in the assistance of her constituents to help them with their problems, Mr. Acting Speaker. That is unfortunate. Yet we are going to see an increased workload for this individual who says that she can handle it.

One of the other areas is the election expenses. I have some problem with that, because the situation in the community of Transcona is that a lot of small individual residents—when I talk about small, I talk about the ability of income here—make donations to the individual. Their donations are not what I would consider to be large donations in the sense of what we might see for the government members opposite.

Mr. Acting Speaker, with the changes that are proposed here there is going to be a requirement, since there is going to be such a large area that these new councillors are going to have to represent when they run for election, that they are going to have to have a large amount of resources to allow them to run election campaigns. This system that the minister is proposing here is not going to afford them the opportunity for the average working communities like Transcona or communities that are on the low income levels; they are not going to be able to support effectively any kind of an election campaign. Yet we are going to see, I believe, where

the large players, and we have talked many times on this side of the House about the developers and those with business interests, playing a larger role in the process and the elections of the city councillors. I believe that will actually take place. We see it to some degree now, but I think it will become much more predominant in the future elections.

Municipal government is our most fundamental form of government. It provides us with all the basic services that we require for day-to-day living. I think quite often we take it for granted; we do not take it seriously enough. We have to recognize the very important role that they play in our society and the difficult jobs that they do, because they handle a lot of the complaints and the case workload that a lot of us may never see as MLAs.

The councillors who are accessible and community-based now, I believe, stand a strong possibility that could disappear, that the councillor will not be living in close proximity or even in the constituency and will not have that special bond like we see with the councillor now who lives in Transcona. There stands a chance that the councillor will not be from that area or could be at the far extremity of the area and not really have a feel for what the community sense is. I can see that developing from my own constituency if someone else is successful in seeking the office as councillor for that community.

The taxpayers, I know and I have even received a few calls on this, and when I am going door-to-door in my constituency, I have talked to some of them about reducing the size of City Council, they want a bigger bang for their buck. That is what they want. At the same time they want an efficient system.

It would also be right to say that taxpayers demand good services, and it includes city councillors who are accessible and community-based. In other words, a councillor who is in touch with the needs and the concerns of their constituents. What is needed is a proper balance between efficiency and democracy. I do not believe by reducing the size of City Council from 29 down to 15 it is going to give that balance. I honestly do not believe that. Democracy by its very nature is not efficient, but this does not mean that one should so radically alter the democratic process of city to make a political system of closed door and elitist process.

There have been other studies done where the report was sensitive to the needs and the traditions of the different communities that make up the city of Winnipeg. I believe the Cherniack report was that particular study. I do not foresee the same results coming out of this Eldon Ross report or this Bill 68 that has followed up on the Ross report.

Transcona in many ways views itself as a unique community with proud traditions and a proud identity. The people of Transcona do not want to lose that sense of community leadership that they have in their city councillor and the loss of community leadership which will definitely occur under a system resulting from this bill.

It is interesting to note that the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) indicated that they want the defeated candidate for the Liberal Party from the last election. I believe the people from Transcona have spoken on that issue and they have made their choice.

To be concerned about efficiency is reasonable, but to be obsessed as this government is, beyond all reason at the expense of local democracy, I think, is the wrong course for this government to follow. In that, I must say that I am opposed to the direction that this bill takes us and that I cannot find myself finding too much to support in this bill.

I thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker, for the opportunity to add my comments to the record.

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): I appreciate the opportunity to join with my colleagues in putting on the record some of our deep and abiding concerns about the background, the philosophy and the underlying ideology that surrounds Bill 68. -(interjection)- Ideology is a concept foreign to some members of the House, Mr. Acting Speaker.

I would like to congratulate the government of the day on their consistency. They have consistently in this session over a number of bills that we have been debating, and certainly nowhere more apparent than in Bill 68, been taking rights away from the community. They have been centralizing power and marginalizing communities in the reorganization of the Child and Family Services agencies. It is very apparent what they have done. They have taken away authority and power and a sense of community from decentralized regional Child and Family Services agencies, centralized the power in a single administrative unit with a very

telling title for the head administrative person: the chief executive officer.

* (1950)

In Bill 68, they have carried on this recentralization, this movement away from democracy, this movement away from community, this movement away from listening to the people, movement away from the cares and concerns of the citizens of Manitoba. One of the things that most concerns us on this side of the House as an impact of Bill 68, and this has been discussed by several of my caucus colleagues, is, as I have stated, the narrowing of the base for representation. By reducing the number of city councillors in the City of Winnipeg from 29 to 15, the government is effectively doubling the number of people who are represented by any one city councillor.

When I was campaigning last summer and early fall in the provincial election, one of the issues that came out of concern to many of the residents in my community was the issue of the potential reduction in the size of City Council. I will say that some of the people who spoke to me about this issue asked me what my position was and I said I was opposed to the reduction in the size of City Council. I asked them what their feeling was on the issue. Some of them said well, I do not know whether it is—it may be not such a bad idea because it will be less expensive.

When I said to them there is no guarantee that the reduction of City Council will be less expensive and most likely will be even more expensive—and that has turned out to be the case. The minister has admitted that this is not a cost-saving measure. When I started talking about that and explaining to people the number of citizens that would be represented by a single city councillor under the new system, they, to a person, whether they were thinking it might have some possible merit at the beginning or not, were opposed to the idea.

They were opposed to the idea for very good and accurate reasons. They were opposed to the idea because they, unlike this government, know that effective municipal representation must be local, must be community-based, must be grassroots and must be able to listen to the immediate concerns of their constituents.

Most—and I know that there are several ex-city councillors who are sitting on the government benches now. I am sure they will agree with me

when I say that the vast majority of the concerns that come across a city councillor's desk on a normal day are questions of a very local concern, neighbourhood concern, street concern, concern about their sidewalks in front of their own home, concern about the light that has been burnt out on their street corner, concern about the lack of a safe crossing walk for their children, concern about backlanes that are literally unpassable because of the potholes, concern about homes that are derelict that appear to be unsafe or unsanitary. Those are the kinds of issues that concern the citizens that they are asking their municipal local city councillors to help them with.

It is difficult enough to be able to deal with those issues and those concerns when you have 20,000 people you are responsible for. If you have 40,000 people, you will find it virtually impossible to be able to handle the issues that are of the most legitimate concern to the citizens of their ward that the municipal political process should be able to assist them with.

The issue of representation and ability of city councillors to do a good job and efficient job and an effective job is one that is clearly not addressed at all in a positive way by this bill, and in fact is addressed in a very negative—will have a very negative impact on the services that are able to be provided to the citizens of Winnipeg.

When residents of the city are told that this bill will not reduce the cost of City Council, as I have stated before, many of them become opponents of the bill because they do understand the importance of having local municipal representation.

The other concern about representation, which is of a major concern, particularly in constituencies represented by my caucus colleagues and me in the city, is the concern about the lack of representation that will occur to the residents of the inner city. That is connected to another major problem with this bill, which is the number of wards and the number of people who will be represented and the costs of election campaigns, which has been addressed by many of my colleagues, as well.

Individuals who live in what are currently the inner-city wards are going to have a much more difficult time being able to financially afford a civic campaign. We have seen what happens to the kind of representation that people get when individuals are priced out of the ability to run. I think the United

States is a classic example where you must be a millionaire, if not a multimillionaire, or have access to people with that kind of financial resources, in order to be able to run as a representative or a senator, at state levels as well as the federal level. The kind of representation that country is now experiencing is something that I do not think anybody in this Chamber will want to have wished on the citizens of Winnipeg or of Manitoba. This is what is likely to happen.

This is what citizens and constituents in the inner city, in the older neighbourhoods, in the working and middle-class neighbourhoods are concerned about, and rightly concerned about, that the people who will be able to be elected to represent them will not, in effect, represent their interests. They most likely will not live in the area, and they certainly will not know anything or have much less of an idea of the issues that face the concerns of those citizens in the older and more centrally located constituencies.

One of the most important elements of a democracy and of a democratic process is the ability to be represented and have your interests—at least have a potential to be heard and to be acted on and to have diverse points of view represented. The diversity of City Council, which is currently one of its strengths, will be sadly depleted by this reduction in City Council.

I would like to speak just very briefly about two issues, one is a concern that I have as someone who was not born, nor did I grow up in Winnipeg. From my perspective as someone who came here from middle-sized, small and large cities in the United States, one of the most wonderful things about the city of Winnipeg is its, up to now, ability to retain its sense of neighbourhood, its sense of local community, its sense of what Transcona is, its sense of what Charleswood is, its sense of what St. James is, East Kildonan, Concordia, the west end. All of these are neighbourhoods that have a great deal of meaning to the people who live there and have provided one of the best things about the city of Winnipeg. I am not sure if it is listed on the 100 reasons to love Winnipeg, but if it is not, it certainly should be as far as I am concerned. It is one of the things that makes Winnipeg a really quality place to live.

One of the, I would say, important elements in retaining that sense of neighbourhood and retaining that sense of uniqueness within the city of Winnipeg is its City Council being represented by an adequate

number of councillors who can reflect on City Council those local and community and neighbourhood issues and perspectives. We are going to lose that. We are going to become homogenized. We are going to become suburbanized, and we are going to become much less of a unique and culturally diverse community.

* (2000)

Finally, I would like to speak just very briefly about some of the assumptions that I think people are making about this bill and the effect it will have on the representation at City Council. We are assuming, and the minister I believe has stated, there are assumptions being made here that because you are cutting in half the number of city councillors that those city councillors will automatically be full time and, therefore, be able to theoretically represent twice as many people at least as effectively as the city councillors are representing their smaller wards.

There is nothing in the legislation, as far as I can tell, that requires or speaks at all to the issue of full-time councillors. There is nothing in the legislation which prohibits a city councillor, one of 15, from continuing to have other interests, other jobs, other positions outside of his or her City Council seat. I am not saying that I would prohibit that, but I am saying that the citizens of the city are making the assumption, and are being allowed to make that assumption by the government, that their representatives because they are half in number will automatically be full time and therefore be able to give a quality of service that, I think, is not going to be forthcoming.

Another assumption that underlies the discussion on this bill is that if you have full-time city councillors, which is an assumption that is not in the act at this point, you will then have office space and support staff, and it will be run much more efficiently and effectively. There is nothing that says that will be the case either. The government is being less than completely forthcoming on the implications of this bill. They are allowing assumptions to remain on the books that are not found anywhere in the legislation and that might very well have an even more negative impact on the quality of representation to be found.

One other comment about the process, the public hearing process, I feel must get on the record because it again shows just exactly what this

government is all about in its definition of democracy and consultation. Just as in Bill 70, just as in the restructuring of the Child and Family Services agencies, just as with their bringing in inordinately large fee increases and reduction of resources to the child daycare system, on all of these instances, and certainly in Bill 68, the government has said that they are consulting. They are going through the process. They are listening to the people.

The Eldon Ross commission was given instructions to bring back a recommendation of between 12 and 15 city councillors. That is hardly allowing for open dialogue to occur when the terms of reference have been laid out in that context. Even given that, the vast majority of the presenters and the presentations were opposed to the reduction in City Council and, as with the other bills that this government has brought forward, the consultation process has been nothing but a sham. It has been a shell game and it has been a charade.

I think what will happen, Mr. Acting Speaker, is that when and if the bill is passed the residents of the city of Winnipeg will soon find to their horror that a Tory is a Tory is a Tory, a majority is a majority is a majority, and the people are the ones to suffer. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Acting Speaker, I am pleased to add my comments to this debate on Bill 68.

It is a rare moment in this Legislature when we can actually get down to debate on some fundamental principles in terms of each of our respective philosophies and ideologies. I think it is absolutely clear that this debate has brought to the forefront those differences. I want to say on behalf of all of our colleagues, we respect those differences, but we have to vehemently say and forcefully say that we disagree with the two old-line parties on this issue.

This debate has been particularly interesting from the point of view of clearly revealing to us and to the people of Manitoba just how similar the Liberals and Conservatives are when it comes to fundamental economic structures in our society, when it comes to democracy and the functioning of democratic institutions, when it comes to challenging change, when it comes to preserving or fighting the status quo.

Mr. Acting Speaker, when you get right down to it, it is clear that the Liberals and Conservatives are

no different. If nothing else, this debate has served very well to enlighten us on those similarities and to clearly demonstrate whose side the Liberals are on when it comes to change, when it comes to status quo, when it comes to corporate concentration, when it comes to enhancing democratic institutions.

We have an interesting position here from the Liberal Party. The suggestion is being made that by supporting that change, even if it is in the wrong direction, that it is a progressive change, that change for the sake of change is progressive. That is what the Liberals are arguing.

The Liberals are suggesting that simply by changing the numbers from 29 to 15 that they are on the side of truth, goodness and light. Let us get to the bottom of their defence of this position. We look forward to hearing more from the Liberals this evening on how they can defend such a position. It is, in my humble opinion, a most ludicrous and unsupportable position. Let us recognize what is actually happening in terms of the ability of the Conservatives, supported by the Liberals, to actually pull one over on the people of Manitoba, suggesting to the people of Manitoba that this reduction in council is important particularly because it will save dollars.

There is no evidence to support that. There is no basis in fact for that assertion. In fact, many commentators on this issue and analysts on this issue have suggested there may be additional costs by reducing the number of councillors to 15, given the size of the constituencies, the need to move to full-time salaries, and the absolute requirement for a considerable number of staff to support elected representatives serving such humongous constituencies.

Mr. Acting Speaker, there is not much to this argument of cost savings except for the fact that it is a very clever argument in terms of convincing the people of Manitoba that this is the right thing to do. It does not take much to see through that argument. What we are then left with is, what is the basis for this decision? Why reduce to 15 the number of city councillors, fundamentally alter and change the decision-making institution at the city level? Why do so unless, as has been put so eloquently by WIN, Winnipeg in the Nineties, that what the Liberals and Conservatives are talking about is political efficiency, not economic efficiency, not financial efficiency but political efficiency, which is, in the words of WIN, log rolling, back scratching,

back-room dealing, which has been normal practice at City Hall for years. These members, these Liberals and these Conservatives, want to entrench that mode of thinking of operation even firmer in terms of so-called democracy at City Hall, in terms of municipal government.

* (2010)

Mr. Acting Speaker, we can draw no other conclusion from this collusion and co-operation between Liberals and Conservatives on this issue than to recognize it for what it is, and that is the concentration of power even more firmly in the hands of a small elite. Make no mistake about it. That is a small collection of white men who have established themselves in a community, in a business, in an employment opportunity where they have the luxury to spend time at this level of politics and to devote such resources to very significant campaigns. Let there be no mistake about where these two parties are coming from.

WIN has clearly said they take exception to this way of conducting civic politics and, in fact, have clearly stated: the electoral consequences of council reduction will increase the likelihood that gang councillors will be elected in the first place. Second, fewer players at City Hall will concentrate political power in fewer hands making the job of rewarding some councillors and punishing others much easier.

That really brings us to the heart of the whole issue, and that is, what does this do in terms of our model of participatory democracy? What does this do in terms of achieving a representative balance in our elected bodies, whether it be municipal, provincial or federal?

Mr. Acting Speaker, my colleague the member from Broadway (Mr. Santos) had some very prophetic things to say on this whole issue of democratic institutions and enhancing those institutions. He, in essence, asked the question, or stated that politics is really asking the question, whose interests shall flourish and whose shall perish? The structure of our institutions, the way in which we elect people, the opportunities available all impact directly on that question and clearly establish whose interests shall flourish and whose interests shall perish.

We know very much that our political structures that have encouraged very back-room decision-making processes and have elected a

homogenous group of people, have ensured that a certain group of interests are represented and allowed to flourish in our society. We only have to look around us to see whose interests are perishing, whose concerns are being neglected.

This bill, Bill 68, and this model being adhered to, being adopted so enthusiastically by Liberals and Conservatives, will only ensure further that those inner-city interests, the poor in our communities, our aboriginal citizens, single-parent women, and the list goes on and on, those interests will continue to perish. So, Mr. Acting Speaker, what the Liberals are suggesting is that we take a bad situation and make it worse. Instead of working on the real crux of the problem at City Hall and improving our decision-making process, opening up the doors of opportunity for all types of people to enter politics at that level, this political party is, in effect, entrenching inequalities in our system, further closing off opportunities to a good number of people in our society.

Mr. Acting Speaker, politicians today and political institutions are very much on trial. People everywhere in Winnipeg and Manitoba, in Canada, are questioning politicians. They are cynical about political institutions. They are expressing dismay and disappointment. There are many reasons for that, but I think the overwhelming reason is that politicians and our political institutions do not, in the norm, represent the views and interests of the communities they serve. I think it is because politicians and political institutions are out of touch, or appear to be out of touch, with the people in our communities. They want politicians to be more direct, to be more accessible, to be more involved on a hands-on basis, to be more representative of the concerns and needs of their communities.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I cannot speak for all members in this House, but I dare say that if we go back to the time when we first thought about a political career and considered running for politics and finally made that decision, we did so probably, first and foremost, out of the interest and the determination to represent people in our community, to speak out for the concerns in our neighbourhoods.

Furthermore, Mr. Acting Speaker—and this I certainly cannot say holds true for all members—to speak up for the powerless, the voiceless, the most vulnerable members in our society. If we go back to that driving force, to that vision, then I think all of

us -(interjection)- The Premier is questioning the suggestion that we are all in politics to serve our constituents, to speak up on behalf of interests in our communities, to represent the most vulnerable, the most voiceless, the powerless people in our communities.

I think that if we all go back to our very beginnings in politics, we will remember that is what drove us into this crazy job of politics to begin with. Mr. Acting Speaker, I would say we want to keep serving our constituents in the best way possible, with as much contact as possible, and as much as possible on a personal one-on-one basis.

Now, Mr. Acting Speaker, there are those who may argue that politicians and legislators should be making policies and setting laws and that the rest will follow. We on this side of the House in the New Democratic Party—certainly, those in WIN, Winnipeg In the Nineties—have expressed the view to provide—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): Order, please.

Ms. Wasylycia-Lels: —have expressed the view that we would like to find in every way possible to continue serving our constituents on a hands-on basis in a very direct personable way and putting, as much as possible, a human face on politics.

Mr. Acting Speaker, it is a hard enough job to do that now. Many of us have families, have young children, have responsibilities that we are trying to juggle. Our job as legislators should be to put in place a framework that encourages people from all walks of life to enter politics and to combine that with the many other responsibilities that they have, particularly parenting responsibilities, care for young children.

This proposal flies in the face, directly in the face of any progressive attempt to make politics more human, to make political opportunities more accessible for people from all walks of life, from all income brackets, from all ethnocultural backgrounds and, particularly, representing both women and men in our society today.

* (2020)

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, Bill 68, is not based on participatory democracy, it is based on exclusionary politics. It will exclude people from many walks of life from entering politics at the

municipal level. It will absolutely block off opportunities for women, for aboriginal people, for ethnocultural peoples, for people living with disabilities, and parents with young children.

Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite do not want to accept my feelings and my opinions on this issue, then I suggest they at least listen to the words of the reputable organization now at City Hall, Winnipeg in the Nineties, who has clearly stated, let me quote for members in the House this evening: The superwards will be real political plums and much will be at stake for any group or party fielding candidates. Campaign budgets and organizations will need to be doubled and risk reduced correspondingly. Therefore, the outright electibility of candidates will be a much bigger consideration in this election process. Nominees may be well chosen on the basis of their political connections, name recognition, media skills and financial support, while such factors as experience in civic affairs, knowledge of the city's problems, practical political skills and commitment to Winnipeggers would be downgraded.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a fairly clear statement in terms of the new style of politics that will evolve as a result of Bill 68. I think it is perfectly evident that we will end up even more so with the small, with the tight club of men who are going to be continuing the most paternalistic, macho style of politics that we see now. It is likely to be even more apparent at City Hall as a result of this issue. Let there be no mistaking, democracy, as we know it and understand it to be in terms of participation, in terms of community involvement, in terms of grassroots activity, is at jeopardy with this bill.

Let there be no mistaking that our goal of ensuring representation that is reflective of all aspects of our society, of all groups, of all individuals in our society, is at stake. Mr. Speaker, I think we should be busy in this Legislature doing the opposite, improving participatory democracy in our province and in our country, and I think we should be opening doors of opportunity for people now generally excluded from political life.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by using the words of one person who has written a great deal on women in politics who states: In the process of struggling for power or for equality, society as a whole may be transformed, becoming more participatory and democratic, expanding rights and bringing to the

forefront values related to humanity and compassion.

Bill 68 does not take us in that direction. I would urge all members to join with us in defeating Bill 68 and getting back to the real challenge before us, and that is making City Hall and all of our political institutions more democratic, more accessible and more participatory.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I want to put it on the record that I support Bill 68. I support Bill 68 for two reasons. Number 1 is that I can tell you in all fairness that the majority of my constituents, a good majority—I would estimate between 85 percent and 90 percent of my constituents—say that this is, in fact, a good bill, that it is a bill that should be endorsed by all three political parties, but that is only one of the reasons.

The second reason why I support Bill 68 is because it is the right thing to do. The city of Winnipeg will benefit if we have a reduction in the City Council. I take exception to what the NDP have been preaching in the past couple of hours, in fact, for the past six, seven months, when it comes to reducing the number of city councillors.

What did Mr. Schreyer do when he was Premier? We used to have over 100 city councillors in the City of Winnipeg. What did Mr. Schreyer do? He cut it down. What did the New Democrats say then? What did the member for St. Johns say ten minutes ago? She talked about the fundamental principles of democracy. She said that it was fundamental principles that she was arguing. What principles is she talking about? Hypocrisy knows no bounds when it comes to the New Democratic Party. The New Democratic Party has to answer to the city of Winnipeg come the next election, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Transcona (Mr. Reid), the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylcia-Leis), and several other city members—I do not believe the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) spoke on this bill. -(interjection)- Oh, he did speak on this bill? I thought maybe he was one of the smart ones who chose not to speak on it.

I did just want to put those few remarks on the record. I think it is very important that the New Democrats do what they preach and grab some principles, and start doing what is in the best interests of the city of Winnipeg, not in the best interests of the New Democratic Party.

Ms. Jean Friesen (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, this bill, we believe, is wrong. It creates constituencies of over 40,000 people, constituencies which will be twice the size of the current council. This is a hallmark bill of this majority government with an agenda of the radical right assisted by their allies in the Liberal Party. It is a reversal of the trends of Winnipeg history; it destroys the characteristic local communities which Winnipeg has had from the time of parish government onwards, the communities which grew out of neighbourhoods, where work and community living were combined, places like Point Douglas, places like Transcona, places like Weston.

What this government plans to do is to replace those political boundaries, to uproot neighbourhoods and communities, to amalgamate, to homogenize, to create Winnipeg in the image of those 1950 suburban ideals. Winnipeg is more than this and has always been more than this.

In Winnipeg we celebrate diversity. Even the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has spoken of the north end social, along with his north end values, mind you, speaking from the canoe. We celebrate multiculturalism; we celebrate immigrants; we celebrate the aboriginal people of Winnipeg; we celebrate the diversity of this particular community. It is what makes us different from many communities, both to the east and the west of us. Those communities needed and wanted and celebrated the direct democracy that they had and the easy access that they had to their city councillors.

* (2030)

What this bill does is to reduce democracy, to reduce the access of citizens to their elected local officials—the local officials who are the most immediate level, who have expectations of immediate action, who have expectations of people who will know their communities, who will not reside 10 miles across town, who will be close to their communities and who can represent them.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that what this bill is is part of a much larger political agenda within Canada. What is happening here and the consequences of what is happening here are going to be a reduction, a marked reduction, in Winnipeggers', Manitobans' and Canadians' attachment to the political process.

There is no doubt that across this country there is a rejection of politicians, a rejection of the political

process, that we have developed over the last few hundred years. The Tory Party bears the great majority of that blame; the Tory Party, in the provinces and at the federal level, has broken its promises time after time after time so that citizens no longer trust those Tory governments.

Then those Tory governments have the nerve, the gall, to turn around and to say that people are alienated from the political process. They are not alienated from the political process; they are alienated from cabinets in Ottawa; they are alienated from provincial Tory governments like Devine's, like Filmon's, across this country.

What this bill does, Mr. Speaker, is to reduce the access again of citizens to their local representatives, to distance them from their political representatives, to create again more of the alienation which we have come to see as the fate of Canadians under Tory government after Tory government. It is not something to be taken mildly, because what we have is very large unemployment in Canada, we have a very high percentage of youth unemployment. You take that together with the alienation of citizens from their politicians, the alienation of citizens from their political process, and what you have is a recipe for totalitarian solutions.

That is what concerns me about this bill, Mr. Speaker. It is part of a broader context, part of that process to distance Canadians from their government. It creates larger wards. It creates situations where people will need \$8,000, \$10,000, \$15,000 to run for election. It creates a council of 15 where the range of representatives for Winnipeg, a community of great diversity, will be much reduced, and that concerns us all on this side of the House. It will further distance, I believe, people from their elected representatives when they find that their interests, their local neighbourhoods, their cultural diversity is not represented at the civic level. So let us keep that broader context in mind—the principle of this bill first of all, and second of all, its consequences.

What will be the consequences of this bill? One of the major consequences is that you will be able to run the City of Winnipeg with eight people, the Gang of Eight. Eight people are going to have control of the economic conditions of two-thirds of our population. One of the major economic engines of this province is the city of Winnipeg. We are very different from other provinces in that way. To turn over control of two-thirds of the jobs to the role of

attracting industry, the role of attracting economic opportunities to Winnipeg is put into the hands of eight people, elected with large budgets and given the responsibility for very large constituencies. So when we are considering our vote on this bill, that Gang of Eight stands very high in our minds, Mr. Speaker.

It is possible that some of those eight, the Gang of Eight, some of them might indeed be Reform candidates; some of them might be members of WIN groups; some of them might be NDP. We are not ruling that out at all, and there certainly will be a challenge to the mayor as well. The point is the principle, not who wins those seats, but the fact that eight people will be looking after the interests of two-thirds of Manitobans.

The second consequence is that this, I believe, is another step in the Americanization of Canada. What we have got here is the creation of Winnipeg in the image of American cities, and it is no hazard I think, no, not just by chance, that people who came to the hearings talked about Los Angeles.

Los Angeles, a city where the power is organized around the constellations of private capital, based on land development, and where the fortunes of the citizens and the city are left to the vagaries of an international market and a disenfranchised population. That is a description of Los Angeles, but it would fit Omaha. It would fit most of the major—and incidentally many of them bankrupt—cities of the United States, and that is not the way we want to go.

Across Canada, Winnipeg stands in the middle. The cities of London, of Hamilton, of Ottawa—all of them have constituencies of about the same size as the current ones in Winnipeg. We are not an anomaly. We are not extraordinary. Many of the cities in fact to the East of us have many smaller constituencies, and on top of this they also have regional government. So simply to say that we should have larger constituencies because Edmonton and Calgary do is to very much misunderstand the context of urban politics in Winnipeg.

I find it very distressing, Mr. Speaker, that, in fact, we would be going the route of places like Edmonton. Has anybody been to downtown Edmonton lately? There, exactly, is the same kind of situation as you have in Los Angeles—an empty downtown. An empty, desolate downtown where

you can hear your footsteps echoing any time after five o'clock at night, a town which has simply been strip-malled to death and the citizens are now paying the consequences of that, even though they have elected a progressive mayor. She is going to have to deal with the decisions that have been made by that kind of a council over the last decade or so.

In one sense, what we have here in Bill 68 is the last cruel joke played on Winnipeg by the gang, those city councillors from Tuxedo, St. Norbert, Riel, Charleswood, Niakwa, Kirkfield Park, who did the damage to Winnipeg in the first place, who ran up the debt which every city homeowner is paying for now, who ignored intelligent development standards. They logrolled until the logs were worn down, they horse-traded until the horses fell apart, they scratched each other's backs until they had forgotten where the itch was, in the disreputable style of politics which justly earned them the name of the Gang of 18, and this is their last cruel joke. They ride again into the sunset, Mr. Speaker.

The elevation of the gang to provincial government has not, unfortunately, given them any new ideas. They have not climbed any mountains. They have not looked up any higher hills. They have come up with one idea, a simplistic, naive, ideologically hidebound policy. They have given us no fundamental reasons for this change. They have given us no evidence to say that this will solve any of the problems in the city of Winnipeg. They have provided us with no research to show how such kinds of councils have worked elsewhere or how they would work in this particular situation. They have given us this simple-minded view that 15 men—and they will be men—in one room will work better, will provide us with better decisions than 29.

The likelihood is that they will be men. When you need far more money to run for City Council, when you do not have political contributions which enable women to get the financial support to win, then you are setting up a situation where far more men are likely to win than women. And if you do not agree with me, you try . . . and show something different. Show me the research.

Mr. Speaker, this government had the opportunity to address the budget process, to look at the procedures of Winnipeg City Council. They vaunt their experience at every turn of the hat in this game. Where did they use that experience? They used it with one, simple-minded, naive idea. They took the knife, like a 19th Century surgeon, who has got only

one tool in his bag and it is a knife, and he cuts it right through. So they cut clear through the political communities of 60 percent of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, as a social democrat, I cannot support this bill.

* (2040)

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I knew when our party promoted the idea, promoted a smaller City Council that it was an important decision, but I never thought that it was going to take on the international dimensions that it has taken on in the debate here today. We know now that Bill 68 is responsible for political assassinations, the failure of Indian democracy, the last request of a dying person. We are all exponents of the radical right. We are attacking the very heart of the Canadian political process. Bill 68 is responsible for unemployment in Canada, and once we are finished with Canada, we are all going to be Americanized. It is a recipe for totalitarian solutions. If I would have known then what I know now, I probably would not have supported this bill. We are all ideologically hidebound. We are all hopelessly naive, and we all live in a dream of 1950s suburbia. I know that the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) is a powerful man, but I would not give him that much, I will tell you.

Let us look at some of the arguments that we have heard throughout this debate, and they are really quite incredible. The first one is that this is undemocratic. This strikes at the very heart of democracy, the heart of democracy that 72 percent of the people of Winnipeg voted for in the last election. We have heard throughout the debate that the government has no mandate, no mandate to make these changes.

I would like to know what the arguments are that have been marshalled by opponents to this legislation and members of the NDP to prove that the government does not have a mandate. It happened to be by coincidence the same day—I do not know why that is, maybe some day we will know—of the election campaign when the Liberal and Conservative Parties made this a feature of their political platform and during the beginning stages of an election campaign. When all the votes were tallied up between the Liberal and Conservative Parties, there was an overwhelming majority in the city of Winnipeg.

Then we had the argument in committee, and this was presented by many, that the rural-dominated government did not have the right to pass legislation that affected the city of Winnipeg. Now I felt at the time and still do, Mr. Speaker, that it was just a tad strange that members on the government side did not have the right to pass legislation that affected the city of Winnipeg, because then I said to myself, as a member of an urban caucus, that we have no right to speak about agricultural policy. Because we do not represent rural Manitoba, how dare we add our voice to a debate on, let us say, Hydro development in the North. I do not live in Thompson. I do not live in Gillam. I do not live in Sherridon, but surely no members of the New Democratic Party or members of the public who came to committee would argue for a moment that members of this Legislature do not have a right to speak on all issues that come before us.

Let us just follow the logic of those who say that the rural-dominated government caucus does not have a right to legislate for the city of Winnipeg. Do I only represent the people of Crescentwood? Do I only have the right to speak -(interjection)- As the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) says quite rightly, only some of them. It was not even 50 percent of them who voted for me in the last election. I am here as a legislator on behalf of all of the citizens of Manitoba who expect me as an MLA, and all of my colleagues and everybody else, to pass a law that is in the best interests of the province and here, not the balderdash that we are hearing from some of the speeches tonight, but this is the heart of the debate. This is the heart of the reason why there ought to be a reduction of the number of city councillors in Winnipeg, so that we do not only represent Transcona or Elmwood or Wolseley or River Heights, but we represent all of the people of Winnipeg on City Council.

Here we have the -(interjection)- Oh, I hear the word "dictator" from the upper reaches of the New Democratic Party. Perhaps the most unusual feature of the debate that we are hearing here is that the New Democratic Party, the party of reform, the party of new ideas, the repository of wisdom and self-righteousness is the party that is defending the status quo. The conservative party in this Legislature is the New Democratic Party. What is it that they are defending? What is the status quo in Winnipeg City Hall now that the New Democratic Party so proudly is defending? Is it the highest

municipal tax base in Canada that they are defending? Are they defending the level of service that we are getting for that taxation? Yes. Are they defending that urban sprawl that they decry so often in this Chamber and outside of it? What are the real values that the New Democratic Party is defending by saying that the status quo is in the interests of the city of Winnipeg? I do not really understand why they are defending the status quo.

If we were satisfied that the kind of governance we were getting in Winnipeg was the best that we could reasonably expect, if we were satisfied that the level of service that we were getting for our tax dollar was all that we could reasonably expect, if we were satisfied that the level of municipal taxation was all that we could reasonably expect, then it would be possible to make an argument for the status quo. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. The truth of the matter is that an overwhelming number of Winnipeggers are alienated from City Hall and alienated from municipal process. If the New Democratic Party does not understand that, they have not been on the phone and they have not been on the streets long enough.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments for Bill 68 we made, we think persuasively, during second reading, but I want to point out a couple of ways in which this bill was introduced by the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst). The Minister of Urban Affairs said that he is going to appoint a partisan committee of individuals to exercise a very narrow mandate, and that mandate was going to include drawing the boundaries around the new wards.

When our party called the press conference and said that was not a very good idea, that by statute through The City of Winnipeg Act there was an independent boundaries commission already established, the Minister of Urban Affairs said the only reason we were objecting to what he was doing was because we wanted to get our "mug" on television. Then miraculously, several week later the Minister of Urban Affairs agreed with us and got his "mug" on television eating just a wee bit of humble pie along the way. It was a serious mistake, but at least we give the Minister of Urban Affairs some credit for having the wisdom to reverse himself and change that bad decision.

* (2050)

We also have heard in this debate an awful lot of misinformation on the record. Never mind the

political assassinations and democracy in India and the driving at stake through the heart of Christianity, et cetera, but we also heard from the member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) that we are going to have ward sizes between 50,000 and 60,000. Well, that is not true. Has anybody got a calculator, Mr. Speaker? If you take 60,000 and you multiply it by 15 wards you get 900,000 people. I did not know we had 900,000 people in the city of Winnipeg. I think it would be a good thing if we had 900,000 people, but we do not.

The member for Transcona also said that resident advisory groups were going to be—I do not know what word he used—but the implication was they were going to be ransacked by this legislation. -(interjection)- They are not going to be listened to. He is putting it on the record again. Bill 68 says nothing about resident advisory groups. They are already mandated by The City of Winnipeg Act. The City of Winnipeg wants to give resident advisory groups more power, more funding. That is fully within their jurisdiction if they choose to do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is taking on a much greater burden than it deserves. It is a good idea. Most of the cities of comparable size in Canada and elsewhere have far fewer city councillors than we have. I cannot think of one municipality that has more than 29 anywhere in Canada or in the United States, the Americanization of Canada notwithstanding. So let us try to keep a little bit of perspective on this bill.

What this bill attempts to do is to make decision making more accountable, to make decision making broader and in the city interest. It has nothing to do with 98 percent of the gibberish that we have heard in this debate tonight and elsewhere.

There is one piece of business unfinished by this piece of legislation, and we want to make that clear on the record. It is now necessary for the government to review election finances for the municipality in Winnipeg. It is necessary to bring in some tighter accountability and control over election expenses, and I hope that the opposition can play a useful and constructive role with the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) leading up to the next session so that we can put those regulations in place before the next municipal election in October of 1992 in Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, our party supports this legislation. We support this legislation because we think it is in

the interests of Winnipeg. We support this bill because we know that a vast majority of the people of Winnipeg, both through the expression on election night, and through conversations, countless, dozens, hundreds of conversations, letters and phone calls we have received, that the people of Winnipeg believe it is the right thing to do.

I can only say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of opposition that we are getting from the New Democratic Party on this bill is a classic case of opposition for the sake of opposing. Have they made one suggestion as to how the governance of the city of Winnipeg can be improved? No, it is all naysay. What they are doing is they are defending a status quo that does not work with not one suggestion to replace it with anything better. We say, let us be progressive. Let us look forward, let us not look backward. Let us support Bill 68. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a few thoughts on the record. We are going to talk about gibberish from the member for Crescentwood. Let us really talk about a history of gibberish in terms of dealing with the City of Winnipeg. The member for Tuxedo voted for a council in 1977 of 29 seats. He did not move an amendment. He voted for a council of 29 seats.

The member for Charleswood, the deputy Urban Affairs critic at that time, now the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme) and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) had a bill before them, and the bill before them had a number of principles contained within the bill. One of them was to go for the first time ever in North America to an independent boundary commission for purposes of establishing the boundaries of the city of Winnipeg. Let us use the positive experience in the province of Manitoba for the purposes of establishing boundaries, and let us do it on a regular basis so that we do not have a situation where the discrepancy in size in ward boundaries for the citizens of Winnipeg would increase dramatically.

We moved that piece of legislation. We also moved that the numbers of wards be contained within provincial legislation and we said that should stay at 29. The members opposite, when they were in opposition, whether it was Mr. Mercier, a former councillor and a former Urban Affairs minister, the present member for Charleswood, the present member for Riel and the present Premier, all voted

for 29. They did not amend it to 24. They did not amend it to 18. They did not amend it to 15 then, because it was felt that one councillor per 22,000 was not a bad ratio of representation. Many of the members said that, and do you know who we compared ourselves to? We compared the councillors in the City of Winnipeg to ourselves. Yes, we could argue that we have provincial responsibilities and they have civic responsibilities or we could argue, as councillors can, that they are the closest to the people, have more phone calls, et cetera, but the bottom line -(interjection)- Excuse me, I would like to speak and not have this little gibbering from the side.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Doer: I have to admit I heckle from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, we decided to keep the size, and there is no magic formula, whether we should have 57 members of this Legislature or should we have 60, should we have 40, should we have 30. Is it more progressive for this Legislature to go down to 30? Is it more progressive for this Legislature to go up to 100? Is that status quo or non-status-quo? We argued that one person for 22,000 or so was not a bad representation. It was pretty consistent with what we are doing now in this Legislature for our own representation.

Then we had a new bill brought in by the former Minister of Urban Affairs in 1988. The proposal at that time was to lower the size of City Council from 29 to 24. The member opposite used the Cherniack report, which I happen to think was not a bad document to be using, because 24 seems to be a number that a couple of independent committees have come up with, Herb Middlesta's committee and Cherniack, surely, incredible people, from a wide spectrum of views. They both have come to the conclusion that, to keep strong community-based neighbourhoods represented at City Hall and also have the most effective possible decision making, maybe 24 should be the number.

Notwithstanding that, the former minister brought the number 24 before this Legislature. Where were the Liberals on that? They were with the status quo.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Doer: Yes, they were with the status quo. They voted against reducing the size of City Council from 29 to 24. I can cite you Harold Taylor, John Angus, very many Liberals said that we needed 29

members because you could only have one councillor per 22,000. The only way you could represent people effectively at the City of Winnipeg was to have that kind of ratio. So the Liberals, of course, voted with the New Democrats, against the Conservatives and against the reduction in City Hall. -(interjection)- Fair enough.

Mr. Speaker, then we had a tax revolt in the south end of the city of Winnipeg last spring, because of the reassessment that took place and some of the shifts in taxation, plus the gang brought in a post-civic election budget that reflected the tremendous costs that had developed in the city of Winnipeg because of the urban sprawl that had developed over the last 15 years by the Liberal-Conservative coalition at City Hall. Many of the same members sitting in this Chamber, the positions of power and authority, worked together with the Liberals at City Hall to develop a city and infrastructure for a city of some 750,000 people, for a population of 612,000. That is why the taxes are too high.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have two choices. We could come in with a planning bill and we could come in with an enlightened debate with the citizens of Winnipeg talking about the real reasons we are paying too much tax, and that is because we built a city too large for the population with too many services for a population. We could talk about the real honest reason why we are paying too much tax, or we could take an easy way out. We can say the real problem with the debt and the taxation at City Hall is we have a council that is too large; let us reduce it to 15 and that will solve all our problems, a dishonest but popular proposal.

* (2100)

Where did this dishonest but popular proposal come from, Mr. Speaker? It came coincidentally the same day from the Liberal and Conservative leaders in the last provincial election. Notwithstanding where they voted and what they proposed before, they came back in the last election to reduce the size of City Council on the same day, by coincidentally the same amount of councillors.

We rejected the popularity of that idea because we felt it was being dishonest with the people of Winnipeg about why their taxes were too high. We believe that the urban sprawl development that has taken place for the last 20 years -(interjection)- Well, the member for St. James asks me if we

formed government. He knows that is not true, and perhaps he should look in the mirror someday himself on that issue.

An Honourable Member: It was a campaign promise.

Mr. Doer: It was a campaign promise. I respect that.

Mr. Speaker, we decided to have an honest debate about the reason why the taxes were too high. The taxes are too high in the city of Winnipeg because of urban sprawl development in the city of Winnipeg, which was led, voted for, voted on at City Hall by successive Liberal-Conservative coalitions at City Hall. They used to call it the gang, and they still call it the gang. It is still the same group meeting in back rooms behind back doors. So we do not need a lecture from the Liberal Party of Manitoba about the principles of civic government. They are the party that meets behind back doors. They meet behind back doors with the Conservative Party. They have been doing it for 20 years, and shame on their political party, shame.

Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with Bill 35. The Liberals at that point said if we had a decent planning bill maybe we would look at the size of City Council. Well, the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) has spoken about Bill 35, and not in very glowing terms, I might add. If that was going to be the quid pro quo for the reduction in the size of City Council, I sure do not see it in Bill 35. The member for Crescentwood does not see it in Bill 35.

We are going to continue on trying to reform the City of Winnipeg. We have suggested a number of amendments that have been rejected by the majority Conservative government, and Bill 35. They go together, these issues. We will continue to try to develop urban reform. We initiated the Cherniack commission and we were following through on many of the reforms, some of the same reforms the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) cited when he talked about the Independent Boundaries Commission some time ago with the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst).

Those reforms are not foreign to us. We brought them in, and we believe in them. We know there are a lot more reforms necessary at City Hall, but we will be quoting chapter and verse a couple of years from now. We will be seeing what happens for the Liberal-Tory vision of City Hall. Will our taxes go down after the Liberal-Tory city council is in place?

No. Will we get decent city planning at the City Hall with the Liberal-Tory city council? I suggest not. Will we see reform on election finances aided and initiated by the Liberal-Tory development gang at City Hall? Absolutely not. They are a back-room group of people at City Hall. They are working together in this Legislature to vote with their back-room friends at City Hall, and we reject it totally, Mr. Speaker. That is why we will vote against this bill.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer). His major criticism seems to be that the Tories and the Liberals have done that absolutely unthinkable, undemocratic thing. We really have done what is absolutely an affront to democracy. We have changed our mind. That is a very dangerous principle, that you listen to the people and the people convince you that your position is wrong and you change your mind. My goodness, what will happen to democracy in this province if we listen to the people? That is a very, very dangerous concept according to the New Democratic Party.

I make absolutely no debate with the member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), when he says we had a different position in 1988. Yes, we did. We did have a different position in 1988, and consistently I was told that it was the wrong position. We had town houses, we had surveys, we talked to our constituents, and our constituents told us to 80 percent levels that they wanted a smaller City Council.

I listened to the arguments that were posed from the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) and those were arguments, I can tell you, that were raised in our caucus, exactly the same arguments. The same positions were debated. We struggled with this position, because many of us were concerned about cutting the number of seats. That is why we were unhappy with the former minister's bill, because we thought 23 was tinkering.

We did not see that 23 or 24 could make any difference in the way in which the city was governed. We put that clearly on the record, that going from 25 to 24 was not what the citizens were asking for. We continued to dialogue and we continued to debate and we continued to discuss, and the numbers that were consistently raised with us was they wanted a City Council of 12 to 15. They thought that kind of a City Council would bring an organization to the city

that would enable the city to work more efficiently, while at the same time representing the legitimate aspirations of their constituents. So mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa, I am very guilty, I changed my mind.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we heard just a few moments ago from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) one of the finest examples, I think, of a hypocritical speech that I have ever heard in my entire life.

He talks about urban sprawl. Mr. Speaker, there is no urban sprawl in Winnipeg. The urban sprawl is outside, and when he was minister he was aiding and abetting it by taking planning authority away from the City of Winnipeg. That is urban sprawl.

We have heard for hour after hour here and we heard it at committee as well, the fact that somehow the reduction of the size of City Council is anti-democratic. We have heard everything from stakes through the heart of democracy to all kinds of other analogies about what is going to happen, but let us for a moment examine what the record of the NDP is with regard to that.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) said it earlier. He said, before 1972 when Mr. Saul Cherniack was a minister of the Schreyer government he went out and said to the people of greater Winnipeg, we are going to remove 13 municipalities, we are going to cut 120 or so municipal politicians down to 50, 51. Mr. Cherniack, Sr., said that and he went out and tried to sell that to the people of Winnipeg.

They did not buy it, but they imposed it anyway and not a word about no democracy, not a word from the NDP. They cut the size of municipal representation in this city in half. In 1977, what they did was they hired the Taraska Commission to go out and decide on what the size of City Council should be. The Taraska Commission said 39, reduce it from 51 to 39. What did the NDP do? They cut it in half again, Mr. Speaker, not a word about no democracy. Talk about hypocrisy.

So, in 1985, what do they do? They hired Mr. Cherniack, Jr. They hired the son of the father to revisit the sins of the father with regard to reform in the City of Winnipeg, and he recommended 24. No, not a word of any democracy in that. Talk about independent commission—you think that Mr. Cherniack was independent? He sat on City Council for one term as a New Democrat, but that

was quite okay, there was no problem there; but you take Mr. Ross, who sat on Winnipeg council for 10 years and was a Conservative, and, all of a sudden, that is wrong. Talk about hypocrisy from the NDP, we see it time and time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of Winnipeg deserve better; they have told us they want better; and Bill 68 is going to give them better. Thank you.

* (2110)

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 68, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question before the House is the third reading of Bill 68, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg.

All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Honourable Members: Yea.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed, please nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The question before the House is third reading of Bill 68, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg.

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

Yeas

Carr, Carstairs, Cheema, Connery, Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Edwards, 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, Lathlin, Maloway, Martindale, Plohman, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wasylycia-Leis, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 35, Nays 19.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Bill 75—The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation and Consequential Amendments Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), that Bill 75, The Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi constituant en corporation le Fonds de participation des travailleurs du Manitoba et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives, be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

* (2120)

House Business

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of bills referred, namely, Bills 54 and 72.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bills 54 and 72 with the honourable member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bill 54—The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991

Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay): Will the Committee of the Whole please come to order to consider Bill 54, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991 (Loi de 1991 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité). Does the honourable Minister of Finance have an opening statement?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): No, I do not, Madam Chair.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Chairperson, in terms of dealing with The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991, there are some changes to the sales tax provisions. I wonder if the minister would outline the reasons for those changes outlined in the bill and what the practical application will be.

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, I am wondering if the member can be more specific. Can he tell me what specific page he is referring to—all of the changes starting on page 8?

Mr. Doer: In terms of sections dealing with Part 6 of the act, do they apply—in some way are measured to the public problems that were raised earlier this year where, in fact, the minister's own staff had some concerns. We had raised concerns at the Public Accounts Committee about situations dealing with tax compliance and collection. Is the minister rectifying something that was publicly raised through the public arena in the early months of this year?

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, the government is going to attempt to rectify. Of course, what we have always found is that you can never legislate integrity. Inasmuch as those businesses in our community that are double charging sales tax knowingly—yes, we will expect them, by passing this law, to make that total remittance to the government. If it can be determined by the consumers that they indeed have paid double sales tax, they then will be able to apply to the government, on some proof or some evidence, for a refund.

Furthermore, Madam Chairman, we are trying to, by way of circular, get that word out to all of the businesses in our province. Again, if it is an unscrupulous act, and indeed not indicated by way of the invoice that there is a sales tax owing at double the rate, then it is going to be very hard to find in that case too. In the sense that the documentation is done properly that double sales tax is charged either knowingly or unknowingly, we now, by way of this change in the statute, will make that an illegal act and expect that amount to be remitted to the government, and ultimately set up a system of rebate to the consumer if indeed we can find out who that consumer is.

Mr. Doer: When we were raising these issues in Public Accounts—and it is related to the implementation of this bill—we raised two concerns with the minister. One is the concern of the regulatory concern that the minister is attempting to deal with now. He is quite correct; you are dealing also with integrity as well in the community. The other issue was the whole morale in his own department in this dealing with the compliance section of the department. I was wondering whether the minister feels comfortable with the

section or amendment of the act in terms of his own area and department in terms of the morale, and whether they, when we pass this amendment, will be working in a positive environment dealing with the proposed amendments before us tonight in this Chamber, or do we still see the situation in his department today that we saw some six months ago?

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, if I felt that just passing a new law would improve morale, I would have done it long ago. I mean, the morale difficulty that I inherited within the Taxation Division was longstanding and had been there for many, many years. What we attempt to do to address the morale question is give a greater cross section of responsibility to our compliance staff. We made them functional in the sense that they are now responsible for a number of statute areas and just not a specialized area.

We have also, of course, changed the third floor significantly in the Norquay Building and hopefully that is more conducive to work surrounding and the activity in the workplace. So I would have to think that the morale has increased significantly in the division but there is some distance to go, and I am sure it will improve considerably yet over a numbers of months.

Mr. Doer: Just a last point on this with the Minister of Finance. Some of these issues came to light by employees speaking publicly, and I know the Minister of Finance was very concerned about that. Have they in fact, with the amendment proposed today, provided a public service with their concerns so that hopefully we, in this Legislature, have improved the regulatory environment in terms of taxation and the perception of fairness in the collection of same?

Mr. Manness: Again, Madam Chairman, I wish it were that easy, but let us put into perspective what was happening. There might have been two or three cases indeed of individuals, particularly supply and install people, who were double-taxing. When we approached them almost invariably they were not knowledgeable of that fact. Indeed, I say to the member, the concern that the government had was not that this was not an important issue and that we should not address it to the extent that we could, but we still sense that when employees of government who swear oaths of secrecy begin to leak private files of taxpayers it is a very serious matter, far beyond the scope of morale, beyond the ability of

the Department of Finance, Sports Minister, indeed it is coming to the very heart and soul of government and whether or not it has the right to release, at will, an individual's private records.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Madam Chairperson, I would like to ask the minister, under Part 4, the amendments provided for The Income Tax Act, page 6 of the bill in question, Bill 54—with reference to 16, there is an explanation in the notes that the minister provided us on this bill which refers to this section disqualifying anyone receiving social allowance from the Manitoba cost of living and property tax credit benefits unless specifically allowed by regulation.

* (2130)

I wonder if the minister could explain more fully, what is the implication of this? Are the recipients going to be receiving less assistance from the provincial government because they may be disallowed from obtaining these various benefits, namely the cost of living benefit and the property tax credit benefit? Could the minister elaborate on the implications of this?

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, the intent here is not to reduce or diminish any benefits now paid to those receiving social allowance. The desire here is to more clearly define what a benefit is, more in keeping with the federal definition, and secondly, also to ensure that those people receiving allowances have an opportunity to do so, more so on a monthly basis through the rates provided, allowances paid by the government through decisions made in the Department of Family Services, as compared to year-end application by way of income tax through, particularly, discounters.

So it is a double reason why we brought this bill in, and particularly this section deals more with the designation and puts it in line with the federal definition.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I am glad the minister has reassured us on this. I would imagine those who are interested in welfare recipients should be concerned with this particular section of the act, because even though the minister has assured us that there was no intention to take money away from welfare recipients, nevertheless you state in your explanation that the section disqualifies anyone receiving social allowance from Manitoba cost of living and property tax credit benefits unless specifically allowed by regulation. So whom do you

intend to disqualify? Whom do you intend to disallow by regulation?

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, from memory, and this is a long way back, but what we are attempting to do is to ensure that individuals who are not rightfully receiving tax by way of year-end income tax filing, those who maybe have collected through the year and are also applying by way of tax return at the end of the year, indeed, that there is some greater scrutiny brought into that so that there is greater fairness. I can indicate though to this House, those legitimate recipients in society who have need for allowance, indeed, will not have their benefits reduced and/or diminished.

Mr. Leonard Evans: The minister has said, well, those who deserve these credits will get them. Exactly how many will no longer be able to qualify for benefits once this particular amendment is passed? I mean, are we talking about a lot of people here? It seems to me that it gives the government a great deal of ability to disqualify a lot of people, possibly taking money from pockets from the poorest people among us, those who have to depend upon social allowances, which includes 10,000 or so disabled people and another large number of single parents. So I am quite concerned that there may be a group of people here who may be unjustly affected in a negative way.

Would the minister indicate to the Legislature or to the committee just how many people are we going to be disqualifying? There are over 20,000 cases of social allowance recipients, I believe, in the province.

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, on page 11 of my budget I said this, and I quote: "Tax Credits: We are acting to assure more timely delivery of all provincial benefits to social allowance recipients. Effective next January, social allowance rates will be increased to include provincial tax credits. By converting the annual tax credit into a regular monthly payment for higher rates"—which will be announced by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer)—"people will benefit on a more timely basis, and income tax refund discounters will no longer have access to these entitlements of social allowance recipients."

All we are trying to do is to provide the benefit in a more uniform fashion throughout the year by way of the allowance as compared to saving the benefit, seeing it build by way of application for tax credit

through the tax form. To do that, we have to pass these regulations.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Is the minister assuring us that there will be no loss of benefits on the part of the recipient through this new procedure?

Mr. Manness: I can assure the member that those legitimate recipients, under the understanding that we have now, the social allowance system, will have no reduction or diminution of their allowances.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Madam Chairperson, I go back then to my previous question. Who are illegitimately, presumably, receiving these benefits now? I am wondering because the item 16, as it is noted here on page 6, definitely refers to disqualification.

Mr. Manness: We will be disqualifying those who are now going to receive a higher benefit through the allowance. We will be disqualifying those who otherwise may have received a big year-end chunk and taking that by way of rebate from the federal government and taking that now and spreading it throughout the year by way of an increase in rates. Nobody will lose the benefit.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Madam Chairperson, each year we get an annual—normally, an annual increase is announced, usually reflecting inflation, 4 percent, 5 percent, or whatever. So is the minister saying that beginning presumably at the next calendar year, because it is usually done on a calendar year, beginning next January, assuming there is the usual annual increase to reflect inflation, you will not only have this, but now you will have presumably, beginning January 1992, a higher payment reflecting one-twelfth of the estimated amount of the cost of living and property tax credit benefit payable to that family or to that individual?

Mr. Manness: The member is correct. When we make the next announcements, once we make the decision on the increase as related to the cost of living, on top of that will be another bump-up to take into account the new system of providing allowance. So the member is correct.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I thank the minister for that statement. It would seem to me, though, that the department is going to have to make some estimates because in the past when a person applied, it was based on that person or that family's particular circumstances as to how much of the cost of living credit they were entitled to or what degree they were entitled to a property tax credit. Let us

say a person's rental or accommodation situation could change during the year or so, that person, his or her family, could be qualified say for part of the year for a property tax credit instead of a whole year or whatever. So it seems to me that ultimately the government is going to have to estimate on a forecast basis as opposed to the applicant coming forward seeking through the income tax forms and so on these credits on a retroactive basis.

At any rate, I would just like to ask the minister: Has there been any discussion on the part of the government, particularly the Minister of Family Services, with any of the organizations such as the Anti-Poverty Organization or any other social welfare agencies, social service nonprofit organizations in the province about this?

Mr. Manness: Well, certainly, the Minister of Family Services had many discussions with these organizations. Specific to this, I would suggest probably not. This is an internal adjustment which, in the mind of the government, will certainly be in keeping with what the wishes of the organizations that the member has referred to. Certainly, there is nothing untoward in this, and I am here to assure the member of that.

* (2140)

Mr. Leonard Evans: The item referred to, the very bottom of page 6, 122.5(1) of the Federal Income Tax, I am just reading this. The Federal Income Tax identifies individuals who are not eligible for the GST credit. In addition to social allowance recipients themselves, this definition includes spouses' dependents and other parent of the dependent child. I wonder if the minister could elaborate on this? We are not clear as to the intent of this particular section.

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, I do not know how clearer I can make it than that which is shown on page 6 of Appendix C of the budget. I honestly do not believe I can make my responses any clearer than page 6 of the budget paper, C: Taxation Adjustments, where we say beginning next January, social allowance rates will be increased to include Manitoba tax credit benefits.

Individuals who receive social assistance for the full year will no longer qualify for Manitoba cost of living and property tax credits. The changes will affect approximately one half of the individuals who currently receive social assistance. The savings in the cost of the tax credit program as a result of this

change will accrue to the province in '92-93 and will be used to increase social allowance benefits.

People on social allowance for the full term will no longer have to complete the annual Manitoba Tax Credit application form. Benefits will flow in a more timely basis and discounters will no longer have access to social allowance recipients' provincial tax credits. In keeping with that, and the member talks about 122.5, to accommodate that part we have to make some of the definitional change as shown at the bottom within that section to which he refers.

Mr. Leonard Evans: What is the implication of this for the GST credit? Will the social allowance recipients still apply through the income tax system for—I think it is a quarterly, I am not sure—a quarterly benefit from the federal government re the GST?

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, what we are passing here will have absolutely no influence on that whatsoever. That is a federal matter and to the extent that they have defined what is income and not income, the individual in question will make application with the federal green form in the booklet, if he is familiar with the income tax form at all, and the federal government will decide the eligibility.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Just a little bit of clarification. In this 122.5(1) there is reference to identification in the GST identifying individuals who are not eligible for the GST credit, but I am just wondering why we are saying, in addition to social allowance recipients themselves, this definition includes spouses, dependants and other parent of a dependent child. Can the minister shed any light on this bit of a nuance?

Mr. Manness: In the sense that we are partner in the federal income tax form, it seems to me that we have to pass this as our commitment to the federal government under the bilateral agreement that we entered into as a GST, I am talking harmonization now. We had to pass this definition in keeping with our joint obligation so that the federal government would continue to collect our tax.

Madam Chairman: We shall proceed to consider Bill No. 54 clause by clause. Is it the will of the committee that the bill be considered in blocks of clauses? Agreed.

Clauses 1 through 11 on page 5, inclusive—pass; Clause 12 through 16, inclusive, on page 6—pass.

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, with respect to Clause 17, I move

THAT subsection 17(2) be amended by striking out the first two lines and substituting the following:

“17(2) The definition of “non-qualifying business” in subsection 7.1(1) is amended”.

(French version)

Il est proposé que la version anglaise du paragraphe 17(2) soit amendée par substitution, aux deux premières lignes, de ce qui suit:

“17(2) The definition of “non-qualifying business” in subsection 7.1(1) is amended”.

Madam Chairman: Clause 17(1)—pass.

Shall the amendment pass—pass. Clause 17(2), as amended—pass.

Clauses 17(3), inclusive to Clause 24, page 9—pass; Clauses 25(1) inclusive to Clause 32, page 13—pass; Clauses 33 through 46, page 16 inclusive—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass. Is it the will of the committee that I report the bill?

Mr. Leonard Evans: Just prior to the report, I just want to reiterate the concern that this side of the House has with regard to Clause 16 as it relates to the various cost of living and property tax credit benefits and the amendments that are being proposed herein. We accept the minister's statement at face value. We accept his position on this, but we just want to be on record that we are very concerned that in no way that this particular amendment takes money out of the pockets of the poorest people in our province, provincial social allowance recipients, which include over 10,000 single-parent families, which include about 10,000 disabled people among others.

We are very, very concerned particularly in this day and age of high cost of living, the GST and all the rest of it, that no action be taken whatsoever by this Legislature that somehow or other curtails or deprives the most needy people in our province from income. We are concerned that these benefits be identified. I would trust that the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) will be speaking to various pertinent organizations in the future about this before the pay-out or before the changes are in effect.

I would particularly trust that the benefits that the minister is talking about being provided on a monthly basis be clearly identified, that somehow or other that there is an identification of these credits on a

monthly basis as opposed to the inflationary adjustment that takes place at the beginning of the year. We will be monitoring this, Madam Chairperson, and we will, I am sure, be hearing from the various organizations such as the Manitoba Anti-Poverty Organization if there is some negative impact. Let us hope that it will be positive and that generally speaking people will be assisted and not hurt in any way.

Madam Chairman: Is it the will of the committee that I report the bill?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Madam Chairman: Agreed and so ordered.

* * *

Mr. Manness: Madam Chairman, I was in error when I referred Bill 72 to Committee of the Whole. It has not received second reading yet. I would therefore move committee rise.

Madam Chairman: Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

* (2150)

IN SESSION

Committee Report

Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 54, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991 (Loi de 1991 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité), as amended, and reports the same and asks leave to sit again.

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

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I propose to call Third Readings, Bills 2 through 73. Would you call them Bill 2?

THIRD READINGS

Bill 2—The Amusements Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs.

Mitchelson), that Bill 2, The Amusements Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les divertissements), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 51—The Pharmaceutical Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), that Bill 51, The Pharmaceutical Act (Loi sur les pharmacies), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): I would just like to say that I enjoyed the presentation of the Pharmaceutical Association. The consultation on this bill started in the mid-'80s and carried on by the minister. It is a good bill. I think it is very worthy of note for all members of the Legislature the section in the bill dealing with an open process by the professional organization in dealing with their own disciplinary action. I think it is laudable, and I think it is the way to go with many of these so-called self-policing organizations.

I know the member for Arthur-Virden (Mr. Downey) is not interested in these comments, but I think it is important to put on record when associations like this put forward a very strong position on an open, accountable process to the public not to just their own internal membership.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 51, The Pharmaceutical Act; Loi sur les pharmacies. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Bill 61—The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), that Bill 61, The Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Fonds de développement économique local), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 64—The Energy Rate Stabilization Repeal Act

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 64, The Energy Rate Stabilization Repeal Act (Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la stabilisation des emprunts d'Hydro-Manitoba à l'étranger), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 69—The Manitoba Medical Association Fees Repeal Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): I move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), that Bill 69, The Manitoba Medical Association Fees Repeal Act (Loi abrogeant la Loi sur les droits de l'Association médicale du Manitoba), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill 71—The Mineral Exploration Incentive Program Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), that Bill 71, The Mineral Exploration Incentive Program Act (Loi sur le Programme d'encouragement à l'exploration minière), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 73—The Rural Development Bonds Act

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Downey), that Bill 73, The Rural Development Bonds Act (Loi sur les obligations de développement rural), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT STAGE

Bill 54—The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991

Mr. Manness: With the leave of the House, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), that Bill 54, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991 (Loi de 1991 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité), as amended and reported from the Committee of the Whole be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable government House leader have leave? Leave. It is agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, will you call Debate on Third Readings, Amended Bills, in the order shown on the Order Paper, starting with Bill 12?

DEBATE ON THIRD READINGS—AMENDED BILLS

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

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 12, The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to pass Bill 12.

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

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is third reading of Bill 12, The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du Banc de la Reine. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 18—The Municipal Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Finance), Bill 18, The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): We are also prepared to pass Bill 18.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 18, The Municipal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les municipalités. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 19—The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 19, The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élection des autorités locales, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are also prepared to pass this one.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 19, The Local Authorities Election Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'élection des autorités locales. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

* (2200)

Bill 41—The Public Schools Amendment Act (2)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 41, The Public Schools Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur les écoles publiques, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

Bill 42—The Public Schools Finance Board Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 42, The Public Schools Finance Board Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur a Commission des finances des écoles publiques, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

Bill 46—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 46, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yes, we are prepared to pass Bill 46, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 46, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 48—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 48, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yes, we are prepared to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 48, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant le Code de la route. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Bill 49—The Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 49, The Colleges and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur les collèges et modifiant diverses dispositions législatives, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand. Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. It is agreed.

Bill 70—The Public Sector Compensation Management Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), Bill 70, The Public Sector Compensation Management Act; Loi sur la gestion des salaires du secteur public, standing in the name of the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. It is agreed.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you call Debate on Third Readings, the bills as listed starting with No. 8.

DEBATE ON THIRD READINGS

Bill 8—The Vital Statistics Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 8, The Vital Statistics Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, this bill has probably had as much debate as any bill in this session. I know there have been many inspired speeches tonight and I was

trying to go by memory and remember exactly what this bill was about and what the debate was about. I cannot, frankly, remember. I know there were some very good speeches and some people put a great deal of research into this, so I think we have all decided to leave those speeches to the history books and allow this bill to pass without any further ado.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 8, The Vital Statistics Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les statistiques de l'état civil. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed and so ordered.

Bill 38—The Wildlife Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 38, The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Leave?

An Honourable Member: What number?

Mr. Speaker: Bill 38. Is there leave? Leave. It is agreed.

Bill 40—The Education Administration Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 40, The Education Administration Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration scolaire, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 40, The Education Administration Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration scolaire. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed and so ordered.

**Bill 58—The Development Corporation
Amendment Act**

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 58, The Development Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société de développement, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, we are also prepared to have this one go through third reading.

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

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is third reading of Bill 58, The Development Corporation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société de développement. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

**Bill 60—The Law Society
Amendment Act**

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill 60, The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau, standing in the name of the honourable member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are also prepared to pass this through third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is third reading of Bill 60, The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du Barreau. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

An Honourable Member: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there is leave of the House to consider the private Bills 32 and 66. I wonder if you might call Bill 66 first.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave of the House to bring forward Bill 66 and Bill 32?

An Honourable Member: Leave.

Mr. Speaker: Leave. It is agreed.

THIRD READINGS—PRIVATE BILLS

**Bill 66—The Winnipeg Canoe Club
Incorporation Amendment Act**

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render), by leave, that Bill 66, The Winnipeg Canoe Club Incorporation Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi constituant en corporation "The Winnipeg Canoe Club"), be now read a third time and passed.

Motion presented.

Mr. Kevln Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

**Bill 32—The Mount Carmel Clinic
Amendment Act**

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickes), that Bill 32, The Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la "Mount Carmel Clinic," be now read a third time and passed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if there is a will of the House to bring back Bill 72, Second Reading, that is The Loan Act, and whether or not there might be a wish to move it through second reading at this time so we can have it ready for Committee of the Whole another day.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to allow Bill 72 to come forward at this time?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave? Leave.

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed.

SECOND READINGS

Bill 72—The Loan Act, 1991

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill

72, The Loan Act, 1991; Loi d'emprunt de 1991 portant affectation de crédits, standing in the name of the honourable member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman). Stand?

An Honourable Member: No.

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

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Question? The question before the House is second reading of Bill 72, on the proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance, Bill 72, The Loan Act, 1991; Loi d'emprunt de 1991 portant affectation de crédits. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

* * *

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that the House do adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The hour being after 6 p.m., this House now adjourns and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, July 24, 1991

CONTENTS

Thrd Readings - Amended Bills

Bill 68, City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (2)	
Santos	5280
Reid	5285
Barrett	5288
Wasylycia-Leis	5290
Lamoureux	5293
Friesen	5294
Carr	5296
Doer	5298
Carstairs	5300
Ernst	5300

Bill 75, Manitoba Employee Ownership Fund Corporation and Consequential Amendments Act	5301
--	------

Committee of the Whole

Bill 54, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991	5301
--	------

Thrd Readings

Bill 2, Amusements Amendment Act	5306
Bill 51, Pharmaceutical Act Doer	5306
Bill 61, Communities Economic Development Fund Amendment Act	5306
Bill 64, Energy Rate Stabilization Repeal Act	5307
Bill 69, Manitoba Medical Association Fees Repeal Act	5307
Bill 71, Mineral Exploration Incentive Program Act	5307
Bill 73, Rural Development Bonds Act	5307

Report Stage

Bill 54, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1991	5307
--	------

Debate on Thrd Readings - Amended Bills

Bill 12, Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Amendment Act	5307
Bill 18, Municipal Amendment Act	5308
Bill 19, Local Authorities Election Amendment Act	5308
Bill 46, Highway Traffic Amendment Act	5308
Bill 48, Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2)	5308

Debate on Thrd Readings

Bill 8, Vital Statistics Amendment Act Ashton	5309
Bill 40, Education Administration Amendment Act	5309
Bill 58, Development Corporation Amendment Act	5310
Bill 60, Law Society Amendment Act	5310

Thrd Readings - Private Bills

Bill 66, Winnipeg Canoe Club Incorporation Amendment Act	5310
Bill 32, Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act	5310

Second Readings

Bill 72, Loan Act, 1991	5310
-------------------------	------